

# Tournament Directors Training

## March 2010

---

### Table of Contents

1	Tournament Exam Syllabus.....	2
2	The Role of the Director .....	2
3	Mitchell and Howell Movements.....	3
4	Running Open Tournaments.....	6
5	NZ Bridge systems policy.....	6
6	Score calculation and changing Scores .....	7
7	Matchpointing with artificially adjusted scores .....	8
8	Running Teams Events.....	9
9	Running Swiss pairs Events.....	9
10	Rectification v Penalty .....	9
11	Mistaken Explanation v Mistaken Call.....	9
12	Play Out of Turn (including premature play).....	10
13	Revokes with and without Rectification .....	10
14	Insufficient Bids Law 27 .....	11
15	Exposed card/penalty card.....	11
16	Inadmissible calls .....	12
17	Calls out of Rotation .....	12
18	Unauthorized Information.....	12
19	Calls based on misinformation .....	14
20	Withdrawn calls / lead penalties .....	15
21	Dummy's rights and limitations.....	15
22	Claims and Concessions.....	15
23	Unintended Calls.....	16
24	Adjusted Scores and Split Scores .....	16
25	Single weighted scores .....	16
26	Fouled Boards.....	17
27	Making decisions at the table .....	17
28	NZ Alerting Regulations.....	18
29	Psyche Bidding.....	19
30	Director's error.....	19
31	Breaches of Etiquette.....	19
32	Awareness of Potential damage.....	20
33	Procedural and Disciplinary Penalties.....	20
34	Running an Appeal.....	21

Notes prepared March 2010  
Allan Joseph Tel (04) 389 8513, Wellington

# 1 Tournament Exam Syllabus

---

The Tournament Director's exam is based on the Laws of Duplicate Bridge 2007. Prospective candidates must know:

How to set up the tables and prepare the club rooms for a tournament

The correct time allocation for each round of boards.

The minimum number of boards required to qualify for the award of masterpoints for tournaments from 3B to 10A.

1. **The basic Mitchell Movement** as used by the majority of bridge clubs in New Zealand - more specifically, to provide an acceptable movement for a given number of pairs over a given number of sessions

2. **How to match-point a score sheet** - more specifically

How to match-point an adjusted board(s)

How to calculate any score earned (without reference to a ready scorer)

How to match-point passed-in score(s)

(There will be a compulsory simple match-pointing question worth 5 marks)

3. **How to administer and interpret all the rules of Bridge.**

4. **How to evaluate and arbitrate in breaches of etiquette in the game of bridge.**

5. **How to correctly apply the NZ Bridge Regulations**

6. **How to correctly apply the Laws of Duplicate bridge as written in the 2007 Laws**

7. **To show a good understanding of the Laws that cover the following topics**

Revoke

Bids/Calls out of Rotation

Penalty cards

Claims and Concessions

Unauthorised Information

Insufficient Bid

Lead Penalties

Leads out of Turn

Misbids and Misexplanations

Questions are generally worth 5 marks and the answers should be a short paragraph, citing the appropriate laws and should demonstrate the candidate's judgment, knowledge and in some cases the techniques or procedures that may be used by the candidate.

Tournament Directors Exam

There are no past papers available, as the question papers are not sent back to the candidates- only the answers. Whereas the club director's exam consists of true/false answers and a statement of the relevant law, the tournament director's exam consists of describing an event at a table and asking you how you would handle the situation, stating the laws and regulations on which you base your answer. One or at most two paragraphs are usually required for your answer. *Remember to state the /law / regulation.*

Candidates should be, at this stage of their directing, thoroughly familiar with all 93 Laws and the current Manual. I suggest that you re-read the law book a number of times highlighting any laws or sections that you do not understand and obtain clarification from whatever reliable source is available. There are numerous director's forums where knowledge and experience is shared.

## 2 The Role of the Director

---

Law 81 - The Director is the official representative of the Tournament Organizer.

The role of the director is to facilitate the enjoyment of playing duplicate bridge. A friendly, sympathetic attitude is essential; a courteous request will more often than not achieve far more than an officious dictate. Try to avoid interrupting players during play, and keep announcements to a minimum. Players are not interested in any problems you are having, so don't tell them about the slow play, the fouled boards, the scores on the wrong line, etc- speak directly to the players involved rather than disturb the whole room.

Active ethics is an essential part of being a director; ensure that you readily disclose all information in your bidding system, and that you never use any unauthorized information.

Dress smartly, be courteous, and stay composed; this will give the outward appearance of confidence. Be careful not to criticize other directors especially when you are asked for an opinion regarding rulings given by other directors.

The director is responsible for the on-site technical management of the tournament, and has powers to remedy any omissions of the tournament organizer - e.g. to establish suitable conditions of play and announce them to the contestants, to arrange for scores to be collected, results tabulated and an official record made of these results, and sometimes the selection of an appeals committee.

Law 10 gives the director the sole right to determine rectifications when applicable; further the director may allow or cancel any enforcement or waiver of a rectification made by the players without his instructions.

Slow play is a perennial problem for directors, possibly their biggest headache; before considering penalizing any players for slow play make sure you have identified the offending pair, and then monitor their attempts to catch up. Assisting their progress usually gets the message across in a subtle way. Don't wait for the noise level to go up before you call the move; if this is the case you are possibly allowing too much time before calling the move. Keep the tournament playing room quiet, especially in teams - a "sssssush- sssssush" usually does the trick!

Interesting duties and powers of the director include:

- To rectify an error or irregularity of which the director becomes aware of in any manner, within the correction period allowed in Law 79C. This correction period is usually 30 minutes after the official score has been made available for inspection.
- To waive rectification for cause, in his discretion, upon the request of the non-offending side i.e. if the non-offending side believes that they may have been the cause of the irregularity by the offending side, they may ask the director to waive the rectification.

Tournament directors should keep abreast of all changes in the regulations and advise, where relevant, the club committee of the implications.

By default the director of a club is often left to somehow educate players regarding the laws and regulations. This may be done by a short "blurb" before playing sessions (time permitting- which is not often), newsletter, seminars, but more often simply by answering questions which the players ask before or after a session.

### 3 Mitchell and Howell Movements

---

#### **Mitchell Movement**

The Mitchell Movement results in two winners – a N/S winner and an E/W winner.

We should be familiar with the basic Mitchell Movement:

- Once around for an odd number of tables
- Byestand and share for an even number of tables.

