



EUROPEAN BRIDGE LEAGUE
7th EBL TOURNAMENT DIRECTORS COURSE

1st – 5th February 2010
Sanremo, Italy

REVELEY SCORE ADJUSTMENTS

by Grattan Endicott

'Reveley' Score Adjustments

by Grattan Endicott

1. A so-called '*Reveley*' score adjustment is one in which a weighted score adjustment [Law 12C1(c)] includes a percentage of results obtained through use of the call that was actually made at the table.
2. It is commonly asserted that '*the law does not allow of this*'. I can find no justification in the law book for this statement. I have no problem if a Regulating Authority or Tournament Organizer adopts such a policy. It is normally the case that such an adjustment is equitable although, in my view, there are rare exceptions when equity calls for a *Reveley* adjustment.
3. In my view law does not preclude such exceptions.
4. In Law 16B3, when a player who had a logical alternative action has chosen an action that could have been suggested by unauthorized information received from partner, and has gained an advantage thereby, the prescribed rectification is the award of an assigned adjusted score. As to the manner of awarding such a score this Law does nothing more than refer the Director to Law 12C.
5. Law 12C tells us that in his assessment of an assigned adjusted score the Director shall discount certain damage self-inflicted by the non-offending side. Otherwise it imposes no restraint generally upon the Director in his assessment of an assigned adjusted score.
6. Law 12C also tells us that an assigned adjusted score replaces the score actually obtained in play.
7. However, *Reveley* adjustments are made under the specific terms of Law 12C1(c). Here we are told that the purpose of a weighted score adjustment is '*in order to do equity*'. It is left entirely open to the Director to determine what he judges to be equity.
8. Concerning Law 12C1(c) the WBF Code of Practice tells us that 'The purpose of this law is to enable the Director and an Appeals Committee to form a view as to what is an equitable outcome in the score and to implement that outcome. It makes the appeal committee the final arbiter of equity'.
9. The WBF Appeals Committee last discussed this law in Maastricht when I was seeking to persuade the substantial Zone 2 element of the committee to allow of weighted rulings. The chief spokesman with whom I was talking was Richard Colker; he, and his Zone 2 colleagues, made it a condition of their consent to my proposal that awards incorporating a *Reveley* element were acceptable.