



Asia Pacific Bridge Federation

Zone 6 TD Newsletter

Newsletter No. 7

January 2015



Golden Jubilee

Happy New Year

First of all, I wish everyone a happy and prosperous 2015. Chinese New Year is just around the corner and I also wish everyone a peaceful Year of the Goat.

This is the Golden Jubilee year of the Asia Pacific Bridge Federation Championships; which started as the Far East Bridge Federation Championships in 1957, renamed the Pacific Asia Bridge Federation Championships in 1996 and again renamed in 2012. We can look forward to the celebration in May in Bangkok! Happy bridging.

2015 Major Confirmed Events in Our Zone

20 th NEC Bridge Festival Yokohama, Japan	10 - 15 February 2015
20 th Asia Pacific Bridge Federation Youth Championships Bangkok, Thailand	1 - 7 April 2015
2015 Yeh Brothers Cup Shanghai, China	8 - 12 April 2015
50 th Asia Pacific Bridge Federation Championships Bangkok, Thailand	21 - 31 May 2015
37 th Bangkok Bank ASEAN Bridge Club Championships Bangkok, Thailand	24 - 29 November 2015



Amendments to the WBF General Conditions of Contest

Section 25 Screen Regulations

In section 25.1 the following sentence is added:

A player who removes one or more of his bidding cards from the tray in an apparent attempt to “pass” is indeed deemed to have “passed”.

At the end of 25.2 (c) the following sentence is added:

Therefore the tournament director cannot make enquiries on a player’s behalf on the other side of the screen during the auction or play.

Section 25.3(g) is amended as follows:

Failure to do as (f) provides may persuade the Director it was the partner who drew attention to the break in tempo. If so he may well rule there was no perceived delay and thus no unauthorized information. A delay in passing the tray of up to 20 seconds is not normally regarded as significant. If the players have not been randomizing the tempo of the auction as desired by section 25.1 paragraph 3, then a delay of than 20 seconds may well be regarded as being significant.

The following cases came from international events in the past year.

Board 25

Dealer: N, Vul: EW

(Misinformation)

♠ AQ74 ♥ A9754 ♦ - ♣ T753	♠ KJ9 ♥ K3 ♦ QT96 ♣ Q982	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50px; height: 50px; text-align: center; vertical-align: middle;">N</td> </tr> </table>	N	♠ 852 ♥ QT62 ♦ K43 ♣ AKJ
N				
	♠ T63 ♥ J8 ♦ AJ8752 ♣ 64			

W	N	E	S
	P	1 ♣	1 ♦
x	2NT ⁽¹⁾	AP	

(Teams, Round Robin)

- (1) N -> E Natural
- S -> W fit raise in ♦

Result: 2NT by S-1 NS -50

Facts:

The TD was called by West after play has ended. She claimed that had she known the “real” meaning of 2NT, she would not have passed. 4 ♥ can be made on this hand.

Ruling:

On further investigation, the TD found that NS did not have an agreement on the 2NT after a double. Normally jump bid by a passed hand is a fit raise. There is nothing on the CC to justify one way or another in this case. The TD hence ruled that NS had an infraction according to Laws 40A & 40B. The TD consulted 4 experts, asking them what they would do if 2NT was natural and what if it was a fit raise. All of them would either pass or bid irrespective of the meaning of the 2NT bid. The TD hence ruled that EW’s damage was not a direct result of the infraction and the table score stands.

Post Mortem:

Would you consider that the jump to 2NT should fall into the category of a fit jump?

TDs should also advised the players in their NBOs to be more specific in their convention cards, especially with passed hand treatments and when there are interferences.



Board 8

Dealer: W, Vul: None
(Misinformation)

<p>♠ K753 ♥ AJ6 ♦ KQ87 ♣ A9</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 100px; margin: 0 auto; display: flex; align-items: center; justify-content: center;"> N </div>	<p>♠ J96 ♥ K84 ♦ A965 ♣ KT5</p>
<p>♠ AQ42 ♥ T73 ♦ 2 ♣ QJ842</p>		

W	N	E	S
1 ♣ ⁽¹⁾	P	INT ⁽²⁾	P
2 ♣ ⁽³⁾	P	2NT ⁽⁴⁾	P
3 ♣ ⁽⁵⁾	P	3NT ⁽⁶⁾	AP

(Women Pairs)

- (1) Precision, 16+
- (2) 8-13, balanced
- (3) Relay
- (4) 11-13, any 4333
- (5) Relay
- (6) E -> N 3343
W -> S 3334

Lead: ♠ 2
Result: 3NT by E +1 NS -430

Facts:

The TD was called by South when the play has ended. She complained that had she known the “real” meaning of 3NT, she could have led ♣ Q and declarer could be held to 9 tricks.

Ruling:

On further investigation, the TD found that 3NT in EW’s agreement is 3343. Hence there is an infraction by W. To determine whether NS’s damage is directly related to the infraction, the TD polled expert players with the question, given the correct meaning of all the bids, “what will you lead with S’s hand”. Most experts consulted would have led the ♣ Q. When the TD asked further, the reason they gave was that West bidding seemed to be worried about a doubleton in her hand and was probably attempting to find a 4-3 major fit. The doubleton will likely be ♣ in this case and the lead of ♣ Q rather than a small ♣ will not give away anything. On the lead of ♣ Q, West will need an almost double-dummy play to make 10 tricks. The TD hence adjusted the score to:

75% 3NT by W =, NS -400
25% 3NT by W +1, NS -430

Post-mortem:

At first it appeared odd for South to lead the ♣ Q and the TD may only give a small % of 3NT= to NS. “Be warned” that TD should not be making arbitrary decisions without going through the consultation process. This is a typical case where the consultation result “surprised” the TD.