When there are feedins, the placement of feedins, the placement of phantom, and calling the jump/switch at the appropriate time must be clearly understood. Also with feedings, some pairs will necessarily be phantom twice. How many? As many pairs as there are sets of feedins – i.e. if there are 4 sets of feedins, then 4 pairs will play phantom twice.

A **Scrambled Mitchell** where pairs change their direction, results in a single winning pair. In practice, the N/S players stay seated and the E/W players move as normal but the boards are turned at right angles (known as switching) on certain rounds.

N/S pairs are numbered as usual.

E/W pairs take their number as their starting table plus the number of tables.

An **Expanded Mitchell** also called Hesitation Mitchell is a Mitchell Movement enabling us to add one (or more) extra round/s to the movement. Why would we bother? Because we can then for example, have 12 tables and play 26 boards.

This is done by increasing the number of moving pairs, which of course decreases the number of stationary pairs, so that one (or more) tables do not have a stationary pair.

In this case of 12 tables, we start off by planning a 12 table bystand and share, which would normally have one set of bystand/rest boards between tables 6 and 7, and tables 1 and 12 sharing boards. This first bystand set of boards compensates for table 1 and 12 sharing. But table 12 now becomes a PIVOT table, i.e. when a moving pair arrives at the pivot table ( from the second highest table) it first plays one round as E/W and then one round as N/S before moving on to table 1. To compensate for this pivoting, we add a second set of rest boards at the half- way/ bystand table i.e. two sets of boards are put in at the half way table.

Interestingly, if we continue to expand a Mitchell movement, i.e. add more rounds (thereby reducing the number of tables with stationary pairs) we eventually end up with a Howell movement.

The **Rover Mitchell** is a way of accommodating a half table, or conveniently a late pair. The " rover pair " sits out for the first round ( obviously that is the case if it is a late arriving pair ), and then the rover pair " bumps out a pair who sits out for one round. The rover pair moves according to a pre-calculated sequence fitting the movement.

It is prudent to pre--warn the pair about to be bumped by the roving pair so that they do not start playing the boards which they should sit out. Usually the rover pair replaces a stationary N/S pair.

The **Appendix Mitchell** may be used to add extra tables to the normal Mitchell movement. These extra tables are called appendix tables and the movement called an appendix Mitchell. This can be used to accommodate a late pair (very handy) but the main virtue is that this appendix movement permits the number of boards to be fixed even though the number of tables may vary.

The movement is set up for a prime number of tables, called the base; all pairs in the base move - N/S move up 2 tables, E/W move up one table( as usual), the boards move down one table (as usual ). In the appendix tables, E/W pairs are stationary and the N/S pairs move.

The movement consists of the N/S pairs moving up two tables including the appendix tables, but the E/E pairs in the base moving up only one table but always staying within the base (because E/E pairs in the appendix are stationary).

A very popular movement is the **1 ½ table Appendix Mitchell**, where the base does not have to be a prime number. In this specific case, the N/S pairs are still stationary and the E/W pairs still move as in a regular Mitchell. N/S pairs are numbered as normal, E/W pairs add their table number to the number of tables. The main group of tables is called the base. If the base is an odd number, we use the odd table Mitchell /once around movement. If the base is an even number we use the Skip Mitchell.

Example - 19 pairs expecting to play 24 boards.

We use a base of 8 tables, and the 9th table is appendix to table 1 and shares boards with it throughout. The odd pair at E/W 10 sits out for the first round, and then rejoins the base at table 1 on the second round. Before moving from the appendix table to table 1, each E/W pair sits out at table 10 for one round. After half the number of boards have been played, call the skip move. Despite the skip, the last round will not be a revenge round.

The **Web Mitchell** allows a predetermined number of boards to be played, irrespective of the number of tables, usually 26 or 24 boards.

When there is an even number of tables you simply divide the room into two even groups, and each group has its own set of boards, which stay within that group of tables.

Start handing out the first set of boards as usual, and then "drop off" the remaining boards after the halfway table on a rest table.

The other set of boards is handed out in "reverse order, starting with boards 25/26, at the highest even numbered table, then boards 1/2 at the next lowest numbered table etc, until you meet the rest table. Of course it would be silly to simply drop the remainder of the boards on top of the other feed-ins - instead they are fed-in "in reverse order" at the highest even numbered table.

However, the players move as in a normal Mitchell i.e. the players move to a higher numbered table (and in doing so may move into the other group and play different coloured boards.

Phantom can be anywhere.

When there are an odd number of tables, we have a Roving pair (which is the E/W pair at the highest EVEN numbered table).

Again the room is divided into two equal groups, with the odd table (known as the Sit-out / Rover Table), temporarily placed out of the way (for the meantime- but don't forget about them altogether!).

The boards are handed out again as with the even number of tables, leaving the Sit-out table with no boards. So what boards does this table play? They play exactly the same boards as the Rover pair are playing at another table.

After each round, the rover pair moves to a predetermined table displacing the E/W pair who are about to arrive from the next lower numbered table. So where does this displaced pair go? They go to the Sit-out table, play there for one round, thereafter rejoining the main group two tables up from where they left.

Because the move is complex, we do need to have some guide cards:

- Firstly a guide card for the rover pair to instruct them of their destination after each round.
- Secondly, we have to warn one corresponding E/W pair that they cannot simply move to the next table because the rover pair is destined to go there.

If there is a phantom, it should be placed E/W at the Sit-out table – in which case the Sit-out table does not require any boards, which is much easier for the director.

This movement may be beneficial on a club night, but since pairs only play against a limited number of other pairs, it is not ideal for tournaments.

### **Howell Movement**

In a full Howell Movement every pair plays against every other pair; there is only one stationary pair. But sometimes there are too many pairs for every pair to play against every other pair, so we play a reduced Howell (reduced number of rounds), also known as a ½ Howell.

As a consequence of reducing the number of rounds we have additional stationary pairs. For each round reduced, we add on one stationary pair. If we continue to reduce the number of rounds, eventually we get half the number of pairs being stationary, which is known as a half Howell, which is in fact the same as a Mitchell.

### **Complete Howell**

If there are 7 full tables we have 14 pairs, one stationary pair, and each pair will play against 13 other pairs so we have 13 rounds of 2 boards per round = 26 boards.

If there are 8 full tables we play 15 rounds with one stationary pair, at 2 boards a round = 30 boards (possibly too many for a club session).

Howell movements are ideal for a smaller number of tables, e.g. up to 8 tables (15 rounds), and the Howell is most ideal for 7 tables = 13 rounds = 26 boards.

