

INSUFFICIENT BIDS (Law 27)

An insufficient bid will very occasionally be an unintended call so that Law 25A will apply and not Law 27. Law 27 deals with insufficient intended calls (intentionally insufficient bids would also infringe Law 72B1).

Any insufficient bid may be accepted (treated as legal) at the option of offender's LHO. It is accepted if that player calls. The auction continues with the insufficient bid being the highest bid to date and everyone at the table is free to deduce what the insufficient bid might be showing.

- If the insufficient bid is out of rotation and is not accepted by the LHO then Law 31 applies and not Law 27.
- If an insufficient bid in rotation and is not accepted then it must be corrected by the substitution of a legal call. Only when Law 27B1(b) is applied may that legal call be a double or redouble.

When the director arrives at a table and finds that LHO has not yet taken any action over the insufficient bid then the first task is to ask LHO if he wishes to accept the insufficient bid. As in any situation when a choice is to be made from a number of options the director must explain the laws so an informed choice may be made. See Law 10C. It may well be that LHO immediately announces that he does not wish to accept the insufficient bid. This is fine however the director should verbally note the fact that LHO did not wish to hear the detail.

Over time each director will find the terminology that works best for him to explain the options. There is an example on the next page.

An offender has three ways to legally correct his insufficient bid when LHO has not accepted it:

- Under Law 27B1(a): The insufficient bid could be corrected by the lowest sufficient bid in the same denomination and when the director is of the opinion that both the insufficient bid and the substituted bid are incontrovertibly not artificial then the auction proceeds without further rectification. Law 16D about unauthorised information does not apply but there may be times when a better score is obtained than could have been obtained without the assistance of the insufficient bid and the director may need to adjust the score.
- Under Law 27B1(b): Additionally to corrections possible as above, the insufficient bid could be corrected with a legal call that in the director's opinion has the same meaning as, or a more precise meaning than, the insufficient bid (such meaning being fully contained within the possible meanings of the insufficient bid) and the auction proceeds without further rectification. Note that Law 16D is not excluded here but there would rarely be any residual information and again, an adjusted score may be necessary.

The meaning of a call ie the information available from the call, is the knowledge of what it shows and what it excludes.

- Law 27B2 – Other than legal calls permissible under the above options, the insufficient bid could be corrected by any sufficient bid or by a pass and the offender's partner must pass whenever it is his turn to call. The lead restrictions in Law 26 may apply. In rare circumstances Law 23 may also apply.

LHO must know about these three ways for the offender to recover before he can make an informed choice as to whether he accepts the insufficient bid or not.

Example: After (1S) 1H the director arrives at the table. Speaking to LHO:

1. Jill, you may accept 1H if it suits you to do so. 1H would be treated as a legal call and authorised information to all.
2. If not, Jack must make a legal call.
3. If he bids 2H, the auction proceeds without further rectification and any information from 1H will be authorised to everyone.

4. Jack may also make any legal call (including a double) that has the information that 1H could be showing or that shows more precise information that restricts the number of hand types he can hold.
5. If Jack takes either of these options I may need to adjust the score if his side gets a more favourable result than would have been possible in a normal auction using his methods.
6. Jack has a third option, to make any sufficient bid or pass and then his partner must pass for the rest of the auction and there may be lead restrictions should they become the defending side.
7. Jill, do you wish to accept 1H?
 - (i) Yes.
Make the call of your choice. 1H is accepted as though legal and is authorised information to all.
 - (ii) No.
8. Jack, you must make a legal call. Would you like me to repeat your options? If you are considering the second option you may wish to speak to me away from the table to make sure your choice of call will allow partner to continue in the auction.

