



EUROPEAN BRIDGE LEAGUE

4th EBL TOURNAMENT DIRECTORS COURSE

31st August – 5th September 2001
Tabiano di Salsomaggiore Terme, Italy

SCORE ADJUSTMENTS

Law 12 Director's discretionary powers

12.1 Types of score adjustments

12.1.1 Artificial Adjusted scores

If a board is unable to be played then an artificial adjusted score is given under Law 12C1. For example, if a player has heard a result from a neighbouring table, or a player has looked at the wrong hand, and the Director decides the board cannot be played (see Law 16B) then he will give each side an artificial adjusted score.

Such a score is Average Plus (A+) if the side is not at fault, Average (A) if the side is partly at fault and Average Minus (A-) if the side is fully at fault. This usually translates into 60% or +3 imps for A+, 50% or 0 imps for A, 40% or -3 imps for A- (see #12.5 for other forms of scoring). However, if a pair's session average is greater than 60% then they get their session average for A+. Similarly, if a pair's session average is less than 40% then they get their session average for A-.

Note *In teams A+/A- translates to +3 imps, ie a team that led by 23 imps without this board leads by 26 imps.*

On score sheets it is best to write A40%/60% for A- to N/S, A+ to E/W since that is how it is input to many scoring programs. With good software, the computer checks to see whether either score should be adjusted to session average. Similarly write A50%/60%, A50%/40%, A50%/50% and so on. A-/A+ or A/A- are acceptable alternatives.

As a principle, the Director should not give an artificial adjusted score that adds up to more than 100% unless there was an outside agency at fault.

Examples

(1) A board is unplayable because the previous table fouled it as is discovered from the curtain cards. The Director gives A+/A+ since an outside agency was at fault.

(2) A board cannot be played because there is no time left. The Director might decide both sides are at fault and give A-/A-. However, if he decides there are extenuating circumstances he can give A/A, or A+/A- if only one side is at fault. But he should not give A+/A unless the table was delayed by an outside influence, such as by another table, or by the Director.

There may be special regulations where an artificial adjusted score is given even though the board is completed. But such artificial scores should not be given at the whim of the Director, but only when a regulation says so.

Example In the EBU there is a regulation that when a Psyche is fielded, the board is completed, and then an artificial adjusted score is given unless the non-offending side has done better than A+. The score given is A+/A- and a Procedural Penalty is added, usually the standard amount (usually 10% at matchpoints).

12.1.2 *Assigned Adjusted scores*

When a score is obtained on a board, and the Director decides it should be changed because of an infraction, he adjusts it under Law 12C2. For example, if a N/S pair defend 3♥ because they were misinformed, and the Director judges that if correctly informed they would bid 3NT vulnerable and make eleven tricks, then he assigns a score of +660 for N/S to both sides.

In a pairs event a single score of this sort is input to the computer replacing the score obtained at the table.

12.1.3 *Split scores*

Law 12C2 refers to the fact that scores need not balance. There are several occasions when a Director should give the two sides different assigned scores.

(1) The actual basis given in Law 12C2 for the two sides is different. The non-offenders get the best result that was likely had the irregularity not occurred. The offenders get the worst score that was at all probable.

Example Suppose 1NT is doubled and then the defence take it out because they are told it was a strong 1NT. In fact it is a weak one, and the Director decides to assign a score in 1NT doubled. Three off seems a likely result. While four off is not likely, it might just happen, because it depends on a particular defence and a mis-guess. So the Director gives the non-offending side 1NTx-3, but for the offending side he assigns 1NTx-4.

(2) Suppose a player knows his opponents have done something wrong. They reach a final contract, and he judges that he will get an adjustment anyway. So he decides to try a gambling double: if he gets a good score, that is fine: if not, then he will presumably get an adjustment anyway.

This is known as the "double shot", legal in many sports, but not acceptable in bridge. Legally, the player's final score is considered to be caused by the "irrational, wild or gambling action" subsequent to the opponent's infraction so is not adjusted. However, the score for the offending side is adjusted in the normal way.

Example A Ghestem jump overcall of 3♣ over 1♣ is described as hearts and diamonds. Overcaller looks surprised at his partner's explanation, and bids 3♠ over his partner's 3♥ and then 4♠ over 4♥. No doubt this will be ruled back since he appears to have used unauthorised information. But an opponent makes a ridiculous double of 4♠, which makes.

The offenders get adjusted back to some contract in hearts. If the doubler's action is considered "irrational, wild or gambling" then the non-offenders keep their table score of 4♠ doubled making.

See #12.2 for further comment on this.

(3) Under Law 82C when a Director has made an error, which is too late to correct, he will assign a score to each side. Since he is required to treat both sides as non-offending these scores will often not balance.

Example A player bids 3♥, and then is told that he has been misinformed. The Director is called but fails to give him a chance to change his bid. He makes ten tricks and afterwards claims that he would have bid 4♠ with the correct information. If the Director feels that he might or might not have bid 4♥ he should assign 4♥ making to this player but 3♥ plus one to his opponents.

(4) In the next section we deal with "weighted" scores: it is possible to get a score that is both split and weighted.

12.1.4 Weighted scores

Law 12C3 allows an Appeals Committee to vary an assigned adjusted score to achieve equity. Following recommendations by the World Bridge Federation endorsed by the European Bridge League it is now permitted for Tournament Directors to do this as well as Appeals Committees.

