

2018 ABDA Directors Seminar - Law 86

Jan Peach QBA Accreditation

Whenever a director considers awarding an artificial adjusted score in a teams' event he needs to immediately consider Law 86B1. It's a good idea to avoid any mention of an *artificial* adjusted score until he knows what has happened at the other table.

If an artificial adjusted score is required but one side obtained a clearly favourable score at the other table then the director awards an *assigned* adjusted score, quite possibly a weighted score. Note there is no distinction between an offending team and a non-offending team. 68B1 says, "a clearly favourable score to one side". A pair who thought +3 imp a possibility may be unhappy to find they end up with -7 imp. Best not to mention average plus prematurely.

Unless the board has already been played at the other table it should be cancelled. If the board has been started at the other table it is completed.

When an artificial adjusted score looms because of slow play at a table, the director could postpone boards at the other table to avoid single results being obtained.

A number of laws refer the director to Law 86B:

- Law 12A - adjusted score in team play
- Law 13D - hand completed with, for example, a 14/12
- Law 16D2(d) - too much accidental extraneous information.
- Law 15B - wrong board discovered during the auction or play.

Other laws lack a reference to Law 86 though it clearly applies because of the over-arching Law 12A:

- Law 15A3 - when a contestant made a call holding a hand from a different board and cannot repeat the call when he later plays that other board.

How does the director determine what constitutes "a clearly favourable score"? We await clarification from the WBF Laws Committee. A result that is not likely to be replicated is the best suggestion I have heard so far. Once a number of tables get a top score it becomes more likely that the problem table could also have obtained that result. Others set the bar much lower for a result to be clearly favourable.

Law 86B2 applies when multiple boards cannot be compared as well as for a single fouled board at teams. Usually neither contestant is at fault for a fouled board so unless the director allows a substitute board to be played (only if neither contestant knows the match result on the other boards) we have a simple +3 imp to both sides via Law 12C2.

When only one contestant is at fault the director needs to calculate whether an assigned adjusted score would be more favourable to the non-offenders than average plus. Either way the offenders receive the complement. -3 imp at best.

Finally, for both sides offending there is average minus to both sides.

Regulating Authorities may have different regulations to handle problems with multiple boards. The ABF has added Appendix 7 "Calculation of Multiple Average Plus Awards During a Single Session/Match," to its Tournament Regulations.

If regulations are silent then Law 86B2 is applied to each board that cannot be compared.