

ABF TOURNAMENT COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD IN SYDNEY

9-10 MAY 2009

1. PRESENT

Kim Morrison (chair), Eric Ramshaw, Peter Reynolds, Marcia Scudder, David Smith.

Actions

2. CONSIDERATION OF ABF TOURNAMENTS

(a1) SWPT/NOT

It was resolved that the format of the SWPT/NOT will remain essentially unchanged for 2010. This is to allow the collection of survey data from all players at the 2010 Festival (see below). We do however recommend a change in timing for the two afternoon sessions [Thurs, Fri of NWT and NST and Tue, Wed, Thurs of SWPT] to 1:30-4:00 and 4:30-7:00. This will reduce the waiting time by 30 minutes.

Sean
Mullamphy

A survey will be undertaken, both at the Summer Festival and on the web to try to ascertain the preferences of a large proportion of players, both attending and not attending.

PR to design
survey

Possibilities might include:

- Start SWPT on Sunday (moving Swiss Pairs to Saturday and redesigning a matchpointed pairs event to take place Friday – Sunday (see below)), ending on Thursday [2 sessions only on Sunday, 3 on Thursday]. The NOT to commence on Friday. ***Note from ABF MC – please consider GNP national final when making any decision.***
- Start SWPT on Monday playing only 12 rounds (and a commensurate reduction in entry fee), finishing on Thursday then NOT from Friday to Monday.
- Possible new matchpointed pairs event to run over 3 days (Friday to Sunday) with cuts after 1 and 2 days, those eliminated having the right to drop into the Mixed Teams.

The survey would cover other more general issues such as:

- why the players choose to come to Canberra,
- which events they like to play in,
- whether they also play at the Gold Coast.

The popularity, or otherwise of the late start and night play on the Monday of the SWPT should also be polled. It might be informative to conduct this survey among the New Zealanders, both in Canberra and at the Gold Coast.

The survey would be designed to allow answers to all questions, by including

alternatives such as ‘do not know’ or ‘no preference’. An incentive to take part in the survey would be two lucky prizes to be drawn on Friday morning of the SWPT (to be eligible, you must include your name on the survey response).

(a2) Friday of the SWPT/NOT (round of 20)

Management
Committee

In determining the ranking of the 20 qualifiers the scoring program is currently unable to implement the tie-breaking policy. The program needs to break ties according to the sum of the opponents victory points. This will allow the prompt promulgation of accurate information.

In the brochure, it was pointed out that for 4 person teams who qualified for the NOT, this would be a long day. Additional problems in 2009 exacerbated this. Two sequential appeals meant delays in determining the draw options and then choices for the ro20.

Sean
Mullamphy

If there is more than one appeal to be conducted in this time slot – they must be concurrent, so it will be necessary to have a pool of suitable appeals committee members on stand-by.

Slow play dogged the Friday night ro20 play. It is recommended that historically slow players should be monitored, especially for this crucial stage.

Sean
Mullamphy

As a general recommendation, slow play should not be tolerated. Penalties should be applied and carried forward into subsequent stages as disciplinary penalties.

(a3) Other problems in 2009 SWPT/NOT

Sean
Mullamphy

- The scoring room was too far from the playing area. This should be rectified for 2010.
- The information on the web regarding final placings in the SWPT was not correct (see Tie Breaking below).
- The lineups for the NOT matches were not accurate. The lineup sheets should be verified by the directing staff and then taken to the scoring room. The information on them should then be used to provide accurate player information for each sector of each match on the web. This information allows easy determination of whether board rules had been breached by any players.
- Directors failed to cover the vast area of the NCC, tending to remain on the periphery. It was frequently difficult to get a director to come to the table for a ruling.
- There appeared to have been no staff debriefing and therefore no opportunity for problem issues to be aired.

(a4) Other general NOT issues

It will be possible for a 5 or 6 person team which entered the SWPT to continue into the NOT (if qualified) as a 4 person team.

(b) PLAYOFFS

It was resolved that a team may enter Division 1 of the Open Playoffs with only 4 members. However qualification will be calculated using the total PQPs for that team. This means that a 4-player team would have only 4 contributors, while a team of 6 would have 6 contributors.

It was resolved that a team of 4 which was successful in the Playoffs must be augmented to 6 using the method as outlined in the Tournament Regulations.

For Teams years, it will be possible to enter as 3 pairs, but the requirement to have earned at least 1 PQP in common with the designated partner will be removed.