Some points:

- 1C opening that does not show at least 3 clubs is an artificial call.
 - “Incontrovertibly” suggests a high degree of proof. Really, incontrovertibly means no doubt at all.
 - The offender may make a correction under second option even though a correction under the first option is possible. He could spurn either or both for the third option. The offender may choose what he considers to be his best option.
 - The intention of second option (Law27B1(b)) is to allow more sensible auctions to continue after an insufficient bid and to lessen the number of times the insufficient bidder is left to guess the (probably) final resting place for his side’s auction.
 - If the director can readily see that the first option is not possible (by checking the system card or by asking questions if an unfamiliar system is being played) then he could start with the second option.
 - “More precise information” could be the showing of an extra suit with the replacement call, more cards in a named suit or a narrower point range within the range “shown” by the insufficient bid
- If the first option is chosen (1S) 2H then the director the director will continue with something like:
9. The possible meanings of 1H are authorised information to everyone and Jack’s partner (Mary) may use that information. I may need to adjust the score if EW get a more favourable score than would have been possible without the assistance of the insufficient bid.
 - If the second option is chosen eg (1S) 3H [Intermediate jump overcall 5 hearts opening hand] the director will continue with something like:
 10. Jack’s new call has the systemic meaning of the partnership. The auction proceeds normally. I may need to adjust the score if EW get a more favourable score than would have been possible without the assistance of the insufficient bid.
 - If the third option is chosen, perhaps (1S) 3NT then the director will continue with something like:
 11. Mary must pass throughout the auction. Should EW become defenders there may be lead restrictions when Mary is first on lead.

There are problems worldwide with the wording of Law 27B1(b). It is widely construed that the director must determine the intended meaning of the insufficient bid before applying this law. “Intended meaning” is not used in this law and the broader “possible meaning” may allow more

auctions to proceed sensibly however players usually want only to consider the intended meaning rather than risk damaging the auction further for their side.

Sometimes the offender will advise the whole table what he intended to mean by his insufficient bid before the director can stop him doing so. This information is unauthorised to partner and the director should aim to warn the offender to say nothing and to get him away from the table before any discussion.

The director is not interested in what cards are in the hand and what the offender thought the auction was to date is not information that the other players are entitled to be told. The director must be very careful not to impart information about the hand by the way he makes his ruling. The director should avoid situations leading to the creation of unauthorised information that could lead to further damage to the auction and play.

The director will need to know the systemic agreements of the offending side. This could be by looking at the system card and/or talking with the offender away from the table. While systemic methods could be discussed at the table in a limited way the offender must not be allowed to ask, "May I bid this, may I bid that?" in front of partner. If a 27B1(b) ruling is to be made the director will need to be satisfied that it does indeed meet 27B1(b) requirements and this can really only be done away from the table.

The test recommended by the EBL for Law 27B1(b) rulings is: Would all hands which might make the new call (the replacement bid(sic)) have also made the old call (the insufficient bid)?

This is a very severe test and our local Zone 7 advice is that that directors should strive to allow 27B1(b) corrections if at all possible at the risk of there being some small amount of residual information.

- The director does not approve or authorise the new call. The offender may want to know what law the director would apply after a particular replacement call is made and the director would advise the offender accordingly.
- A common cause of insufficient bids is that the offender did not see the prior bid or that he saw it but thought it was at a lower level. It may be that he thought out his responses to an asking bid at a level too low eg 5NT (King Ask) 5D (One King). This situation is usually a clear cut opportunity to use 27B1(b).
- With 27B1(b) available it will be even rarer to rule that the insufficient bidder could have been aware that his insufficient bid could well damage the opponents perhaps by stopping partner's rush to a higher level. It may also be that the insufficient bid is accepted more often because offender has more ways to recover.
- Very occasionally, an insufficient bid may be subject to Law 25A. That an insufficient may have been unintended should not be discounted nor should Law 25A be used as an escape mechanism from the rectifications available under Law 27.

Suppose the cheapest sufficient bid in the same denomination is made and both the insufficient bid and sufficient bid pass the "not artificial" test. A 27B1(a) ruling.

It is important to note that partner is entitled to know that the new bid may not be systemically pure. Partner is entitled to correctly deduce what the offender's hand holds and use that information to reach a good contract providing it is a good contract that could have been reached without the assistance of the insufficient bid.

Otherwise, the director may need to award an adjusted score under Law 27D.

Nor is partner obligated to push on to game or slam because the new bid under 27B1(a) systemically shows a stronger hand. Partner may correctly deduce that the insufficient bidder has a weaker hand however a good score must be one that was possible without the assistance of the insufficient bid or the score may be adjusted.