Note *Directors are currently permitted to give such adjustments in EBL events, and in some European countries. It is hoped that more NBOs will follow suit.*

Using this Law a Director who is giving an adjustment and feels there might have been several possible outcomes is allowed to give a weighting to each outcome

Example Because of misinformation a pair defend 4♥ doubled. If correctly informed they will certainly bid game in spades, possibly slam, and make eleven or twelve tricks, twelve being more likely.

Under Law 12C2 the Director would probably give 6♠ making, or if he felt that was too unlikely, perhaps a split score: 6♠ making to the offenders, 4♠ plus two to the non-offenders.

Under Law 12C3 a weighted score could be given, thus:

	25% of +1430 (6♠=)
plus	40% of +680 (4♠+2)
plus	20% of +650 (4♠+1)
plus	15% of - 100 (6♠-1)

As a method of assigning scores to achieve equity this is often acceptable to the players. The offenders must not gain from this, so the weighting should lean in the non-offenders favour. This is called "sympathetic weighting".

Some authorities use slightly different methods. One method is called "true weighting". In this case there is no benefit of the doubt given to the non-offenders. To make sure the offenders do not gain, Procedural Penalties are freely given as well as the weighted score adjustment. This method is used by the WBF in World Championship events.

It has also been suggested that the non-offenders should get a weighted score as in sympathetic weighting, but that the offenders should get the full adjustment via Law 12C2, thus being a split score. This method of weighting is called "skewed weighting", and, while legal, is not recommended by the EBL.

Once such a ruling has been given it needs to be calculated. This is done by converting each score to matchpoints or imps and then applying the weighting. Any resulting fraction is rounded in favour of the non-offenders.

Examples

1) It is pairs. The assignment is:

25% of +1430 (6♠=)
 plus 40% of +680 (4♠+2)
 plus 20% of +650 (4♠+1)
 plus 15% of - 100 (6♠-1)

An average is entered into the computer, and the frequencies calculated. Then the matchpoints are found. The calculation might be thus:

Score	Mpoints	Weight	Adjust
+1430	17.1	25%	4.275
+680	12.2	40%	4.88
+650	8.7	20%	1.74
- 100	3.4	15%	0.51
	Total		11.405
	Rounded		11.5

If average is 8 then an adjustment of 3.5 is added to the N/S score, and subtracted from the East-West score. Good software will do the calculation from the various scores and weightings.

1) It is teams. The assignment is:

25% of +1430 (6♠=)
 plus 40% of +680 (4♠+2)
 plus 20% of +650 (4♠+1)
 plus 15% of - 100 (6♠-1)

In the other room, suppose N/S scored +650 in 4♠.. The calculation would be thus:

Score	IMPs	Weight	Adjust
+1430	+13	25%	+3.25
+680	+1	40%	+0.4
+650	0	20%	0
- 100	- 13	15%	- 1.95
	Total		+1.7
	Rounded		+2

So the board is scored as +2 imps to the non-offending side.

To avoid confusion, weighted scores should always be presented in the same way. See our example:

25% of +1430 (6♠=)
plus 40% of +680 (4♠+2)
plus 20% of +650 (4♠+1)
plus 15% of - 100 (6♠-1)

Scores are always shown as N/S scores, in descending order of N/S scores. Calculation is easier if each weighting is given a line to itself. This way of expressing weighted scores is called the "Maastricht protocol".

12.1.5 *Split and Weighted scores*

(1) In 12.1.3 (2) we saw that if a non-offender commits wild or gambling action then his side gets their actual table score, but the score is still adjusted for the offenders. Of course this adjustment could be a weighted score.

(2) In Tenerife there were occasions where the Director or appeals committee felt the blame for the occurrence was not completely one-sided, ie. the non-offenders might have protected themselves better, and split the score to reflect this.

(3) It is not normal to have an adjusted score that is both split and weighted except in these two situations.

12.1.6 *Method of calculating split and/or weighted scores at pairs contests.*

In a pairs event it is normal to input an average and then do manual adjustments for split and/or weighted scores. Hopefully improvements in software will allow these adjustments to be calculated by computer.

12.2 **Score adjustments**

The award of an assigned adjusted score (see Law 12C2) is appropriate when a violation of law causes damage to an innocent side (although the extent of redress to this side may be affected, see below, if it has contributed to its own damage by irrational, wild or gambling, action subsequent to the infraction) Damage exists when, in consequence of the infraction, an innocent side obtains a table result less favourable than would have been the expectation in the instant prior to the infraction.

If the damaged side has wholly or partly caused its own damage by irrational, wild or gambling action, it does not receive relief in the adjustment for such part of the damage as is self-inflicted. The offending side, however, should be awarded the score that it would have been allotted as the normal consequence of its infraction. This will be adjusted by a Split score: see 12.1.3.

A revoke by the innocent side subsequent to the infraction will affect its own score but again the infractor's score is to be adjusted as before without regard to the revoke.

12.3 **Contact details**

Feel free to contact me to discuss anything further. My details are:

David Stevenson
63 Slingsby Drive
WIRRAL
CH49 0TY
England UK

Tel: +44 151 677 7412
Fax: +44 870 055 7697
Mobile: +44 7778 409955
Email: bridge@blakjak.com