## Reduced Howell

But when we have 9 full tables we would need to play 17 rounds which is definitely too many, so we reduce the number of rounds to say 14 rounds. How many stationary pairs would we have?

In any Howell movement, **table guide slips** are left on each table informing pairs who their opponents are and which boards are to be played. Then after the round is played, it informs the pairs at that table as to their new destination.

## 4 Running Open Tournaments.

---

The Masterpoint manual stipulates the minimum number of boards to be played for the award of masterpoints for various grade tournaments. Club session 20 boards in circulation

Junior 5B Intermediate, 8B Multigrade and 3A Open all 48 deals

5A Open 60 deals      10A Open 72 deals      15A Open 96 deals

Tournament director's qualification allows the director to direct up to 5A Open tournament unsupervised; 60 boards (minimum) is usually played over two sessions, but can be played over three 20 board sessions. Say we have 18 tables

Session 1 Mitchell —30 boards min. per session

Session 2 If N/S in the first session, sit at tables 1 to 9 and if E/W in the morning sit at tables 9-18 then toss. Remember seating rights if there was an E/W phantom in the first session, try for a N/S phantom in the 2.

If the event is over three sessions, -20 boards min. per session, continue with this format;

Session 3, if N/S this morning sit at tables 1 to 4, then toss, if E/W fill the remainder of the tables then toss. This does facilitate most pairs meeting most other pairs during the event, but not all. The ideal is to have a completely *balanced* movement i.e. all pairs play against all other pairs an equal number of times, and play as many time N/S as E/W.

A combination of Mitchell and Howell gives a very good tournament format.

The director may wish to seed the field, i.e. rank the contestants, and ensure that the starting "groups" have an equal number of strong pairs as weak pairs. Ranking is done both quantitatively (e.g. using master point ratings) and qualitatively by giving consideration to a contestant's previous bridge history and accomplishments.

## 5 NZ Bridge systems policy

---

There are Green, Blue, Yellow and Red Systems, and also a group of conventions referred to as Brown Sticker conventions.

Green — mainly natural

Blue- strong club systems (e.g. Precision)

Yellow — Highly unusual methods (HUM)

Red — All systems that do not fall under Green, Blue or Yellow, and also includes Green or Blue systems that contain a Brown sticker convention.

Random actions, and encrypted signals are forbidden in all play in NZ. Both players in a pair must play the same system- see law 40 B2a

Should a Contestant contravene the systems policy, and if the non offending side has been damaged, the

director can award an adjusted score; regulations recommend a 60/40 artificial score.

In addition the director may assess a disciplinary penalty, taking into account amongst other things, the standard of the offending pair, and was it reasonable for the offenders to have been aware that they were transgressing the systems regulations. See manual D8.

For Junior Tournaments, only Green and Blue systems are allowed, and although Multi 2D/Multi 2C is a Green system convention, it is not allowed in Junior Tournaments.

In teams tournaments (defined as at least 8 boards in succession against the same pair) all systems are allowed .Green, Blue, Red and Yellow, but sometimes in the initial stages of the teams tournament, lower graded teams are given "protection "from Hum systems.

At A point pairs tournaments, Green, Blue, and Red (with limitations) systems are allowed.

## 6 Score calculation and changing Scores

---

We must be completely familiar with the scoring table of Law 77, remember the learning aid STGOI and revising especially the following:

Slam Bonuses 500/1000 Not Vul and 750/1500 Vul.

Overtricks (X and XX ) 100/200 Not Vul , and 200/400 Vu!

Defeated contracts (X and XX)

Remember the learning aid : VUL 2-5-8-11-14 (starting at 2 , jumping in 3's)and NVUL 1-3-5-8-11-14(starting at 1, two 2's then jumping in 3's.

A passed in board is entered as Zero for both side, but a board not played (e.g. played against phantom, or a shortened movement) is simply not scored.

Should there be a phantom; one direction gets a higher total top than the other direction.

In the final calculation of scores for a tournament, theses scores are then "factored "- this is done automatically by the scoring program, but can be done manually.

Should one session of a tournament have more boards than the other, the percentages for the two sessions are required to be "weighted ". If selected to do so, the scoring program will do this, but the number of boards for each session needs to be entered.

To help understand "weighting" take an exaggerated example — in the first session only 1 board is played, whereas in second session 59 boards are played.

The winner of the first session obviously has not achieved as much a victory as the winner of the second session, who came first over 59 boards.

Law 79 Tricks Won -also deals with scoring errors.

A scoring error may be of two types — an inconsistent score, or an incorrectly recorded result.

### **Inconsistent score:**

The director may change of his own accord an error made in "vulnerability" or a score awarded to the wrong side (provided of course he is absolutely sure to which side it belongs).

Further, a computed or tabulated error of an *agreed upon score* may be changed within the "correction" period) as specified in 79C, only provided both pairs agree that it is the correct result .The director may not alter an inconsistent score if the pairs are unavailable for consultation .

### **Incorrectly recorded result**

An incorrectly recorded result i.e. the score is consistent but the recorded result incorrect, can also be adjusted if attention is drawn to it within the same time frame. However the director must have complete confidence in the recollection of both pairs, and should be wary that a more experienced pair does not forcefully state the events on a less experienced pair if the director has any doubts, then the consistent score as originally recorded shall stand. See manual D22

## 7 Matchpointing with artificially adjusted scores

For every adjusted score we reduce the "top" of the board by 1, and increase the "bottom" by 1. Begin by giving every pair with an adjusted score an average ie. 50% of the top, and recalculate later.

Board 7                      Dealer S                      Vul All

NS	EW	Contract	By	Made	N/s Score	EW score	N/s MPS	New	original
1	12	INT	E	(1)	10Q				0
2	14				60%	40%	15		2
3	16	1NT	E	1		90			
4	1	1NT	W	(2)	200			-3	
5	3	1NT	W	(1)	100			5	8
6	5	1NT	E	(2)	200			7	10
7	7	ID	W	1		70			12
8	10	2S	N	2	110			11	14
9	8	2NT	N	(1)		100		13	16
10	6	No bid						15	18
11	7	2D	W	(1)	100			17	20
12	9				60%	60%	15	19	22
13	11				50%	50%	15	21	24
14	13	PHANTOM						23	26
15	15	1NT	E	1		90		25	28
16	17	1NT	W	(1)		100		27	30
17	2	INT	S	2		120			32

Top = 32                      Allowing for phantom top = 30, 10%=3      Average (50%) =15

There are 3 adjusted scores, so reduce the top from 30 to 27, and increase the bottom from 0 to 3. Next, matchpoint as usual, omitting in the meantime, the adjusted scores.