Specific rectifications exist for a number of situations in which the application of Law 27B1 and 27B2 is not a straightforward process:

- Double and redouble may only be used when imparting the same information as or more precise information than the insufficient bid under the 27B1(b) option. Otherwise, a correction by doubling or redoubling is cancelled and any sufficient bid or a pass as allowed by 27B2 is made. Now there are two withdrawn call for which lead penalties may apply. The original insufficient bid as well as the double or redouble. There are rare circumstances in which Law 23 may also be applied.
- A “correction” with another insufficient bid can happen. LHO is given the opportunity to accept the second insufficient bid. If LHO does not accept the second insufficient bid then the offender must now make any sufficient bid or pass and partner must pass for the rest of the auction. Once again Law 26 and Law 23 may apply.
- If the offender replaces his insufficient bid before the director has ruled on rectification, the replacement call stands unless LHO wishes to accept the insufficient bid. If the insufficient bid is not accepted then the director applies the appropriate clause as though the offender had listened to his options and made his choice.

Law 27D caters for the possibility of score adjustment following application of Law 27B1.

If following the application of B1 the Director judges at the end of the play that without assistance gained through the infraction the outcome of the board could well have been different and in consequence the non-offending side is damaged (see Law 12B1), he shall award an adjusted score. In his adjustment he should seek to recover as nearly as possible the probable outcome of the board had the insufficient bid not occurred.

The offending side may well land in a good spot and get a good score and that’s fine providing there was no assistance from the insufficient bid. Lucky guesses and deductions are not adjusted. One reason for score adjustment is when crucial information is available more cheaply (lower in the auction) after an insufficient bid and the offending side is able to stay out of a higher and less favourable contract.

There may be times when the director allows a 27B1(b) correction and later realizes that, with the benefit of hindsight, he should not have done so. This is not classed as a director error and an adjustment may be made using Law 27D.

Some examples:

1.... 1S (2C) 1NT

1NT is not accepted. Suppose responder did not see the 2C call and had been trying to show 6-9 hcp and a willingness to play in No Trump. The director allows a 27B1(a) correction to 2NT which systemically shows 10-12 hcp with a club stopper and a willingness to play in No Trump.

Opener does not have to push on to game with 15 hcp and may pass because he is entitled to guess correctly that partner has only 6-9.

However, can this partnership find the excellent 2NT contract making 8 tricks without the insufficient bid? May be, may be not. The director will need to check and if he believes not then an adjusted score will be awarded.

Perhaps a normal auction would be 1S (2C) X showing 4 hearts, 3+ diamonds and 6+ hcp or some long suit and 11+hcp and the next hand passes. Opener would rebid 2NT with a balanced 12-14 hcp, 2 only hearts and a club stopper. All Pass. Score stands. It’s a normal sort of result for that system and in no way assisted by the insufficient bid.

Another pair might not play negative doubles or negative free bids and have no systemic call to describe responder’s fairly ordinary hand. Perhaps 2C is passed out and makes 8 tricks. Perhaps opener now bids 2S for 8 tricks. Either way, the offending side cannot get to the good contract of 2NT without the assistance of the insufficient bid so the score is adjusted.

2.... (1S) 1H

Suppose the offender corrects to 2H under 27B1(a) and the auction continues (1S) 2H (3S) 4H making 10 tricks for a good result. Advancer has guessed a successful contract that wasn't found at other tables or perhaps intended to sacrifice yet 4H turned out to be a making contract.

(i) The insufficient bidder had a very ordinary 10 point 1H overcall of what he thought was a 1C opening but 10 tricks make on the lucky position of the opponents' honour cards. The score stands. There was no assistance from the insufficient bid.

(ii) The insufficient bidder has a good opening hand with 5 hearts but didn't see the 1S opening. A normal auction (without the insufficient bid) using their methods would also have been (1S) 2H (3S) 4H so again, score stands. The insufficient bid has not helped the offending side to get a good score.

