



Tournament Committee

MINUTES

Meeting held in Sydney at the NSWBA
Saturday 2nd February 2019, 9:50-15:45

1. Present

Peter Reynolds (Chair, this meeting only), Sheila Bird, Laurie Kelso, Warren Lazer, Matthew McManus and Marcia Scudder.

Apologies: David Morgan

2. Matters arising from previous minutes

a. Player consultation on three-stage format for Open Butler Pairs

WL will proceed with the preparation and promulgation of a consultation paper, to be distributed just after the Butler at the Melbourne ANC.

b. Swiss VP scales

MM and Peter Buchen are continuing work on this.

c. Appeals or alternative

- i) Appeals Committees were used at the SF, but there was insufficient explanation given to a number of committees as to the relevant laws, and what tests they were required to apply in order to comply with these laws in their ruling.
- ii) A number of issues arose with polls conducted in both the Playoffs and the SF. One was that it was felt that the pollees were not given the full information when there had been different explanations given on opposite sides of a screened table. Another is that polling by email suffers from the difficulty of detailing all the relevant information in the email, and allowing interaction with pollees, including answering queries that the pollee might have. For events like the Playoffs there is no pool of players available on site for such a face to face polling to occur, so phone polling would have to occur, with email as a second-best option for some polls. The TC noted that the directing staff may also need to ensure that there is consultation between two highly qualified directors.

d. Accreditation of scorers and scoring programs

The TC noted that the ABF's new Technology Committee would have the capacity to deal with this. There was some concern that some members of the Technology committee had a vested interest in decisions made.

The TC noted that the Adelaide ANC Committee were advised that it was preferable to use MM or Compscore for scoring, and were asked to ensure that there was good presentation to the public both on the web and on site.

3. 2019 Playoffs

a. Regulations for future playoffs

Feedback was received on a number of issues that arose in the 2019 Playoffs: augmentation, playing in fixed partnerships, and HUMS.

- i) The TC noted the strong reactions from a number of players to the perceived failure to follow the regulations when the team that won the open playoff was augmented. The TC noted:
 - The winning team was, unusually, a team of four.
 - The team wanted to play as a team of four or include a playing captain who would only play in extremis.
 - Notwithstanding the excellent achievement of the team in winning the playoffs as a foursome, the TC believed Australia's best chance of success in the APBF and Bermuda Bowl would be if the team had a strong third pair.
 - The TC had drafted the augmentation rules with the intention that the pair augmented had to have played together as a pair in the playoffs but, after a query, received advice from the ABF's Legal Counsel that the relevant wording was ambiguous.
 - As a result the TC has agreed with the request from the successful team to add Tony Nunn and Liam Milne as a partnership to the Australian Open Team for 2019.
- ii) The augmentation provisions in the regulations for the Mixed Team Playoff were tightened to ensure that the two players of the augmented pair should have played as a pair in that Playoff.
- iii) ***The TC recommends that teams enter the Open, Womens, and Seniors Playoffs as three pairs, and that each entered pair must play at least 50% of the boards in each match.*** Other configurations are also acceptable provided that a system card has been submitted for that pairing. Note that, in line with WBF regulations, a maximum of 4 system cards can be submitted by one team.
MC agree with the recommendation to play in flexible partnerships. MC recommend that 4 person teams continue to be allowed to enter the playoffs and that augmentation regulations be tightened as per the mixed playoffs with only one pair being added to the team for the year.
- iv) There was discussion as to the procedure to be adopted if one player from each of two partnerships in a six-person team suddenly became unavailable, with cause. Options were for the two remaining players to combine as a pair (presumably with no system card submitted) or if one player could bring in a substitute. It was considered sufficient that the CTD could make this decision in the unlikely event of its occurrence.
- v) HUMS. The policy at present is that the system regulations of the knock-out stage of the Target Event be duplicated for the Playoffs. This meant that for all the Playoffs except the Seniors', HUMS were allowed. ***The TC recommends that this policy be retained.*** Note that 2020 is an Olympiad Year, when no HUMS are permitted.

MC accept this recommendation.

b. Review of Open, Women's and Seniors' Playoffs

Unfortunately, due to the difficulty in finding BBO operators in Canberra, only one match was broadcast for much of these events. Video and audio were available from all tables in case of disputed recollection.

A suggestion was made to advertise for operators via Facebook. The TC noted that the ABF may need to subsidise operator costs for operators from outside the Canberra area in future.

The screens in use were not up to international/WBF standard, as they did not reach to the ground underneath the table. It was possible for players to touch their partner's feet or legs, which is not compliant with WBF standards. *The TC recommends that these screens be replaced with WBF-compliant ones* but recognized that the MC would need to decide if the cost incurred in replacing the existing screens is worthwhile.

MC will explore the costs of implementing this recommendation and make a decision following the investigation.

The question of the disparity in the length of each match for the Women's and Seniors' was raised again by a number of players. The Women liked 128. The Seniors were divided between 96 and 128. The TC noted that this was the same when the initial consultations were held about this format for the playoffs and when the length of matches for the Seniors' was specifically reviewed after the first year. The TC will look further into the length of the Seniors matches.

