

New Section P - 2007 Laws –Effective 1st June 2008

The 2007 Laws of Duplicate Bridge shall be implemented on 1st June, 2008 for all congresses and state events in Queensland excepting that the Arana Swiss Pairs and Swiss Teams Congress on 31st May and 1st June shall be conducted under the 1997 Laws.

Several of the 2007 Laws of Duplicate Bridge require or allow certain options to be exercised by the Regulating Authority. Some of these options are already incorporated in the QBA Systems regulations and the QBA Alerting Regulations.

The following matters form part of the QBA Regulations and will take effect from 1st June 2008 and override any other regulation that appears to be in conflict with Section P.

Add to 2.4 Self-alerting calls in the QBA Alerting Regulations

Any 2C response to a 1NT opening bid in an uncontested auction.

Reference: Law 12C1(c)

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 nonoffending 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:

$(0.3*20.7) + (0.4*13.0) + (0.2*5.4) + (0.1*1.1) = +12.6$ - 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 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 or two decimal places depending on the norm for the programme used, 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.

Reference: Law 12C1(e)

None of the provisions of this Law apply in Queensland

Reference: Law 12C2(b)

For IMP play - see Law 86A

Reference: Law 16B2 and 16B3

When a player has substantial reason to believe that an opponent may have used unauthorized information, the preferred procedure is to summon the Director at the end of the hand but it is not an infringement to call the director earlier or later.

When a player believes that an opponent has provided unauthorized information to his partner by a gesture, comment, hesitation, or the like, he may immediately try to establish the facts about what has occurred. This should be done as pleasantly as possible, stressing that establishing the facts now (as to the gesture, comment, hesitation, or the like) is to avoid dispute later should it be necessary to call the director at the end of play. The director should only be called at this earlier time if there is no agreement about what has occurred.

Reference: Law 40B2(a)

This Law is the basis and authority for the classification and restriction of certain partnership methods as outlined in the QBA Systems Regulations. It is also the authority for the procedures as described in the QBA Alerting Regulations.

Both members of a partnership must play the same system, including bidding and card play agreements. Where, as a matter of style, members frequently adopt different approaches from each other, that difference (or those differences) must be disclosed on the system card.

Reference: Law 40B2(b)

The QBA Systems Regulations do permit written defences to Yellow Systems and Brown Sticker Conventions to be referred to at the table in some events.

Reference: Law 40B2(c)

This law applies as written.

Reference: Law 40B2(d)

The QBA Systems Regulations prohibit the psyching of conventional opening bids that are forcing and made by agreement on strong hands (e.g. a Game Forcing 2♣ or a Precision 1♣)

Reference: Law 40B3

Prior agreements by a partnership to vary its understanding during the auction or play following a question asked, a response to a question or an irregularity committed by its own side is prohibited.

Reference: Law 40C3(a)

A player is not entitled during the auction and play periods to any aids to his memory, calculation or technique. This includes not recording the opening lead before the play of the hand is complete.

Reference: Law 41A

The opening lead should be made face down. A lead made face down is not an opening lead until faced and may thus be retracted without penalty, but only upon instruction of the director i.e. when the lead was made from the wrong side or following the correction of misinformation.

Reference: Law 61B3

Defenders may make enquiries of each other or declarer regarding a possible revoke at the risk of creating unauthorized information.

Reference: Law 70E2

In adjudicating disputed claims involving an unstated line of play the following guidelines apply:

(a) Top down

A declarer who states that he is cashing a suit is normally assumed to cash them from the top; this is especially so if there is some solidity.

Example

Suppose declarer claims three tricks with AK5 opposite 42, forgetting the jack has not gone. It would be normal to give him three tricks since it would be considered irrational to play the 5 first.

(b) Different suits

If a declarer appears unaware of an outstanding winner, or losing line of play [but see (a) above], and a trick could be lost by playing or discarding one suit rather than another, then the director should award that trick to the non-claiming side.

Example

Declarer has three winners in dummy and must make three discards. He appears to have forgotten his ♦J is not a winner. It is careless rather than irrational that he should discard some other winner to retain the ♦J.

Reference: Law 73A2

Mandatory pauses are not required during the auction or on the first trick.

Reference: Law 76C2

The right to rectification for an irregularity may be forfeited if attention is first drawn to the irregularity by a spectator for whose presence at the table the non-offending side is responsible.

The right to correct an irregularity may be forfeited if attention is first drawn to the irregularity by a spectator for whose presence at the table the offending side is responsible.

Reference: Law 79C2

No change in score may occur after expiry of the score correction period set by the Tournament Organizer.

Reference: Law 80A3

The ABF has assigned to the QBA the right to regulate congresses and state events within Queensland.

Reference: Law 80B

The Tournament Organizer (also known as the Convenor) of congresses and state events within Queensland is the official, recognised by the QBA, responsible for arranging and preparing for a congress or state event. Where a committee or body is responsible for organising the tournament, the Tournament Organizer is deemed to be the Chairman of that committee or body.

Reference: Law 80B1

Where responsibility for a congress or state event run under the auspices of the ABF Masterpoint Scheme is delegated to a Tournament Organizer (be it a Club, Zone or Individual), these entities are not permitted to draft or implement regulations, written or otherwise, that are in conflict with the 2007 Laws of Duplicate Bridge nor the QBA Regulations.

Reference: Law 80B2(j)

Although arranging for scores to be collected, for results to be tabulated and for an official record to be made may be performed by the Tournament Organizer, ultimate responsibility for the accuracy of the scoring is vested in the Director who must be permitted to oversee and check the performance of said duties and if need be to correct the work carried out by others.

Reference: Law 81

The term “Director” means the Director in Charge appointed by the Tournament Organizer under Law 80B2(a).

Reference: Law 86A

For matches of fewer than 11 Boards, the score awarded (as average plus or average minus) shall be plus or minus 2 IMPs (unless further regulated for particular events).

Reference: Law 93C1

The correct procedure for requesting a review by the QBA Appeals Committee of the decision of an appeals committee is detailed in Section I of the QBA Regulations. Any such request, if deemed to lack merit, may lead to a reprimand or a sanction.

Reference: Law 93C3(a & b)

The QBA Tournament Committee may review any Appeals Committee decision arising from any tournament run under the auspices of the QBA. The Tournament Committee will however limit its functions to the interpretation of the 2007 Laws of Duplicate Bridge and will not decide facts or change or purport to change any ruling that has been made under those Laws. It follows that the committee will not overturn the result of an event but it may issue an opinion in order to establish or confirm a legal precedent or procedure.