3.... 1H (P) 1H Not accepted, corrected to 2H under 27B1(a) then a 4th seat (P) and
3C* (P) 3S** (P)
4H (P) P (P) Making 10 tricks.

* Are you maximum? Can you help with potential club losers?

** Yes, a maximum hand. Cannot help with your club losers but I have useful spades.

Responder thought he was dealer and hadn't even noticed the first two calls. Opener has 19 hcp and responder has an opening hand 5+ hearts and a small singleton diamond. Their normal auction would have been

1H (P) 4D splinter (P)
4S* (P) 5H** All Pass. Making 10 tricks.

* First round stopper in spades

** Denies diamond void and denies first round club stopper.

With these big hands every pair in the event pushed on towards slam and even stopping in 5H was a disaster because of the club problem and an unlucky lie of the cards.

This pair was assisted by the insufficient bid in being able to locate the club losers at a lower level. They got a better result via the insufficient bid than they would have had in a normal auction. The score is adjusted to 5H-1.

4.... 1H (3D) 2H Not accepted by LHO.

Suppose responder didn't see the 3D bid and was trying to say 3+ card heart support 6-9 hcp.

(i) For one offending side, the system is that 3H over 3D in a normal auction is non-forcing with 3+ card support 6-9 hcp. With a better hand responder would have doubled for takeout and shown heart support later. 3H has the same meaning as responder was trying to show by 2H.

A 27B1(b) ruling would be possible and takes away the guesswork for opener. He knows 3H has the systemic meaning of the partnership.

(ii) Another partnership might play 1H (3D) 3H as 3+ hearts and invitational values. Being stronger reduces the number of hands the offender can hold but the values are all wrong to permit a 27B1(b) correction. With this hand, responder would not have bid 2H in an uncontested auction so 3H fails the test, "Would all hands which might make the replacement call have also made the insufficient bid?"

Only a 27B1(a) or 27B2 correction would be possible.

5.... (2NT) 2S Not accepted by LHO

2NT is 21-22 hcp balanced. Suppose the offender thought the opening bid was 1NT 15-18 hcp and had been trying to show a two suiter in spades and a minor suit with 10+ hcp.

A 27B1(a) correction is not possible as 2S is not incontrovertibly not artificial. Unless the offending side has a call over 2NT that in the director's opinion has the same meaning as, or a more precise meaning than, the insufficient bid then a sufficient bid or pass under Law 27B2 is all that is left with partner passing throughout the auction etc.

6.... (2NT*) 2H 2NT is alerted promptly and 2H is not accepted by LHO

2NT shows both minors. The director determines that (1NT) 2H shows hearts and spades. 3H systemically shows 5+ hearts and a 12-15 opening hand. The pair have an agreement that 3C (a cue bid of a suit shown by 2NT) shows a 16+ hand with 5+ hearts. A double would be interest in penalties.

27B1(a) and 27B1(b) correction look impossible so the offender is left with any legal bid or pass under 27B2.

7.... 1C (P) 1C Not accepted

An intended 1C can only be a 1C opening. This pair plays a Standard American style system in which 1C shows a 2+ card suit and 10-20 hcp so a 27B1(a) correction is not possible.

2NT shows a balanced hand and 12-15 hcp (a point range within 10-20) so could be possible under 27B1(b). That 2NT systemically denies a 4 card major suit may satisfy the "more precise" test as in "the more hands that a call excludes the more precise the meaning of a call becomes".

Suppose the full auction is now:

1C (P) 2NT (P)

3C* (P) 3S (P)

4S All Pass

*Stayman

Perhaps 4S could have been found in a normal auction but, this pair has changed their system after an infringement by their side. This is forbidden. 2NT systemically denies a 4 card major. A 3C Stayman continuation is not part of their system had the auction simply been 1C (P) 2NT.

1C (P) 1C corrected to 5C? Opening hand, 6+ clubs. Fewer hands possible as more clubs shown and the same point range. Opener might continue perhaps with 5NT grand slam force if he wished.

8.... (1H) 1H Not accepted.

A 27B1(a) replacement of 2H is not an option as the pair play Michael's Cuebids.