The late finish was considered a problem, which can be relieved to some extent in future by an earlier (9:30am) start. *The TC recommends this start time for all events using 64-board matches, and recommends TOs provide lunch for those involved.*

MC accept the recommendation.

c. Review of Mixed Teams

Positive feedback was received after the recent Playoff in Sydney. The catered lunch was well received and allowed teams to socialise. All tables in the semifinals and final were broadcast on BBO, but no audio/visual record was made.

4. Future Mixed Teams Playoffs

TC recommends that a similar timing and format be used for the 2020 Playoff, i.e. open entry with no PQP requirements, but recommends that only contending teams be permitted to enter. However, the TC noted that the following year (2021) the SF will, likely, move one week later and impinge on the Australia Day long weekend time slot.

MC agree with the recommendation. Will the TC please make a recommendation as to location and Tournament Organiser for this event for 2020.

We also note that in 2019, the Consolation Pairs was run as an NSWBA event. We would like clarification as to whether this event should be an ABF licensed event.

MC request the TC develop a similar playoff format and PQP approach to other playoffs for the Mixed Teams for 2021.

The TC noted the growing popularity of Mixed Teams internationally, including decisions by top women players to play in the Mixed rather than the Women's championships. If this

trend were to become apparent in Australia then the TC would need to consider whether the Mixed Team playoffs should precede the Women's and Seniors'.

a. Canberra In Bloom

CIB is considering including a Mixed Teams event, and there was discussion as to whether good performance in this event should lead to some advantage (direct entry to QF, or VP carry forward for the Swiss) for the Mixed Teams Playoffs. The TC was not in favour of any such advantage being offered for the CIB event.

PQPs were also not recommended for CIB, even if the new format were adopted, given the continuing clash with the NZ Nationals which would affect the quality of the field.

b. Augmentation of 2019 Mixed Team

The TC recommends that the team be augmented by Pele Rankin and Stephen Fischer for the Target Event of the World Championships in China.

MC accepted this recommendation.

The team indicated that they would prefer to change the team to include Laura Ginnan and Peter Hollands instead for the APBF in Singapore. The TC did not oppose this request, subject to a number of conditions. It noted the MC's decision to augment one pair (Rankin and Fischer) for both events.

The TC endorsed Peter Hollands as NPC for both events.

5. Review of the Summer Festival

a. Entries/venue/format

Entries to the 2019 SF declined by 6.5%. Feedback included the venue (lack of playing space and breakout space, despite the increase from last year) and the hotel's lack of flexibility to allow late checkout for players who lose the KO matches of the NOT. The current format has been in place for several years now, but the low number of teams qualifying for the NOT leads to lack of interest in late rounds. There is no good post-SWPT event which might encourage players to stay on.

b. Future recording (video)

The TC noted that Traian has introduced a new camera plus stand that is relatively cheap and portable, allowing the directing staff to record all the action at any table they (or recorders etc) are concerned about. Although there is no evidence of any collusive cheating in Australian events, tools like this could aid detection in the future.

6. Review of Youth Week

Leigh Gold's report was received. It raised no issues for the TC.

7. Use of video and sound recording by directors

The audio/visual recording of tables in KO events makes it possible for directors to review the relevant occurrence to assist in making director rulings. For example, changes in tempo can be ascertained with confidence. The Regulations should be amended to mandate that directors to use this information when it is available.

8. Consistent naming of 'subset' events [categories] held within national events

MM has collated the many events with restrictions on Masterpoints that are part of the Tournament Calendar. The table is given in Appendix 1.

The preamble to the list is a definition of the Rules applicable to players who have won Gold Point ABF events restricted by Masterpoints. The aim is to prevent players contesting restricted events which they have previously won, and to disallow players who have won two restricted events from entering further events with that restriction.

9. Restricted events

a. Youth Representatives in restricted teams

At the SF Restricted Teams youth players who were very well credentialed, but nonetheless met the Masterpoints limit were part of a team, mainly comprised otherwise of family members. TC is of the opinion that such entries should be allowed, perhaps encouraged, as they bring into the tournament scene players who would not have otherwise been involved. The TC noted that with the rules set out in Appendix 1, these youth players cannot enter the event next year.

b. Systems in Restricted events

This discussion arose because of the use by a pair in a Restricted event at the SF which, while technically passing as a green system, had embedded in it many unusual continuations in what would normally be basic auctions. This had a disconcerting effect on the less experienced players in the field. The problem that arises is how to firstly find out about and secondly police the use of this type of system in a Restricted event.

As part of Appendix 1, system limitations on various types of restricted events are tabulated. There is also a statement regarding the inappropriateness of using convoluted continuations in basic auctions at the Restricted level.