Finally make the calculation for the adjusted scores: 50 % stays as 15 MPs, 60% becomes 18 MPs, and 40% becomes 12 Mps

Referring to tables 14, 13 and 12 in the above traveller, what event/s do you think occurred to bring about these adjusted scores?

Refer manual D29, and note pairs in no way at fault receive an indemnity of 10%

What could have happened at Table 2?

## 8 Running Teams Events

---

The rules of competition should be published before the start of the tournament, stating how many rounds/matches, how many boards per match, the type of draw (round robin or swiss), and any carry over from the qualifying rounds into the finals if applicable.

## 9 Running Swiss pairs Events

---

Swiss Pairs is effectively a Team Event where you play 8 boards against another pair and your score is scored against a datum which is the average score at all the other tables.

## 10 Rectification v Penalty

---

The 2007 Laws emphasize the difference between rectification and penalty. The definition of rectification is the remedial provisions to be applied when an irregularity has come to the Directors attention, whereas a penalty is specifically reserved for procedure and discipline, see definition.

A disciplinary penalty should only be applied in aggravated circumstances and as a guide only if the director deems that without the penalty no change would occur.

A procedural penalty however, maybe awarded in fairness to the other contestants who have been (disadvantaged, e.g. a pair fouls a board and the next table requires an artificial adjusted score. This disadvantaged table may in fact have scored a top on that board but are now limited to a 60% plus an indemnity. This could cost the contestant a final placing and the disadvantaged contestants may expect the director to award a procedural penalty against the offending pair.

Law 90 lists the type of offences subject to procedural penalties. A procedural penalty is applied to both players of the offending pair even though one player may be completely innocent, but a disciplinary penalty need be applied only to the offending player, not the offending pair. This may be very relevant in an individual contest.

## 11 Mistaken Explanation v Mistaken Call

---

Law 75 gives a clear explanation on the difference, and the responsibilities of the players.

A mistaken explanation is an explanation which does not match the partnership agreement, and since Law 40 demands that all partnership understandings must be made available to the opponents, a mistaken explanation is consequently an infraction.

A mistaken call or a misbid is simply a mistake by the player and provided the correct explanation of that call is given to the opponents there is no infraction.

However both a misexplanation and a misbid are mistakes, and both result in unauthorized information. This unauthorized information must not be used by the offending partnership.

Often one player of the partnership believes that they have a certain agreement whilst the other player thinks the agreement is something else. In the absence of clear cut evidence, (e.g. a clearly written system card,) Law 75C makes it clear that the Director is to presume mistaken explanation rather than mistaken call and proceed with his ruling and adjusted score on this basis.

When a player realizes that he has given a misexplanation, he should immediately notify the director, who will conduct proceedings thereafter, but if a player knows that his partner has given a misexplanation he should do nothing in the meantime. If this pair becomes the declaring side, they should notify the Director and must volunteer a correction of the explanation; this minimizes the possible consequential damage caused by the misexplanation, and gives the opponents a much fairer basis on which to make the opening lead. In effect, this correction keeps the possible damage within the auction and not the play.

However if the offending pair becomes defenders, they should not volunteer the correct explanation until completion of the hand.

Note — Law 21 call based on misinformation and Law 75 have much in common and are "coupled".

Law 21B clearly states that the failure to alert promptly where an alert is required is deemed misinformation.

### **Reopening the Auction —**

Law 21B1a states that until the end of the Auction period, and provided his partner has not subsequently called, a player may change a call without other rectification for his side when the director judges that the decision to make the call could well have been influenced by misinformation given to the player by an opponent.

Note — the *auction* ends after 3 consecutive passes but the *auction period* ends only once the opening lead has been faced, see Law 17E. So until the opening lead is faced, the director may reopen the auction but only going back 2 "places".

## **12 Play Out of Turn (including premature play)**

---

All directors should be very familiar with leads out of turn

- Law 53- accepted leads
- Law 54 — Faced opening leads out of turn
- Law 55- declarers lead out of turn
- Law56- defenders lead out of turn

The withdrawn card of a defender becomes a major penalty card ( Law 50 ) with consequent lead restrictions.

Tournament directors should also be familiar with Law 57- premature lead or play.

When a defender leads to the next trick before his partner has played to the current trick, or plays out of turn before his partner has played, the card so led or played becomes a major penalty card, AND declarer can require:

Offenders partner to play the highest card of the suit led, or to play the lowest card of the suit led; should the partner not have a card of the led suit, then declarer can forbid the play of a card of another suit specified by the declarer.

Interestingly, if declarer plays from dummy before LHO has played (as is quite often seen), then there is no rectification if RHO plays prematurely.

## **13 Revokes with and without Rectification**

---

The usual revoke is failure to follow suit when able to.

But a revoke may also be a failure to lead or play a suit or card specified by an opponent when choosing an option in rectification of an irregularity.

A defective trick (see Law 6 ) is when a player has omitted to play a card to a trick, or has played too many cards to a trick.

In both cases, if the error is not rectified before a player on each side has played to the following trick, then the offender is deemed to have revoked on the defective trick and is subject to a one trick penalty in accordance with law 64A2

Law 64 B lists 7 situations which even though the revoke is established, there is no rectification.

However Law 64C gives the director the discretion to assign an adjusted score, if he feels that application of the revoke law does not sufficiently compensate the non offending side.

Example - the non offending side may have made a call on the next deal, or may have moved to the next table or may even only become aware of the revoke when the " hand records" are handed out at the end of the session ;if notified "within the correction period"( law 79C), the director can rectify the situation and assign an adjusted score to restore equity.

## 14 Insufficient Bids Law 27

---

An insufficient bid, even an insufficient bid out of rotation, can be accepted.

An insufficient bid out of rotation can be accepted but if it is not accepted Law 31 applies instead of Law 27. However, an unintended insufficient bid can never be accepted - Law 25 applies.

If the insufficient bid is not accepted, then -

27B1a: if the insufficient bid is corrected by the lowest sufficient bid in the same denomination, and if both the insufficient bid and the substituted bid are incontrovertibly not artificial, the auction proceeds without further rectification. Law 16D (unauthorized information) does not apply but Law 27D does apply.