The offender thought the opening bid was 1D. It seems most unlikely that discussion away from the table will locate a replacement call that systemically shows 5+ hearts and some range within 8 to 16 hcp or has extra information to limit the number of possible hands held.

Seems unlikely that a correction will be possible under 27B1(b) using either interpretation so the offender's last resort is 27B2, any sufficient bid or pass.

9.... 1H (P) 1H Not accepted.

This time a 4 card major system is being played and the offender would like to correct under 27B1(b) and not 27B1(a). He wants to use a replacement call that shows an opening hand and 4+ hearts so opener

Some possibilities: A strong forcing 3H showing 4 hearts if that is their system

Jacoby 2NT showing 4 hearts and a balanced opening hand

3S, 4C, 4D showing a singleton or void with 4+ hearts and an opening hand

2NT and 3S, 4C and 4D would fail the severe EBL test. Every single hand that might support a bid of 2NT (or 3S, 4C, 4D as the case may be) would not have been opened 1H.

However, all these bids would be more precise than a 1H opening and should be ok in Zone 7. If the director does not require partner to pass throughout the auction then clearly a 27B1(b) correction and not a 27B2 correction has been made. Players are not required to know the laws and the director must make sure that partner is aware of the actions available to him.

10... (1C) 1C Not accepted.

The offending side plays Precision. 1C can only mean 16+ HCP, 0+ clubs.

The director may need to discuss possible 27B1(b) corrections with the offender away from the table.

A double shows 13+ which is less precise than 16+, more hands are possible so not acceptable.

A 1NT overcall shows 16-18 HCP balanced with a club stopper, 2+ clubs and no 5 card major. Certainly the information about both the point count and the shape is more precise. Sounds allowable under 27B1(b).

What if he doesn't have a club stopper or does have a 5 card major? This is not a problem. The laws allow psyches and misbids. The director considers systemic meanings only and his job is to advise what is permitted by the laws. The director doesn't approve or authorise the new call. If the offender regularly makes insufficient bids corrected by psyches and misbids then the problem becomes more a matter for Laws 23, 72B1 or 40A3.

11.... 1C* (1H) 1D**

* Precision

** Negative 0-7 HCP without the 1H overcall.

This pair's system uses Pass after a 1H overcall to say 0-7 so a Pass sounds acceptable under 27B1(b).

Perhaps another pair uses 1C (1H) Pass as 0-4 and 1C (1H) X as 5-7. Both these sound acceptable as they are more precise than 0-7.

12.... 1H (P) 3H (P)
4NT (5C) 5C (no keycards) Not accepted.

The offender could pass or make a sufficient bid with partner passing throughout under Law 27B2 or use a 27B1(b) call that imparts the same meaning. Luckily for this pair they play the DOPI convention where a double after the interfering 5C also says "no keycards" so the offender may make that call without barring partner.

13.... 1H (P) 3H (P)
4NT (P) 5D (P)
5NT (P) 5D (1 king) Not accepted

Clearly the offender was trying to say "1 king" and he may bid 6D saying "1 king" under 27B1(b).

14.... 2NT (P) 2C Not accepted

Here the offender was using Stayman and was confused about the level. Here we have some grey areas. Every hand that would support 3C Stayman would not be strong enough to support 2C Stayman after a 1NT opening. Also, 2C might be Extended Stayman while 3C is Simple Stayman. Despite this,

most will allow a 3C correction under 27B1(b) and standby to use 27D if any assistance leads to a more favourable score.

15.... 2NT (P) 2H Not accepted

Here the offender was trying to transfer to spades and just forgot that it was a 2NT opening not a 1NT opening. Again, the rigid EBL test may fail but directors in the more relaxed Zone 7 would usually be happy to permit a 3H transfer bid under 27B1(b) .

DIRECTOR'S DISCRETIONARY POWERS (Law 12)

The Laws allow the director to award an adjusted score in these situations:

- When he judges that the Laws do not provide indemnity to a non-offending contestant for the particular type of violation committed by an opponent. The Director may not award an adjusted score because the rectification required by the Laws is either unduly severe or advantageous to either side.

