

European Bridge League – Tournament Directors course Torino 2004
Answers for the final examination

- E1** *East received UI and pass is a LA for 4NT. The adjusted score for EW should be based on 4♠X -5, resulting in 15 imps for the NS-side at this table.
The 5♥-bid is bad bridge. NS should have defended 5♦X going -4, resulting in 14 imps. So the consequent damage is 1 imp, the subsequent damage 23 imps. This results in - 15 imps for EW and 1 imp added to the actual result for NS (- 9 imps) which leads to - 8 imps for NS (the teams).*
- E2** *EW are partly guilty for this situation and the ♦-lead from North is quite normal (more than a 25% action), so there is no reason to adjust the score.*
- E3** a) *With 5 tricks to go West has 2 hearts, a diamond and ♣KQ and North is in big trouble. To keep 4 clubs he either has to discard ♦J or ♥A offering declarer his 12th trick. But if we assume that West, had he continued play, would have discovered his wrong counting he has an option to play for the right guess in hearts, throwing away a club in dummy (percentage play). The contract should not be allowed.*
b) *In this case L69B applies. There is normal play by NS awarding declarer 12 tricks. So the agreed score stands. Contre-coeur.*
- E4** a) *No, North could tell the same after play of the board and then the penalty tricks need to be awarded.*
b) *The information that East revoked is UI for declarer (he admitted he didn't notice it!). But his play was based upon the knowledge to get a penalty trick transferred. Without that knowledge he had only one chance: to finesse the ♦Q, resulting in 8 tricks. So the adjusted score gives declarer 9 tricks.*
- E5** *Yes, the choice for the 4♣-bid has no relation with the UI that his partner has more than a minimum hand. The misunderstanding is obvious from the bidding. And another yes concerning the 5♣-bid: North is not restricted in his bidding at all.*
- E6** *Not playing the ♥K results in subsequent damage. South should have understood that East unintentionally gave only part of the full explanation and he should have inquired further. Result stands.*
- E7** *South's explanation looks rather strange given his own hand. The more normal agreement is that 3♣ shows a good weak two in hearts. No proof supporting South's explanation that is what the TD has to assume: wrong explanation. What would the likely lead have been had East known the meaning of the 3♣-bid? Not a heart nor a club, but the other suits look equally likely. Reason to award a weighted score, 50% for 7♣ made and 50% for one down (L12C3). And what if West tells that he would have doubled 7♣ had he been aware of the misunderstanding and hoping his ♠A to take a trick?*
- E8** *West is allowed to double, but after the discouraging 3♣ reply pass is a LA. The continuation could be suggested by the earlier hesitation. Adjusted score 3♣ +2.*
- E9** *NS only get a trick when that would have been theirs in any normal line of play. North is lucky not to have many important cards to choose between on three more rounds of diamonds. We can be sure that he will stick to his 5 spades if East does not claim. The contract is therefore deemed to be one off. L 69B*
- E10** *There was a hesitation and there is a LA (pass). But we also need a suggestion related to the bid of 3NT. And there isn't one, the hesitation 3♦-bid tells that South*

- reluctantly prefers not to play in NT (despite it is a pairs contest). So the 3NT-bid was not suggested, North made a good (lucky?) judgement. Result stands.*
- E11** *South needs to be penalised for his behaviour. It is hardly possible to ignore such remarks as an opponent. Still this play from East (♣3) can't be accepted as a consequence of this infraction. The fact that South tried to nullify his illegal remarks plays also a role in this decision. Result stands.*
- E12** *Without proof of a clear agreement the TD has to assume that the damaged side is wrongly informed. And East would have avoided the overruff for sure. Not knowing how to make his contract he will find out in time that the clubs break 3–3 and fulfils his contract. Adjusted score 4♠X made.*
- E13** *East doesn't have an attractive first lead at all. The relation between the not complete disclosure of the agreement and a likely club lead is weak. Result stands.*
- E14** *This is an unacceptable misleading action, with QT76 visible on the table. East is right to draw the conclusion that North can't have the bare ♦J now. But then he still has to find that card for an overtrick. And the finesse is certainly more attractive than the drop. A weighted score is a reasonable decision: something like two-thirds for the finesse and one-third for the drop, making 10 tricks. And the NS-side deserves a procedural penalty, not paying sufficient attention to the game or not following correct procedure during play.*
- E15** *Counting honour points West now knows that his partner most likely does not have the ♦Q, which is a conclusion using UI (East having the ♥K). And playing diamonds most certainly is a LA, if not the obvious play, after which declarer makes his contract. Adjusted score.*
- E16** *West did not act as careful as L73D1 demands from him. So 73F2 applies, and North's decision not to play the ♠A is normal if not a good one. Damaged and redress. But North has a problem when the ♠Q is played smoothly, there is still the option to duck this trick, since KQT in West is a real possibility. A weighted score half of the time making 4♠ and half of the time going one off (or something similar). And a serious remark towards West not to repeat this (a procedural penalty could be considered).*
- E17** *+170 would have resulted in 12 mp. The normal result after the infraction (+100) gives NS 4 mp and the actual result ends with 1 mp. So the consequent damage is 8 mp and the subsequent damage 3 mp.*
- E18** *Which law deals with this problem? It should be L71 for the conceding side (EW) and L69B for the acquiescing side. South understood that East was going to win 9 tricks and acquiesced. NS only get an extra trick at this stage if they would have won it with any normal play. That is not the case so NS get only 4 tricks (East has an easy squeeze on North). East's intention was to claim 8 tricks and he also gets only an extra trick if he would have won that under any normal play. Which is not the case. Double finessing in diamonds is an option for example. So EW keep their 8 tricks. This problem is a gift to the Italian TD's who like split scores in claims.*
- E19** *West has a bridge reason for his thinking pause: should he play the ♠Q or not? The conclusion from South that West now needs to have the ♠A is for his own risk. Result stands.*