27B1b: irrespective of artificiality, if the insufficient bid is corrected with a legal call that has the same or precise meaning than the original insufficient bid, then the auction proceeds without further rectification.

27B2: except for the two allowable substitutions above, if any other call is made the offenders partner must pass whenever it is his turn to call.

You should also read and learn / understand all sections of Law 27.

The procedure for assessing whether to allow the substituted call to be accepted without further rectification is described in the manual D16.

Firstly, to ascertain the offending player's original intent at the time of the infraction may require removing the player from the table and asking about the intention of the bid and the pairs method. You may need to check this against the pair's system card. Thereafter the director can explain the options to the offending player. Occasionally it will be unclear whether to allow the correction without restriction under Law 27B1b or to require the offender's partner to pass throughout the remainder of the auction under Law 27B2. **The director is advised to err on the side of applying Law 27B1b, i.e. try to get a normal bridge result.**

If the non-offending side is damaged, either because of the partner using unauthorized information, or because of the director's judgment on allowing the substitution without further rectification, then the director can apply Law 27D

**Under no circumstances should the director give weight to the fact that he has made a poor judgment**, i.e. Law 82C (directors error) is not applicable. This is the only case in the laws and regulations where the director gives the benefit of the doubt to the offending side. Numerous examples are available on this in the Manual D17 — D19 and in the Commentary to the 2007 Laws by Tom Kooijman, Chairman of the WBF Laws Committee.

## 15 Exposed card/penalty card

---

Law 48 and 49 deal with the exposure of declarers and defenders cards respectively. An exposed defenders card becomes a penalty card and lead penalties on offender's partner are described in Law 50. NOTE —the information that the penalty card has to be played at the first opportunity, is authorized information for all players, but other information derived from the sight of the penalty card is unauthorized for the partner of the player who has the penalty card, but authorized for declarer.

Example — a defender leads the King of clubs out of turn, this is not accepted by declarer and it becomes

a major penalty card. Declarer demands a club lead from offender's partner, (and the king of clubs is put back into his hand). The defender now on lead must lead a club but his choice of card must not be based on the knowledge that his partner has the King of clubs or more likely 2 touching honours or a sequence.

## 16 Inadmissible calls

---

Law 35 to 39 should be thoroughly studied. Law 35 defines 4 types of inadmissible calls. Inadmissible calls can never be accepted and are always cancelled. However, they can be condoned, i.e. offenders left hand --opponent calls before rectification, however in this case the inadmissible call and all subsequent calls are cancelled and the auction reverts to the player whose turn it was to call and proceeds without further rectification.

Law 23 (awareness of potential damage) and 26 (call withdrawn lead restrictions), DO apply unless the calls have been condoned in which case they DO NOT apply.

## 17 Calls out of Rotation

---

Laws 29 — 34 should be studied. Interesting aspects of these laws are —

Law 29C— When a call out of rotation is artificial then the laws apply to the denominations *specified* rather than the denomination *named*, e.g. Hamilton 2D (defence to 1NT) showing both majors is considered a call of the majors rather than a diamond call and lead restrictions are based on that.

Law 30C — When a pass out of rotation is artificial or is a pass of an artificial call, the law regarding bid out of rotation applies rather than the law regarding pass out of rotation (because the pass, in reality, specifies a denomination.).

## 18 Unauthorized Information

---

Law 16 clarifies the meaning and scope of authorized information, as opposed to unauthorized information. This law lists three sources of UI:

- UI from partner
- UI from extraneous sources, and
- UI from withdrawn calls and plays

We need to clearly understand some bridge terms before we proceed:

Action — a call or play

No logical alternative —when more than 75% ( 3 out of 4 ) of players would choose the same action, we say there are no logical alternatives to that action.

Logical alternative- when 25% (1 out of 4) of players could choose a certain action, we say that action is a logical alternative.

There may be a number of logical alternatives, by definition, each is a different action.

Under normal conditions, a player may choose any action he wishes — i.e. he can choose from among numerous logical alternatives.

BUT, when partner has made available UI that may suggest an action, then the player may not choose any logical alternative which could demonstrably have been suggested by the UI.

A typical, simple example is when North has bid to 35, East bids 4H, then South hesitates ( goes into a tank) before passing.

North has some logical alternatives — he can pass, he can double, he can bid to 4S— BUT any logical alternative which can demonstrably be suggested by the tank, is illegal.

The only legal option is for North to pass.

Notice, Law 16B1, makes it clear that in assessing whether an action is a logical alternative or not, the director must take into consideration the class of player involved, and the methods of the partnership.

Law 16B2 - Reserving rights - When a player considers that UI is available, and that damage could well result, he may announce that he reserves the right to summon the director later . The opponents should summon the director immediately if they dispute the fact that UI may have been conveyed.

Law 16B3- Claim of UI being used. The director should be called who applies Law 12C (awarding an adjusted score ).

However, the director needs to consider the following before making a score adjustment.

Was there UI?  
Was this UI used illegally by partner?  
Was there damage?  
And was this damage caused by the illegal use of the UI?

Only if all these conditions are met, should the director consider awarding damages to the non offending side.

### **Self Inflicted damage**

Law 12 — directors discretionary powers deals with score adjustment, and 12C1b deal specifically with self inflicted damage.

subsequent to the illegal use of the UI, the non offending side has contribute to their own damage, it does not receive relief in the adjustment for such part as is self inflicted.

The manual D13 clearly states that for the purpose of this law, a "serious error" by the non-offending side should be judged according to the calibre of the player.

It is assumed that bridge players make mistakes and to make a mistake is not a serious error, just poor judgment. A serious error has to be more than poor judgment.

Tom Kooijman in his commentary states: "Redress is given only for damaged caused by that infraction, not for damage as a result of a subsequent serious error. This includes wild or gambling actions, and, for example, the loss of an extra trick as rectification after a revoke.

The tournament director splits the damage caused by the infraction (known as **consequent** damage) from the **subsequent** damage and compensates only the consequent damage."

Sometimes, intentionally or otherwise, a non-offending side may try for a "double shot", i.e. after an infraction by the opponents realizing that they maybe entitled to an adjusted score, they double recklessly. If this double comes off they are happy, and if it doesn't come off they claim damages because of the infraction. The tournament director should not allow this, and applies 12C1b.

To enable the director to assess whether the non offending side was damaged by the infraction, we should proceed as follows —

Record the actual table result — as bid and played.

Determine which action was " wild or gambling," remove this action from the bidding and then assess the result which would have resulted after the infraction but without any wild or gambling action).