Board 19

Dealer: S, Vul: EW
(Misinformation)

<p>♠ A982 ♥ AK754 ♦ 965 ♣ A</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 100px; height: 100px; margin: 0 auto; position: relative;"> <div style="position: absolute; top: 50%; left: 50%; transform: translate(-50%, -50%); font-weight: bold; font-size: 2em;">N</div> </div>	<p>♠ J763 ♥ 2 ♦ T4 ♣ QT9854</p>	<p>♠ T5 ♥ J98 ♦ AKQJ72 ♣ 73</p>
<p>♠ KQ4 ♥ QT63 ♦ 83 ♣ KJ62</p>			

W	N	E	S
			P
1 ♥	3 ♣	4 ♦ ⁽¹⁾	4 ♠
5 ♣	5 ♠	P	6 ♣
x	AP		

(Women Pairs)

- (1) E -> N ♥+♦, FG
- W -> S ♥ support, short ♦
but after pre-emp could
be ♦ suit instead, not sure
which

Result: 6 ♣ x by S -5 NS -1,100

Facts:

The TD was called by South when the play was over. She claimed that she has been misinformed. Had she known the “real” meaning of 4 ♦, she might not have bid on and EW might have played in 5 ♦ or 5 ♥.

Ruling:

On further investigation, the TD found that in EW’s agreement a single jump over an overcall is fit raise while a double jump is a Splinter. However, there is no explicit agreement after a pre-emptive overcall as now a Splinter at the 5-level would have been too high. The explanations as stated before were written and West was actually not sure which was correct. However, the TDs concluded that if South was concerned about the meaning of the 4 ♦ bid and was not satisfied with the explanation given, the TD should have been called. This should not have happened at the end of the play. The TDs ruled that although there was an infraction by South, the damage was self-inflicted as South could have been protected if the TD was called earlier. The TD hence ruled that the table result stands.

Post-mortem:

In most international tournaments, there may be quite a lot of communication problems due to language barrier. Such was not the case here. TDs should remind their players that the TDs attempt to provide a level playing field for all participants, but can only do so if the players also protect themselves. Trying to play with a double-edged sword will usually not give you a good result.



Questions & Answers

(Email to: awching@netvigator.com)

Q : A pair was found using 2 ♦ opening as weak 2 in either major, or a gambling 3NT type hand with either minor. Is this allowed? If not, then what should we do when they reached an otherwise difficult to bid 5 ♦ doubled contract and made?

A : This is a Brown Sticker convention, and is normally not allowed unless your conditions of contest state otherwise. When a pair is using such a convention, it will be subject to a disciplinary penalty of up to 2 VPs according to APBF General Conditions of Contest 15.1. In addition, the score will be adjusted if the opponents are damaged as a result, and the pair will not play again until the convention card is properly corrected to the satisfaction of the CTD. In adjusting the score, the table result is usually cancelled. The score of the offending pair's teammate will normally be compared against the datum and the team's result on this board will be -3 IMPs or the result of the comparison, which is least favourable.

Q : We were organising a national event and participants were required to file their convention cards by a certain deadline. Some of them did not despite several reminders. What can we do?

A : My suggestion is to add in the Conditions of Contest that for those failing to file the convention cards, they will be required to play the WBF Standard Card.

Q : Playing with screens, I asked my screenmate what his partner's bid meant. He wrote down something which I thought I understood. In fact, there were 2 possibilities and said he wasn't sure which was correct. I took the wrong view and got a bad result. I called the TD but did not get any redress. Why?

A : You should have called the TD when your opponent could not explain to you clearly. "Don't assume". Otherwise, you were deemed to be satisfied with the explanation. You will be taking your own risk and any damage would have been subsequent.

Q : At the end of the play, we discovered that declarer had started with only 12 cards. The missing card was quite insignificant to the contract. Should we have called the TD?

A : You should have. According to Law 14B4, the card is deemed to be in declarer's hand all the time and he might have committed a revoke by not following with that card.

Clarification

In the WBF Systems Policy Section 2.4.f), it states that "For the avoidance of doubt an opening bid of one club which may be made on a doubleton or singleton club and which is ostensibly natural and non-forcing should be regarded as natural and not artificial". I wish to clarify that although the 1 ♣ bid is considered not artificial in this situation, **the bid is alertable in the WBF Alerting Policy**. Individual NBO may wish to differ in their own alerting policy.

In Section 7 of the WBF System Policy, it states that "A System, for the purpose of this section, may include different methods for different vulnerabilities". This is adopted by the APBF in its championships and congress. However, the APBF Supplementary Conditions of Contest clarify that each method will be considered as a separate system. A team is only allowed to file a maximum of 4 systems. Please also note that a pair is not allowed multiple methods for different vulnerabilities in a APBF pair tournament.