



Answers

- 1a L57A
1b L57C1
1c L57C2

- 2 It is NS's responsibility to ensure that their alerts have been seen, so there was misinformation and the TD needs to consider how the auction might have gone if EW had known North had shown hearts. East would still have doubled, which they had already established during the event would be takeout of hearts for their partnership, and the auction would thus be likely to start:

West	North	East	South
		pass	1♣
pass	1♦*	dbl	2♣
2♠	3♣	?	

Would East bid further at this stage? In the auction that had taken place, East HAD bid on to 3♥, and therefore could be expected to bid on to 3♠ if we were satisfied that the two situations were essentially the same. Therefore the only polling to be done is to ask players whether they would be more likely to bid 3♠ in the proposed auction if 1♦ had shown hearts or if it had shown diamonds. Most polled thought the difference would be slight, but they would be a bit more likely to bid if North had shown hearts than diamonds, because of the softer diamond values. Ruling was 100% of 3♠ for EW.

- 3 L25B applies. Normally we should not accept this particular change under L25A, because South may well have been confusing the notrump ranges. At the table, South added that he made the change immediately. This suggests that he thought the change was allowed under those circumstances, even if 2♦ was a deliberate (but mistaken) bid. North has UI, and 2♠ would be the normal response to 2♦. At the end, in a) the TD should come to the conclusion that does not matter what North bids: NS would reach 4♥ regardless. In b), however, a poll must be made to evaluate the possibility of NS getting to slam (–1).
- 4 TD needs to decide who claimed. Since it was NS, and also NS who now wanted the result changed, the ruling needs to be under L71 rather than L69B. This tells us to award a trick:
- A. if a player conceded a trick his side had, in fact, won; or
 - B. if a player has conceded a trick that could not be lost by any normal play of the remaining cards.

North has a complete count of the hand and can see that a heart now will force dummy to ruff with its Ace, promoting North's spades to both be winners. A spade lead would limit North to one trump winner. In a high-level event this seems clear but it would not be unreasonable to rule in some fields that a spade at this point would merely be careless.

- 5a 11 tricks; L64A2
5b 10 tricks; L64B4
5c 11 tricks; L64C2a
5d 10 tricks; L64B4



Simulations

10th EBL/WBF TD Workshop, Sofia, 21-24 November 2024

- 6 This is indeed true in that if EW both throw hearts and North now plays a heart, the spades are blocked and South gets a trick with the HK. West's claim requires East to play a specific card in order for the claim to be valid L70D2. Had the claim been contested at the time, we would rule under L70A and we give South the extra trick. However, because it was a later objection to be ruled under L69B2 it seems "not likely" that this would have happened had play continued, since declarer had not noticed the problem at the time and her partner not until later on.
- 7 Everyone who was polled thought that the North hand was good enough to go on to game, but in the absence of any documentation of NS's claimed agreement it should be ruled that pass is a logical alternative and adjusted to 3♥+2. Note that if the North player had considered the hand good enough to insist on playing in game, he might have started with a game-forcing 2♣.
- 8 L27B2; L27D
- 8a Adjust to 6♥/6NT -1
- 8b As above; failing to take both tricks defending 5NT does not mean they would do the same against a slam.
- In all cases, 72b and c apply as well: North should awarded a severe penalty. The TDs are requested to give some thought about whether not cashing both aces in 5NT should be considered a self-inflicted damage leading to a so-called "subsequent-consequent" split score (12Ce).
- 9a ♥10 is the accepted lead and ♥4 is a penalty card so must be played and declarer gets a cheap trick.
- 9b West's ♥10 is picked up and is no longer a penalty card. East leads something other than a heart but his ♥4 remains as a penalty card, so if West gets in, declarer can prohibit a heart again.
- 9c Although declarer says East can lead anything, because his ♥4 is a major penalty card, it must be played now and since West's ♥10 is also an MPC it too has to be played so declarer gets a cheap trick.
- 10 What does the UI suggest? It is rather unclear but the TD can poll players on this question. It is likely to find that the UI does not suggest bidding a slam, but it does suggest bidding diamonds rather than hearts. After polling result is likely to be adjusted to 4♥ down something.
- 11 Score adjusted to 75% of 4♠ -2, 25% of table result.
Points of interest to discuss: will N or S bid 5H? Will they make 11 tricks (unlikely, as a finesse over West is more likely now)?
- 12a 11 tricks. It is too late for automatic trick adjustment, but West would have made 11 tricks without the revoke, discarding dummy's last diamond on a club while South ruffed with his natural trump trick.
- 12b The automatic trick adjustment leads to 12 tricks,
- 13 The knowledge that West is void in diamonds arises from the legal procedures of the Laws (L59) and as such is authorised under Law 16A1c. As an aside, it's not clear that NS are actually damaged, since East would almost certainly lead a diamond at the first opportunity anyway.