Now adjudge what the most likely outcome would have been without the infraction and then assess this result.

If the score for the non-offending side as calculated in 2 above is less than the score as calculated in 3 above, then the non-offending side has been damaged and score adjustment is necessary.

However, we still need to look at the self-inflicted component —

The table result stands if there was no damage as above.

### **Serious Error**

In bridge it is normal to make mistakes; they are part of the game. When considering damage relating to an infraction a non-offending player should not be disadvantaged/punished for making such a mistake unless this is considered to be really unacceptable/serious error.

A serious error could be a revoke, failing to take a second finesse when the first finesse showed exactly where the cards are, etc.

## **19 Calls based on misinformation**

---

Players are entitled to know about the opponents bidding and play agreement.

Law 20 *Review and explanation of calls* and law 41 *Commencement of Play* have much in common. Law 20 was initially written for Spoken bidding, which is still used in other parts of the world.

In NZ where we either use bidding pads, or bidding boxes, there is no need for a review of the auction- it is visible to all, but according to Law 41B, the right to request a review of the auction expires after opening leader's partner has played to the first trick; hence that is when the bidding pad should be turned over, or the bidding cards returned to the box.

Thereafter, declarer or either defender, **at their own turn to play**, may request an explanation of the opposing auction — but not a full review of the auction.

Replies to questions should be given by the partner of a player who made the call in question.

However the, director may vary this, *requesting* the partner to leave the table — not *sending* him away- and then asking the player who made the call to give an explanation of their system. Note of course, the player does not have to disclose what's in his /her hand —as long as s/he give the systemic meaning of the call.

A player may ask concerning a single call, but Law 16B1 UI from partner may apply ).

A player may also ask what the contract is, and whether it was doubled or redoubled, but not by whom.

Note Law 20F1 —the partner of a player who asks a question may not ask a *supplementary* question until his turn to call or play.

Note Law 20 G1 — it is improper to ask a question solely for partners benefit.

Law 21 begins by stating that no rectification or redress is due to a player who acts on the basis of his own misunderstanding. This can be further extended to misunderstanding partners poor handwriting, (when using written bidding), which does not entitle that side to any redress. However poor handwriting by the opponents certainly could be considered misinformation. see D42 paragraph 6 regarding handwriting. In this matter the director's decision is final.

Failure to alert promptly where an alert is required is deemed misinformation. In the absence to evidence to the contrary, the director is to presume mistaken explanation rather than mistaken call.

There are 2 issues which prevent a player from changing his call:

- Partner must not have subsequently called.
- The end of the auction period must not have occurred, i.e. the opening lead must not have been faced.

If either of these two events have occurred then it is too late to change the call. If a player elects to change a call because of misinformation his LHO may change any subsequent call he may have made without further rectification unless at the end of the hand the director judges that this withdrawn call conveyed such information as to damage the non-offending side in which case Law 16D applies.

This law allows the director to reopen the auction but only as far as 2 places back.

## 20 Withdrawn calls / lead penalties

---

Law 26 states that if a call is withdrawn and the suits specified in the withdrawn call are not specified in the legal auction, then a defender's partners first turn to lead (which may be the opening lead), then declarer may require offenders partner to lead such a suit or prohibit offenders partner from leading one such suit.

If the withdrawn call did not refer to any suit or suits, e.g. a withdrawn NT call, then declarer can prohibit offender's partner from leading any ONE suit at his first turn to lead

Note the requirement to lead the suit is a requirement only for the first round. But the prohibition from leading that suit continues for as long as the offender's partner retains the lead.

Note also even after complying with this rectification, the information derived from the withdrawn call remains unauthorised to offender's partner throughout the rest of the auction and play, and remains unauthorised unless subsequent legal calls or play make this information authorised. When both authorised and unauthorised information are available, and the use of this information could damage opponents, the UI "trumps" AI.

## 21 Dummy's rights and limitations

---

Law 42 — Dummy's Rights

Dummy has absolute rights and qualified rights; qualified rights are rights that are subject to other limitations. Law 43 — Dummy's Limitations

This law states 6 limitations on dummy; the first three concern themselves with dummy not getting involved in the play, whereas the second three concern themselves with dummy doing rather 'naughty things' Violation of any of these limitations could result in a procedural penalty.

But further, violation of the 3 naughty thing, have further repercussions. Read and study law 43A and 43B.

## 22 Claims and Concessions

---

There is a difference between a claim and a concession. A claim states that a contestant will win a specified number of the remaining tricks which may include a concession of the remaining tricks. Once a claim is made PLAY STOPS, the director should be called and the director applies Law 68.

However when a defender attempts to concede one or more tricks and his partner immediately objects, no concession has occurred. Unauthorised information may exist so the director should be summoned immediately however PLAY CONTINUES and any cards that have been exposed by the defender in these circumstances do not become penalty cards but Law 16D applies to any information arising from the exposure of these cards. Of course this information is UI to the offending side but AI to the non-offending side. When there is a contested claim the director adjudicates the result of the board as equitably as possible to both sides but any doubtful point as to the validity of a claim shall be resolved against the claimer.

Law 70 which we should all be familiar with clearly outlines the directors responsibility and considerations. Note that prior to 2007 the term "irrational" was used, this term is no longer used and only the term "normal". Notice footnote 23 — For the purposes of these laws "normal" includes play that would be careless or inferior for the class of player involved. This clearly means that even our top players

can be careless and should not be precluded from having the claim resolved against them.

## 23 Unintended Calls

---

Law 25 explains until partner has made a call a player may change his unintended call for a call which he actually intended to make. The speed of the request to change or the fact "that his pen is still on the paper" or "in the same breath" or "almost instantly", have no relevance.

The **only** consideration is the intention. The manual explains this occurrence as a "inexplicable mental aberration". What this means is that a player who has made a mistake cannot apply to have this call replaced by another call.

However just because a player may say "oops I have made a mistake" doesn't really mean he has made a mistake as such and it can in fact be an unintended call. Notice 25A3 — if the auction ends before it reaches the players partner, there is still a possibility to have a call changed under Law 25 but once the auction period as ended, (i.e. the opening lead has been faced), then the unintended call can no longer be replaced.

## 24 Adjusted Scores and Split Scores

---

Whenever this topic is considered we need to firstly consider whether we are considering match play (teams) or ranking play (pairs or match points).