All members of any nomination to play in the Open Division 1, Women's or Seniors Playoffs must be listed on the Panel.

The situation has often arisen that a team withdraws after acceptance to the playoffs but before play commences. Teams are encouraged to enter Division 1 of the Open, and Women's and Seniors Playoffs so that they may replace such a withdrawing team (ie act as a reserve), even though they may consider that their chances of qualifying initially may be remote.

In the event that a team is reduced in players at the last minute, the sequence of augmentation events will be:

- (i) augment one player or pair from the panel
- (ii) play as a team of four, and if successful, augment to 6
- (iii) substitute a reserve team.

All entry fees for the Playoffs must have been received prior to the day of commencement (preferably by direct credit).

It was resolved to set up a survey on the web, to gain feedback from the public regarding the new format for the Open Playoffs, in particular the introduction of Division 2. ***ABF MC endorsed this request and referred it to the Player Liaison Committee.***

PR to liaise with Di Marler regarding the web survey.

It was resolved that the 2010 playoffs will be held on 20-24th March 2010 (with second preference 24-28th March 2010). We note that Good Friday is on 2/4/2010 and that the Gold Coast in 2010 will be from 26th Feb – 7th March.

Possible locations are the Hellenic Club in Canberra or the Bowlers Club in Sydney. ***ABF MC confirmed location will be Sydney 2010 20-24 March 2010.***

(c) AUTUMN FESTIVAL

The improvement in table numbers for the Autumn Festival was acknowledged and it was resolved to send a congratulatory email to the Tournament Organiser, Di Marler.

MS to email Di Marler

(d) BUTLER PAIRS

The format of the Butler Pairs is considered too onerous for many players and so some consideration of this should be made for 2010.

A survey at the 2009 event might indicate some preferences.

Some perceived problems are:

PR/ER to liaise with Peter Kahler

- too many days
- too many boards per day
- too long a break between matches

We understand that Peter Kahler is conducting research in this area.

3. TIE-BREAKING

Where ever tie breaking leads to progression to a later stage of the event, it should be done by playing additional boards whenever possible. This would occur any time the next segment starts on the following day. Procedure should be:

- (i) one 4-board set shall be played to break a two-way tie
 - (ii) two 3-board sets shall be played to break a three-way tie
 - (iii) three 2-board sets shall be played to break a four-way tie
- and if still tied, one board (duplicated) should be used.

It is anticipated that this mode of tie breaking would be appropriate for the NOT , NWT, NST, ANOT, SNOT, SNWT, GNOT to determine participants in a subsequent stage.

Tournament
organiser to
liaise with
scorer

For the final result of any Swiss Teams, and for tie breaking above where there is insufficient time, the placings should be determined by total VPs of opponents. No results should go onto notice boards or the web that have not had this mode of tie breaking applied. This mode of tie breaking should be used, if necessary to determine the winner of the VCC.

It is proposed that for Finals of ABF events, with the exception of the Playoffs and the ANC teams, there be no attempt to break ties. Titles would be shared. This would obviate the problem of uncertain finishing times for events, and allow participants to organise their travel with confidence.

4. ABF TOURNAMENT REGULATIONS

Revisions

A number of sections of the TR require modification. All changes to the Tournament Regulations shall be in force as of April 1, 2010, except those relevant to the Playoffs, which will apply to the 2011 event. ***ABF MC referred all of Item 4 to the ABF Regulations Committee for comment/action.***

(4a) Eligibility for PQPs

26.4 Ineligible players (paragraph 1.5 of these Regulations), teams or pairs are not entitled to PQP. Teams with fewer than two eligible players or pairs with no eligible player are classed as ineligible. An ineligible team/pair that otherwise would be entitled to PQP shall be replaced

by an eligible team/pair, and all PQP awards for the particular event shall be adjusted accordingly.

Proposed change: Teams or pairs with no eligible players....

The principle behind allocation of PQPs is that only units containing an eligible (to represent Australia) player can earn PQPs. Furthermore, eligible members of the units may only earn PQPs while they continue to comply with board rule requirements.

26.5.3 Should there be only two eligible players in a team and one of those players becomes ineligible for PQP due to failure to meet the board rule in a particular stage of an event, the remaining eligible player also forfeits entitlement to any further PQP awards even if he continues to meet the board rule in subsequent stages.