Example: A player has an established revoke and the rectification required by the laws is the transference of one trick. The non-offenders get one more trick than they would have got had the revoke not occurred but the director is powerless to adjust the score.

- If no rectification can be made that will permit normal play of the board. Directors should strive to find ways under the Laws to allow boards to be played. They should take some time to look up various laws to find a rectification. This law should be the “last resort” not the first or easiest solution. In some cases it is good to have a board played anyway just in case there is a director error or if an appeal is made even if an artificial score is later awarded.
- If there has been an incorrect rectification of an irregularity.

The director might award an adjusted score on his own initiative or because a player requested a ruling within the time limits.

Score adjustment is intended to undo damage caused to the non-offending side and to take away any advantage gained by an offending side through its infraction. Damage exists when, because of an infraction, an innocent side obtains a table result less favourable than would have been the expectation had the infraction not occurred. In assessing damage the director must determine a side's expectations the instant before the infraction occurred,

An assigned adjusted score is a real bridge score and replaces the one obtained at the table.

Example: EW play in 4H easily making 10 tricks for NS -420. The director rules EW could have used unauthorised information to reach 4H and believes that 3H making 10 tricks would have been the result without the infraction. He adjusts the table score to NS -170 for 3H+1.

There are times when the non-offenders turn an anticipated good result into poor result.

Example: This time the 4H contract above is doomed. A score of NS +100 would have been an excellent result for NS. North decides upon a “double shot” and bids 4S with a very poor hand and motley spades. He is doubled and goes down 3 tricks vulnerable for NS -800.

NS keep their -800 and EW get the anticipated NS +100 without the infraction.

Example: In a competitive auction NS are bidding hearts and EW are bidding spades. NS reach 3H and East bids 3S which the director rules could have been based on unauthorised information. The director considers that 3S should make 8 tricks and 3H should make 9 tricks.

By defeating 3S, NS would still have gotten a poor score of NS +50 because their expectations in 3H were NS +140.

But, North revokes, and 3S is allowed to make for NS -140. The offenders EW are not permitted to gain from their infraction so their score is adjusted to NS +140, the expectation immediately prior to their infraction.

Now the director needs to look at the matchpoints (a pairs event) to work out how much damage was caused by North's revoke and how much by East's infraction..

*3HN(9)	140	14
3HN(9)	140	14
2SE(8)	-110	1
3SE(8)	50	7
4HN(9)	-50	4
3HN(9)	140	14
3CN(9)	110	10
2SE(8)	-110	1
3S(8)	50	7

Without the infraction NS were heading for 14 matchpoints.

*3SE(8)	50	8
3HN(9)	140	15
2SE(8)	-110	1
3SE(8)	50	8
4HN(9)	-50	4
3HN(9)	140	15
3CN(9)	110	12
2SE(8)	-110	1
3S(8)	50	8

After East's infraction NS were heading for 8 matchpoints.

*3SE(9)	-140	0
3HN(9)	140	15
2SE(8)	-110	3
3SE(8)	50	9
4HN(9)	-50	6
3HN(9)	140	15
3CN(9)	110	12
2SE(8)	-110	3
3S(8)	50	9

After North's revoke NS received 0 matchpoints.

NS expected 14 matchpoints immediately before the infraction and 8 matchpoints after the infraction but got 0 matchpoints after North's revoke.

NS's score is adjusted to 6 matchpoints calculated by adding the damage caused by East's infraction (14-8) to their actual score after their own error (0).

NS are not entitled to have the self-inflicted damage undone. They made an error unrelated to the infraction. On the other hand, the offending side keeps the score that would have been allotted as a consequence of its infraction only. It does not benefit from the non-offenders serious error or wild or gambling action.

In Zone 7 an assigned adjusted score may be weighted to reflect the probabilities of a number of potential results after damage has been caused.

An artificial adjusted score is occasionally awarded in place of the table score when things are such a mess after an infraction that the director cannot determine an assigned adjusted score. The director's judgement is a large factor but the Zone 7 suggestion is that having more than four possibilities could be enough for the director to consider awarding an artificial adjusted score.