10. PQP regulations re the board rule

A query was received from Sartaj Hans regarding the allocation of PQPs for the 2019 NOT. Leibowitz/Gill failed the PQP board rule in the final of the 2019 NOT (cf 2018 when Leibowitz/Beauchamp failed the PQP board rule in the semi-final). In both years the team, composed of otherwise PQP-ineligible players, went on to win the event. The difference is that in 2019 the team was PQP-compliant entering the Final. In 2018, L/B were awarded $\frac{1}{2}$ the PQPs available to losing semi-finalists, the second placed team was awarded the 1st place PQPs and awards filtered down from there. In 2019 L/G were awarded $\frac{1}{2}$ the PQPs available to the losing finalists. In line with the Supplementary Regulations:

- 10.1 To be eligible for PQP, a player must play in at least one-half of the matches in the Swiss qualifying (fractions rounded down) and at least 2 stanzas in each match in a finals series (quarter-final, semifinal, final).

When L/G did not comply with this rule, the team was rendered ineligible for PQPs and so the 1st place PQPs go to 2nd placed team etc, with L/G awarded $\frac{1}{2}$ the PQPs available to the losing finalists.

11. Seeding of Playoff Winners in subsequent national event.

A team comprising some (but not all) of the team winning the Australian Women's Team Playoff was seeded 7th in the NWT. Correspondence was received indicating that they should have been seeded 1st. However, TC is of the opinion that seeding should be left to the CTD.

As a follow on from the discussion the question arose as to the best way to create the draw in round 1 of a large event. One option is random top half v random bottom half (which is in common use), but the scoring program must be able to generate this draw. Another is 1 v 2, 3

v 4 etc. In the short term this should be left to the CTD, however there was some preference to the random top half v random bottom half.

12. Other business

At present outright Masterpoint awards are only earned if a player plays 40% of the available boards.

TC recommends that this be reduced to be in line with title awards that require 25% of the boards to be played.

13. Next meeting

Friday 24th May, 2019, in Sydney at the NSWBA

Appendix 1

Proposal for precluding previous winners from Masterpoint-restricted ABF events

Rule 1 - Players who have won a listed Masterpoint-restricted ABF event will not be permitted to enter that event in subsequent years.

Rule 2 - Players who have won two listed Masterpoint-restricted ABF events will not be permitted to subsequently enter an ABF event with the same masterpoint restriction. In a case where the player has won two or more events with different masterpoint limits, this restriction will apply to the limit of the second highest event in which they were successful.

Notes:

- i) Only events of two or more sessions will be included in the table of listed events.
- ii) The table of listed events will be updated as appropriate.
- iii) Winning a category prize within an event with multiple masterpoint ratings will not activate Rule 1 or Rule 2.
- iv) For the purposes of Rule 2, if a player has already entered a subsequent event at the time they won a second listed event, they will be permitted to compete in that event.

Listed Masterpoint-restricted ABF events

- a) A player winning two events within a group will not be permitted to subsequently enter events in that or any lower ranked group.
- b) A player winning one event within a group and one event within a higher ranked group will not be permitted to subsequently enter an event in the lower ranked group or below.

Group 1	SFOB Life Master Teams
Group 2	SFOB Under 750 Teams
	GCC Intermediate Pairs
	GCC Intermediate Teams
	GCC Ivy Dahler Intermediate Pairs
	CCG Intermediate/Restricted Pairs
	CCG Intermediate/Restricted Teams
Group 3	SFOB Penline 500 Swiss Pairs
	GCC 0-500 Weekend Matchpoint Swiss Pairs
	GCC 0-500 Monday Butler Swiss Pairs

Group 4	SFOB Non-Life Master Teams
	AN < Life Master Swiss Pairs
	AN < Life Master Teams
	BR300 Teams
Group 5	SFOB Under 300 Teams
	GCC Restricted Pairs
	GCC Restricted Teams
	GCC Ivy Dahler Restricted Pairs
	TFOB Restricted Pairs
	BR Restricted Swiss Pairs
	VCC Victor Muntz Restricted Swiss Pairs
	ABPC Restricted Pairs
	CIB Restricted Matchpoint Swiss Pairs
	CIB Restricted Swiss Pairs
	HRMC Restricted Pairs
	SN Two Men and a Truck Restricted Teams
	SN Ted Chadwick Restricted Pairs
Group 6	SFOB Novice Teams
	SFOB Novice Matchpoint Swiss Pairs
	SFOB Novice Swiss Pairs
	GCC Novice Pairs
	GCC Novice Teams
	GCC Friday Novice Pairs
	BR Novice Swiss Pairs
	SN Novice Pairs
	VCC Frank Power < 200 Swiss Pairs
Group 7	GCC 0-50 Wednesday Pairs
	GCC 0-50 Butler Swiss Pairs

Event Key

SFOB = Summer Festival of Bridge

GCC = Gold Coast Congress

TFOB = Tasmanian Festival of Bridge

AN = Autumn Nationals

BR = Barrier Reef Congress

VCC = Victor Champion Cup

ABPC = Australian Butler Pairs Championship

CCG = Coffs Coast Gold

CIB = Canberra in Bloom

SN = Spring Nationals

HRMC = Hans Rosendorff Memorial Congress