Proposed change:

the remaining eligible player retains the right to accrue PQP awards.

(4b) Finals for National Events

New section to be added somewhere

The length of the final for all National Events in Categories A or B shall be of no less than 64 boards and will preferably be played in four equal parts.

The length of the final for all National Events in Category C shall be of no less than 48 boards and will preferably be played in four equal parts.

It is recommended that for a 64 board final, the timing shall be 9:00-11:00; 11:15-1:15; 1:45-3:45 and 4:00-6:00.

In most cases, this would allow competitors in the final to leave on the latest flights home. The session times should be advised to BBO.

(4c) Yellow systems

5.3.4 Other teams events

Provided that the provisions of paragraph 5.2 of these Regulations are met, any system may be played in all other teams events (paragraph 1.2 of these Regulations) with the following restrictions:

- (a) YELLOW systems shall not be played in any of the first three rounds of the event

Proposed change:

YELLOW systems shall not be played in the first session of the event where the draw and systems are not advertised before the tournament.

Protected Pairs may request that yellow systems are not played against them.

5.3.6 Pairs events

- (a) YELLOW systems are not permitted in any pairs event except in stages II and III of the Open and Women's Butler Pairs Championships and in stage B (and stage C where there are three stages) of the Seniors Butler Pairs Championship (see also paragraph 5.3.1 of these Regulations).
- (b) The provisions relating to BROWN STICKER systems and "protected pairs" (ABF System Regulations) are applicable to permissible systems in pairs events.

Proposed change:

YELLOW systems are permitted in any pairs match where the number of boards is at least 8.

5.3.7 Supplementary and side events

- (a) YELLOW systems are not permitted under any circumstances in any supplementary or side event (paragraph 1.1 of these Regulations).
- (b) The Director shall strictly enforce the provisions relating to BROWN STICKER systems and "protected pairs" (ABF System Regulations) in all supplementary and/or side events.

Proposed change:

Remove word 'strictly'

(4d) Supplementary Regulations

29 Supplementary regulations

Note that there is a conflict – 1:11 says the TR prevail, 29.6 says

ER to draft changes

The ABF Tournament Unit may not correct any supplementary regulation made at the discretion of the Tournament Organiser

(4e) Scoring errors

12.6 Scoring errors made by officials may be corrected at any time during a particular stage of an event except for the last stanza of the stage, when such corrections can be made no later than 30 minutes after

posting of the scores.

Proposed change (as in TC Minutes Jan 08)

The correction period for scoring errors made by tournament officials in ABF events shall be:

- (i) For all stanzas but the last one – up until the beginning of the last stanza
- (ii) For the last stanza – up until 30 minutes after the scores are displayed.

ER to draft changes

(4f) Forfeits, withdrawal and disqualification (Sections 13/14)

(4g) Stop cards

29.4 In tournaments where bidding boxes are in use, the Tournament Organiser may sanction the use of “Stop Cards” provided that an adequate description of their use is given in the Supplementary Regulations and by notice posted in the playing room(s).

Proposed change:

Remove ‘In tournaments where bidding boxes are in use’.

(4h) Concessions in Matches assigned for Vugraph

23.3 Deviation from Vugraph schedules that have been advertised on BBO is not permitted without approval from the Tournament Sub-Committee.

23.3.1 Before deviating from an advertised BBO schedule, the Tournament Organiser must advise the broadcaster of the deviation.

23.3.2 A contestant is not permitted, except in an emergency, to forfeit a match that is scheduled for BBO broadcast unless the Tournament Sub-Committee can arrange a substitute match to be broadcast.

23.3.3 Any contestant that forfeits a match that is scheduled for BBO broadcast in contravention of the provisions of paragraph 23.3.2 (immediately above) shall be subject to the disciplinary powers of the ABF (section 3 of these Regulations).

It was resolved that it is unreasonable to expect a match to continue when it is all but impossible for one team to win. In this case, it is permissible for the match to be terminated and any subsequent Vugraph appearance by that match cancelled.

Proposed changes:

Add to 23.3 'except in the event of a concession by one team participating in the match'

Delete 23.3.2 and 23.3.3

Promulgation of periodic changes to the ABF Tournament Regulations

In order better to communicate revisions to the Tournament Regulations, a "box" system appended to the regulations document (analogous to the one used by PQP Compiler John Scudder for communicating changes to PQP regulations) will be introduced.