- 14 In discussion among TDs the majority view was that the tempo break was not likely to be from a holding of Qx, but the counter argument is that it does suggest a choice was there to be made, which is not the case with a single club left.
Because of the extreme nature of the tempo break, it was agreed that this did suggest that she had more than one card she could have played, so we adjusted the score. Since, without a tempo break, South would still have a decision to make, we gave her 50% of making the slam and 50% of one-off. Afterwards there was some question of giving East a PP for her actions but this was not finally implemented, though it probably should have been.
It is worth considering that if we think that an extreme hesitation like this one indicates a choice of cards to be made, why should a lesser hesitation not do so?
- 15 Polling players as to what they do at trick three will find all play a heart, saying that it is inconceivable that the lead was anything other than a singleton. One of them would have played back a heart at trick two, trying for two off. They will also say that a slow ♦10 suggests not continuing hearts, rather than encouraging them. Table result stands. IMPORTANT: To get top note the TD must investigate thoroughly EW's carding methods.
- 16 NS are entitled to know of this possibility even if it was not an explicit agreement by EW. When players are polled as to their play at trick 2 with the fuller information about the 1 ♦ bid, it is still far from automatic for them to switch to a diamond, but some will. An award of 40% of 3NT-1 and 60% of 3NT+1 was made.
- 17a Declarer has 50/50% guess, which obviously make it a doubtful point whether declarer would be sure to get this right. 6 ♠-1
- 17b This declarer has indicated awareness of the potential problem, even if a little late. 6 ♠=
- 18 TD needs to investigate and come to a conclusion as to whether or not this was by agreement. If so, polling players will determine how likely a club lead would be with the correct information. Then:
 - 18a the opening bid is systemic: result adjusted to what the poll would point at.
 - 18b1 same as in a); NS have different opinions about the meaning of "better minor", but EW are entitled to know South's.
 - 18b2 same as a); partnership's style is an agreement.
- 19 Declarer revoked twice in the same suit. Law 64C applies for the second revoke. If he realises that he has ♥Q after playing the King from dummy, he will lose two tricks. Plus one trick transferred for the first revoke 64A2.
- 20a 1♥ opener promised five hearts, so 2NT is not comparable.
- 20b 1♥ opener promised five hearts or extra strength, so 2NT is not comparable.
- 20c 1♥ opener might be a minimum opener with only four hearts, so 2NT is comparable.
- 21 L24 B. Both sides offending. North barred from bidding and 1NT is the contract.
- 22 4 ♠=. West was misinformed before the opening lead, and it is clear why she led a heart, and equally clear that she would have led a club if correctly informed. Having won a club lead, East would surely have returned a diamond. East's failure to do so when she had the chance is not an extremely serious error nor a gambling action in the hope of getting a score adjustment.



Simulations

10th EBL/WBF TD Workshop, Sofia, 21-24 November 2024

- 23 As a simulation, the important points are for the TD to ask about cue-bidding style and to tell pollees of this. Also to recognise that saying she would have bid more with the correct information is not persuasive if she can't identify which that would have been different. Not having cue-bid is unrelated to the infraction: result stands.
- 24a No late alert, no misinformation, no adjustment
- 24b/c West should have called the TD and may have been allowed to change his pass. Now too late, score stands,
- 24d West should expect an alert of 2♦ whatever its meaning, so we should expect players to protect themselves if there is no alert.
- 25 Players are entitled to a correct description of their opponents' agreements, even when they don't match the hand making the calls. Sometimes, as here, they would be more successful with this information than with an accurate description of the hand. We awarded a weighted result of 70% of 6♥-1 and 30% of 6♥=.
- 26 Change not allowed. East may well have made a reflex 1♣ opening bid. It is certainly doubtful whether the bid was unintended.
- 27 EBL Screen Regulations 3.1 Description of the Operation and use of Bidding Boxes
A call is considered 'made' when placed on the tray and released. A player who removes one or more calls made from the tray in an apparent attempt to "pass" is indeed deemed to have "passed".
Both sides are responsible for making sure that the whole auction is visible on each side of the screen.
The question is whether or not any player had made an apparent attempt to "pass"? That was not their intention – they removed the cards from the tray because they thought the auction was over, not because they intended to pass. Based on this, considering that both sides were offending, East's ♦J was a card exposed during the auction, dealt with under Law 24B, which meant that when the auction continued West was barred from bidding and it finished with 5♠ being the final contract.
An alternative approach would be that by removing their cards South and West passed, which again would lead to the final contract being 5♠.
- 28 Given the right information, it is obvious (expected) that everybody would take the ♣A (there no need to poll).
Though you may strongly dislike South's play, and you may even consider it a serious error, it is not unrelated to the infraction of misinformation, nor can it be judged to have been gambling, so L12C1(e) does not apply and we simply consider what the player would have done with the correct information, which is to play the ♣A.
Consequently, we adjust to 4♥x-1