### Ranking Play

In this type of competition a contestant's score is compared to other contestants by calculating match points. Example — if the top for the board is 24, and N/s earn 18 matchpoints, then normally E/W would receive the complement, i.e. 6 match points.

However when awarding adjusted scores the scores awarded to each side need not balance. This is referred to as a split score.

When would we award a split score? To prevent an offending side gaining as a result of their infraction.

### Match Play

This is "teams" where scores are compared only with one other score — i.e. the other team, or in the case of Swiss Pairs, the datum.

An adjusted score here is given in Imps .Law 86A, states that an average plus is awarded by adding 3 Imps to a side's score ,and an average minus is awarded by subtracting 3 Imps from a side's score ( But not both — i.e. if a board is fouled by one pair during a teams event, that team gets an average minus i.e. we subtract 3 Imps from their imp score ( we do not also add 3 Imps to the other team's score)

## 25 Single weighted scores

---

### Single weighted scores .Law 12C1c

Sometimes it will be very difficult to assess a score due to the many possible outcomes of the auction and play. The director can choose to award a single weighted score.

The manual 013 and 014 show how to calculate single weighted scores for teams and pairs.

## 26 Fouled Boards

---

Law 87 deals with fouled boards. A fouled board is not only if one or more card is displaced in the board but also if the dealer and or vulnerability differed between copies of the same board.

In scoring a fouled board the director determines as closely as possible which scores were obtained on the board in its correct form and which scores were obtained in the changed form(s). he then divides the scores on that basis into groups and rates each group separately as provided in our regulations D28 and 029.

**In teams** if the board at the home table was fouled, but not at the away table, it is possible for the director to deal a new board and have both tables play that board; the rest of the teams play the other boards as normal. Where it is not possible to deal and play a replacement board the match is scored as though the board had never been played. The team responsible for fouling the board may, at the discretion of the director receive a procedural penalty of 3 imps or 6 imps if the cards are exchanged between partners. Lastly if the number of fouled boards represent such a significant number of the total number of boards it would not be equitable to declare a result, both teams will be assigned 18 VPs.

**In pairs** provided a board has been played more than three times OR by more than 1/3<sup>rd</sup> of the field, each 'pair's score is ranked and match pointed in their own group. The Manual 028 gives a formula to calculate the final match points. The N.Z. Bridge Scoring Package will calculate this automatically provided you make the appropriate selection.

If the board was fouled at one table only both sides gets 50%, if at 2 tables the pair with the highest score gets 55% and the pair at the other table gets 45%. If there are 3 tables played the fouled board the first place gets 60%, the middle place gets 50% and bottom place gets 40%. Tie pairs share the difference.

Pairs at no way at fault receive an indemnity of 10% and a further indemnity as per the provisions of Law 88 and see Law 12C2.

Pairs partially to blame receive no indemnity. Note that failure to detect a fouled board puts a pair partially at fault. (This is probably iniquitous but that is what the Manual 028 says.) A pair responsible for fouling a board receives a penalty of 10%.

## 27 Making decisions at the table

---

The director should be summoned at once when attention is drawn to an irregularity, Law 9B1a.

The director alone has the right to determine rectifications where applicable, Law 10A

When directing, always have the law book and manual on hand. Some directors carry the law book to the table when called.

The director should always make some ruling at the table to allow play to continue, or else the whole room could be held up. See Manual C9. Some "irregularities" simply require a mechanical application of the laws, e.g. opening lead out of turn.

Other "infractions" may require the director to assess the situation as best as possible (within the constraint of time and other issues on hand) and to make a judgment decision advising the contestants of their right to appeal Law 83.

Also be on the look-out for non offenders who because of some action lose their non offending status. For example, dummy, after exchanging hands with declarer, later calls director after a revoke and before any other player has brought attention to it - there is no rectification for the revoke.

Sometimes the director may wish to defer a ruling and seek further advice from other directors (on a point of law) or from more experienced players (on play and judgment). But we only defer a ruling when the play of the hand is completed, not during the play of a hand.

## Law 12. Director's discretionary power

There are two types of adjusted score: assigned or artificial

**Assigned -** You can consider this to be a *reassigned* score.

If normal play of the board can be achieved (and the director should always aim for this), then if the non offenders have been damaged, the director is entitled to award an *assigned adjusted score to take the place of the actual score achieved at the table.*

**Artificial** The infraction is such that normal play of the board is not possible.

Example 1: North pulls out East's cards (by mistake) and has a look at them.

N/S are awarded average minus — no more than 40%  
E/W are awarded average plus - at least 60% ( see law 12 C 2c . )

Example 2 - There are 14 cards in West's hand, and only 12 cards in North's hand, and the bidding and play continues until North notices he is one card short.

Both sides are offenders so award average 50% to both sides.

**Assigned** (more easily understood as re- assigned!)

Here the irregularity was such that the hand could be played normally.

The director is empowered to use his discretion and judgment and to attempt to restore equity by adjusting the contract, (or the score), but this is only necessary if the non offending side was damaged.

General Notes -

The 2007 laws now allows the director, in the case where the possible results without the irregularity are numerous (defined as more than 4), to award an *artificial* score.

The non offending side is not eligible for damages caused by their own wild or gambling action.

Although the director may award an artificial adjusted score if there has been an incorrect rectification of an irregularity (i.e. the director made a mistake and the table result was quite unfair to one or both sides), Law 82C Director's Error. The Law makes no demand that this be done and it is preferable to give a re-assigned score based on the directors assessment of what the most likely outcome of the board would have been without the infraction/irregularity.

If players daft damage after an irregularity and this is not obvious, put the onus on the claimants to show how the irregularity caused their damage.

## 28 NZ Alerting Regulations

---

Law 40 states that each partnership has a duty to make available its partnership understandings to opponents before commencing play against them. The Regulating authority specified the manner in which this shall be done. This Law is the basis of our Pre-Alert System in N.Z. and Australia which at present 2010 is fairly controversial.

The principle of alerting should be to disclose, not as little as you must, but as much as you can and as comprehensibly as you can. Directors should take special precaution to Practice Active Ethics not only in alerting but in **all** aspects of playing.

Regulation D40 describes Pre-Alerts, most importantly that pairs should acquaint each other with their basic system, length of their 1 level openings, and strength and style of their open 1NT and any unusual self-alerting calls as defined that may catch an opponent by surprise, highly unusual carding, e.g. leading low from doubletons.

The Pre-Alerts are relevant and very important in Teams Play where at least 8 boards are played against an opponent. At club play where most players are aware of systems played by club members, the Pre-Alerts seem superfluous.