The appointment of 'Regulation Monitors' has proved to be a positive initiative and we recommend that this continue.

5. OTHER MATTERS

(a) Swiss Draw query

The question arises as to whether the highest placed tying team should draw the next highest, or lowest.

(b) Safeguards when using Electronic Scoring

It is recognised that there are problems associated with electronic scoring, in particular:

- failure to enter all scores
- inaccuracy in the scores entered.

It is proposed that use of electronic scoring be accompanied by filling out and submitting a score sheet, at least for the top 10% or so of tables in play, for cross checking purposes should the need arise.

Matthew McManus advised that the latest version of Bridgemates allows viewing of a table slip. Use of this version may alleviate the problems in the future.

(c) Administration of Lineup Sheets for all ABF events

It is proposed that this become part of the licensing agreement for each tournament.

It is a responsibility of the Tournament Organiser to ensure that Lineup sheets are accurately compiled for all matches in the NOT and for all Semi-Final and Final stages (or equivalent) for all other ABF events. The lineup sheets should be preserved and the information thereon should be used to ensure that the correct assignment of player's identity is used for any Web transmission. At the conclusion of the event, the Tournament Organiser should ascertain whether each player has fulfilled the board rule for the purposes of awarding PQPs and for declaration of the Title holders. Any failure to comply with the board rule should be notified to the ABF_PQP compiler within 7 days. Lineup sheets should be retained as part of the history of the event and should be stored with such information, or at the ABF headquarters (suitably labelled).

(d) Bobby Richman

It is proposed that Bobby Richman receive accolades from the ABF for passing the 10000 masterpoint mark. It is suggested that a new class of Grand Master be created, Platinum Grand Master.

(e) John Brockwell

The Tournament Committee wishes to give a vote of thanks to John Brockwell for his tireless work on the committee. We wish him well in all his future activities. *John Brockwell is a member of the Honour Roll of the ABF.*

(f) Event Reports

The committee noted with satisfaction that reports emanating from each of the ABF events should be passed on the TC for their perusal.

KM to respond

6. CORRESPONDENCE

- Michael Wilkinson proposed some alternatives for the SWPT/NOT. We appreciate this contribution and will consider it in the future, but we will not be making any major change to the format for 2010. KM to respond
- Ben Thompson, Michael Wilkinson and Ian Thompson all corresponded with regard to the eligibility of the Milne team for PQPs once two of the three eligible players failed the board rule. It was deemed that if a team commenced the NOT as eligible for PQPs, it retained that status as long as at least one eligible member continued to satisfy the board rule. Note that for 2010 a team will be eligible for PQP awards as long as at least one member is eligible. If at any point a team becomes ineligible, the PQPs it may have earned from that stage onwards evaporate. KM to respond
- Ron Klinger wrote suggesting that the Open Playoff should commence with a Swiss encompassing teams in both Divisions, with those in Division 1 having some sort of starting score, to ensure an easier passage to the next stage.
- It was resolved that, subject to the results of the survey suggested above, the format would remain essentially unchanged for the next Teams Playoff in 2011. KM to respond
- Kim Ellaway corresponded regarding the possibility of an Intermediate event targeted at those with 301-500 masterpoints. This was met with approval. The suggestion that a newcomer could play with a very experienced player and 'average' their masterpoints was not recommended. It was felt that to go along this path might be better achieved by conducting a Pro-Am tournament.
- The replacement of Robert Krochmalik by Ted Griffin for the PABF Seniors event was recommended.
- The sharing of Laurie Kelso as captain for the Open and Seniors teams at the the PABF was not recommended. The committee considers that

each representative team should have their own captain.

- The concept of publishing the full minutes of the TC meetings on the web was approved some time ago, however, none have been posted. We need a modus operandi from the MC for this to happen.
- Ross Crichton complained about the continually poor coverage, in particular the final stages, of ABF events on the web. It would appear that access to the ABF site is limited, and on occasions this was not organised in advance. The MC should ensure that this access is available for all events.

7. NEXT MEETING

The meeting finished at 2:45pm. The next meeting is scheduled for 25-26 July (or 1-2 August). It is anticipated that Sean Mullanphy will be invited to attend this meeting to participate in matters relating to the Summer Festival. It is proposed to ask Sue or David Lusk to fill the vacancy on the Tournament Committee, and to suggest that one of them attend the next meeting as an observer.

ER to liaise with Sean and determine time and venue.