Awarding an artificial adjusted score must not be taken as the easy way out. It must be the last resort once a result has been obtained at the table.

When owing to an irregularity no result can be obtained at a table the Director awards an artificial adjusted score according to responsibility for the irregularity. Average minus (at most 40% of the available matchpoints in pairs) is awarded to a contestant directly at fault, average (50% in pairs) to a

contestant only partly at fault, and average plus (at least 60% in pairs) to a contestant in no way at fault.

When the director awards an artificial adjusted score of average plus or minus at teams (imp scoring) that score is normally plus or minus 3imps but this is varied by the QBA Regulations to be ± 2 imps for matches of fewer than 11 boards.

Should a non-offending contestant obtain a session score exceeding 60% of the available matchpoints or should an offending contestant obtain a session score that is less than 40% of the available matchpoints (or the equivalent in imps) then these contestants are awarded the percentage obtained (or the equivalent in imps) on the other boards of that session.

Example: If the non-offenders average 63% on the other boards in the session then they get 63% on the problem board. If the offenders average 32% on the other boards then they get 32%.

In individual events the director enforces the rectifications in the Laws, and the provisions requiring the award of adjusted scores, equally against both members of the offending side even though only one of them may be responsible for the irregularity. The director does not award a procedural penalty against the offender's partner if of the opinion that he is in no way to blame.

Weighted Scores

Frequency tables are the basis of computer scoring. First tabulate the number of times each score occurs This is usually from the highest score down to the lowest.

Frequency	Score	Matchpoints
2	480	61
13	450	46
8	420	25
4 (e)	170	13 (f)
2 (c)	110	7 (d)
3 (a)	-50	2 (b)

Calculate the matchpoints for lowest score by taking 1 from the number of frequencies (a) - 1 = (b)

Add these matchpoints to the number of frequencies for the lowest score to the number of frequencies for the next lowest score to find the matchpoints for the second lowest score. (b) + (a) + (c) = (d)

Then (d) + (c) + (e) = (f) etc

The following advice concerning weighted scores is from the Zone 7 Laws Commission:

Directors are permitted to award a single weighted score that endeavours to restore the balance of equity on the hand in the instant prior to the infraction. The calculation of the weightings relates to the expected outcomes from that point forward in an auction unaffected by any irregularity. Any residual doubt that exists in the assessment of the relative weightings should be resolved in favour of the non-offending side.

Example: As a result of misinformation a pair defends 4HX. If they had been correctly informed they will certainly bid game in spades and possibly slam, making eleven or twelve tricks depending on declarer's line of play.

The Director may conclude that equity is best served by substituting a single weighted score as follows:

	30% of +1430 (6S =)
Plus	40% of +680 (4S +2)
Plus	20% of +650 (4S +1)
Plus	10% of -100 (6S -1)

At Pairs: Assuming there are 12 Tables, the frequency table would look something like this:

Frequency Score Matchpoints

2.3	+1430	20.7
5.4	+680	13.0
2.2	+650	5.4
2.1	- 100	1.1

The weighted score would be:

$$(0.3*20.7) + (0.4*13.0) + (0.2*5.4) + (0.1*1.1) = +12.6 - \text{rounded to 1 decimal place.}$$

A single score of N/S +12.6 would be entered.

At Teams: Assume the score in the other room was N/S +650

<u>Net Score</u>	<u>IMPs</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Adjust</u>
+1430 – 650 = +780	+13	30%	3.9
+ 680 – 650 = +30	+1	40%	0.4
+ 650 – 650 = 0		20%	0.0
- 100 – 650 = -750	-13	10%	-1.3
		Total	3.0

The IMP total is rounded to the nearest whole number and the board scored as +3 to the non-offending side.

Alternative Manual Calculation Method for Pairs Tournaments Scored by Computer

Clearly to make one of these weighted adjustments for Matchpoint scoring without the aid of computer software would be tedious, if not impossible, particularly in large fields. Many software packages do not currently cater for this type of adjustment. Until a software modification is implemented the following procedure shall, by regulation, be deemed the correct one:

Enter the scores into the software as normal, substituting average to both sides at the table to which the ruling applies. Then calculate the weighted score using the match-points assigned by the software (a board print out will provide this).