Alerts are compulsory — you may not ask an opponent not to alert

Self Alerting calls should not be alerted.

There are 4 types of self alerting calls —X, XX, cuebids of opponents suit/s, any bid at level 4 and higher. . Note that a cue bid is not Only bidding the same denomination that the opponents have bid, but also the suit/s which their bid (or call) may have implied!

Example — a pair play Lionel defence against 1NT, and they X their opponent's 1NT opening bid, showing Spades and another suit. If responder now bids 25 (rangefinder) , it need not be alerted, in fact it SHOULD NOT be alerted.

Tournament Directors should not allow players to manipulate these regulations to their advantage, e.g. experienced players claiming damage through a technical failure to alert will need to present a strong case. Opponents are also expected to protect themselves, unless they show the inability to enquire about a call because in doing so they could either convey unauthorized information to partner and/or give the opponents information to which the opponents are not entitled.

## 29 Psyche Bidding

---

A “Psyche” is a gross and deliberate misstatement of honour strength and/or of suit length.

Examples: opening 1S with 2 small spades and 12 HCP's is a psyche, likewise opening 1S with 5 spades and 3 HCP is also a psyche.

A light opening with 4 spades and 8HCP's although deliberate is not a gross misstatement. Both aspects have to be present, i.e. both gross and deliberate.

Psyches are of course legal, but NZ regulations place some restrictions on such calls. Persistent psyching is not permitted: defined as more than one psyche per partnership per session.

It is forbidden to psyche

- An opening " Multi"
- An opening strong hand with 13+ points, which is unlimited , and does not show a specific suit or a balanced hand.

In addition, it is forbidden to Psyche the following **responses** to an opening hand:

- A conventional game try or game force, which neither relates to a specific suit or suits nor shows a balanced hand .e.g. an OGUST 2NT game try in response to a Weak 2 opening.

## 30 Director's error

---

Law 82 which deals with rectification of errors of procedure, also has a section dealing with director's error. Note however, manual D22, although the director May decide to award a 60/60 treating both sides as non offending, he /she is not obliged to do so, and is advised to the Contrary

If the board can still be played and scored normally that should be allowed and a reassigned score awarded if necessary. See examples in the manual.

## 31 Breaches of Etiquette

---

Law 74- Conduct and Etiquette- lists specific examples of breaches Of etiquette and specific examples of

breaches of procedure, but although listed under separate headings, such actions frequently overlap, and together can be referred to as breaches of ethics.

Manual C7 points out that breaches of procedure is a difficult area for directors, because of the infinite variety of actions, and the dilemma the director has to face in deciding what constitutes a breach of ethics. An accidental happening, an unfortunate slip of the tongue, an innocent reflex action or a light hearted comment is not the same as 'malice designed to confuse" But irrespective of the intent or lack of intent to disadvantage the opponents, the offending side should not gain by such action

Therefore if damaged, the non offending side is eligible for redress/ score adjustment.

In addition such breaches are cause for a director to consider applying a procedural and or behavioural penalty. Usually talking to the player involved explaining the need for active ethics and/or a warning is sufficient remedy.

A penalty should only be applied in aggravated circumstances, e.g. regular re-occurrence of the same unethical behaviour, or a flagrant disregard for the requests or instructions by the director.

As a guide, if some other means of correcting such behaviour e.g. a request / warning) would achieve the desired result, then there is no value in applying the penalty.

If a player breaches etiquette and is rude to partner, the director may turn a blind eye, but if this rudeness impacts on the enjoyment of the game by others, then the director should act.

## 32 Awareness of Potential damage

---

Law 23 Awareness of potential damage

This law deals with the awareness of the potential damage which a player's **infraction** could cause. If the director deems that a player could well have been aware at the time of the infraction that this could damage the non offending side, then the director may award an adjusted score.

Example — By choosing to bid out of turn so that partner is forced to pass, thereby preventing their side from getting into a poor contract.

Law 73 F- Violation of proprieties

This law deals with a similar topic, but in this law it is the player's violation of the **proprieties** (correct procedure) which is considered. If the player *could have known* that his action, which has no demonstrably reason, could work to his sides benefit, then the director may award an adjusted store.

Example-An innocent declarer assumes that **LHO** has more than a singleton which is played only after a distinct break In tempo (for whatever reason).

## 33 Procedural and Disciplinary Penalties

---

Although the issuing of penalties is at the discretion of the director, who may wish to impose his own directing style, the guideline is that penalties should only be given in aggravated circumstances.

in pairs, penalties are given in matchpoints, normally 10% of the top of a board, which is subtracted from the pairs total store at the end of the session.

In teams play, penalties are given in Imps (or sometimes VPs) which similarly are deducted from the teams score at the end of the match.

Law 90 Procedural Penalties lists the type of offences subject to procedural penalties, the most common offences being slow play, fouling a board, and loud discussion of the hand at an adjacent table.

Law 91 Penalise Or Suspend relates to maintaining order and discipline.

This law empowers the director to issue disciplinary penalties for unacceptable behaviour, and even empowers --•a director to suspend a player for part or all of the current SESSION .This decision is final and may not be overruled by an appeals committee.

A director may disqualify a contestant (for cause), but this is subject to approval of the Tournament Organiser.

Remember that rectification of damage is done by score adjustment — NOT by (procedural) penalty.

## 34 Running an Appeal

---

The last two Law 92 and 93, deal with a contestant's right to appeal and the procedures of appeal.

Notice, Law9 3C , dealing with further possibilities of appeal, authorizes the regulating authority ( in our case NZ Bridge ) to assign the final responsibility for dealing with an appeal. Manual D24 confirms the policy of NZ Bridge is that the decision of the on site appeals committee is final .Hence appeals must be run to a high standard.

A review of appeals committee decisions may be requested but this is only to clarify NZ bridge policy and to act as a precedent for future decisions.

The manual C10 toC18 comprehensively discusses the procedure for hearing an appeal.

As tournament directors, you are expected to advise the appeals committee on these procedures, and to be available to clarify any law or regulation

Often the appellants, or maybe all the players, are upset and nervous, and therefore by regulation, a wholly courteous manner is essential from the appeals committee as well as from the players.

Note Law 80Bk - it is the duty of the tournament organizer to make arrangements for the conduct of appeals, Law 8181- the director has the power to remedy any omissions of the tournament organizer.

Therefore if an appeals committee has not been chosen before the event, the director should organize the selection if and when needed.