In the above example the following results will be obtained:

Score	Matchpoints
+1430	20
+680	13
+650	6
- 100	2

The weighted score for NS would be: $(0.3*20) + (0.4*13) + (0.2*6) + (0.1*2) = +12.6$.

Finally correct the match-points for both sides, rounded to one decimal place, using the adjusted score (penalty) routine. Since the average on the board is 11 and has already been assigned, the director will add 1.6 match-points to N/S and deduct 1.6 match-points from E/W.

Some Random Notes for Club Directors:

Auctions may be re-opened usually via Law 21 and very occasionally via Law 25A.

Players need a bridge reason for breaking the tempo of the auction or play. Breaking tempo before playing a singleton is not acceptable. Nor is thinking about what to play from a doubleton.

No one other than dummy is responsible for displaying the dummy in accordance with the Laws.

There is no redress for a player who pulls the wrong card from his own hand and plays it.

Newer players may think incorrectly that declarer may change a card played or designated "because he is declarer". This may stem from declarer and dummy not having penalty cards.

Be aware of half tables - place late comers with a warning "I may need to move you."

If the opportunity arises, escort new players to a table and introduce them to anyone already seated.

Try making any announcements before boards go out so that players are more interested in listening to you than starting to play.

Check that half tables are not lurking. Players may leave possessions at one table making it look occupied while chatting at another table making it look full.

Particularly for a multi section competition have someone check that all sets of boards are the same and that they match the hand record.

Check numbers as boards are put out. Boards out of order may be an indication of incorrect dealing.

Don't get into a tangle because someone may be twisting the truth - this is a matter for the recorder.

Consider repeating the facts determined about a situation back to the table so that there is an opportunity for correction.

Practise your patter. If players have difficulty understanding your rulings then think back over what was said and adapt for the next time.

If players don't allow you to complete a ruling - note this verbally.

Seeding: When a tennis player ranked 254 in the world beats the top seed in round 1 at Wimbledon, he doesn't become the top seed. He most likely is still a relatively poor player who just had a lucky day. Seed your field. Consider doing draws for all rounds before the competition begins so you won't be tempted to base later rounds on earlier results.

Common failings are:

Not advising left hand opponent of the option to accept an infringement in cases where the Laws permit him to do so.

Not explaining all options available as rectification. This can take some time eg opening leads out of turn but the director must not assume that players know the Laws.

Common Exam Problems:

Not giving LHO the option of accepting the infringement where permissible.

Not being specific as to actual ruling in a given situation. Saying "the director may transfer 1 or 2 tricks" is not good enough if the situation requires 2 tricks to be transferred.

Using movements that foul, having 5 board sitouts, using skips with half table Mitchells.

THE DIRECTOR'S ROLE

☞ A director is a person who makes rulings so that the game can continue. Law 81 lists a Director's Duties and Powers, all of which are important.

☞ A Club Session Director tries to make sure that paying customers enjoy themselves.

Some suggestions:

🌀 Be clean and neatly attired.

- 🔥 Avoid being overtired and cranky.
- 🕒 Start and finish on time.
- 🔊 Be consistent about calling the moves.
- 🔗 Establish a pattern that regular players accept and can adapt to. In time this cuts down on the amount of verbal instruction.
- 🔊 Don't be a microphone hog.
- 📖 Carry your Law Book with you. Be prepared to read relevant passages to reassure players.
- 😊 Stress that rectifications are to restore equity and not to punish.
- 🕒 Take time to make decisions. Don't be rushed.
- 👁 Be alert for potential personality problems. Hovering within earshot makes players cautious.
- 😞 Discourage slow play.
- 👉👈👉👈 Don't use fancy movements just to show how clever you are.
- 👉 Don't point.
- 🧠🔪🚗 Keep mistakes in perspective. What's the worst thing that could happen?
- 🎓 Attend workshops and subscribe to mailing lists.
- 😊 Enjoy.

Updated April 2009