

Newsletter

January 2022



HKCBA LTD

<http://www.hkcba.org>

Member of World Bridge Federation

Member of Pacific Asia Bridge Federation

Member of Sports Federation and Olympic Committee of Hong Kong, China

目 錄

Table of Contents

	Page
Minutes of the 2nd Council Meeting. 2022.....	3
Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting. 2022.....	6
Minutes of the 4th Council Meeting. 2022.....	8
Appeal Case – Mixed Team.....	10

2nd Council Meeting Minutes

Date: January 13, 2022 (Thursday)

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Venue: Zoom

Present: Officers:

Derek Zen – President (DZ)

Pearlie Chan – Secretary (PC)

Zia Wai - Treasurer (ZW)

Council members:

Crystal Tang (CT)

Charlie Lee (XL)

KF Mak (KF)

Kelvin Chan (KC)

Louis Tam (LT)

Tony Lau (TL)

WK Lai (WK)

Item	Content	When	Action
1	Adopted minutes of last meeting.		
2	Follow up matters raised in last meeting (by minutes order): i) Appeal case about Martin Poon's directorship has been handled by Appeals Committee and passed to TD side.		KC
3	Financial Affairs: i) Latest Bank Balance: HKD3.18million (received HKD1.125million for 2021-2022 IASS and HKD1.125million for 2021-2022 Tier B funding).		
4	Internal Affairs: ii) HKCBA new website: missing 2019 Intercity data for master point calculation, have already identified some source for the data. After that will complete master point update.		WK

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> iii) Coaches for 2022 Asian Games: confirmed to proceed with Mr. Patrick Huang as the coach for Ladies and Mixed Team, and invite Mr. Giorgio Duboin to be the coach for Men's team. Next step is to confirm the coaching fee and agree the training schedule and coaching service. iv) Youth Team budget: Council endorsed the budget prepared by Leo Cheung. v) Promotion of bridge in secondary school: Leo Cheung proposed to take over the promotion job which includes providing training to teachers in school, organize secondary school competitions (Rose Bowl etc.). He has requested around HKD98K budget from Council per year. Council discussed and agreed to subsidize HKD50K and the remaining fee Leo has to find other sponsors. vi) Asian Games Selection Committee update: selection trial will be held on pair basis. Selection Committee to decide on the trial approach e.g. Gembridge or Lovebridge or BBO Vugraph. For the coming World Bridge Championships (WBC) which will be held in late March 2022, since it will have passed the deadline of submission of Asian Games representatives to SF&OC, in case the team achieved good result in WBC and name change is required, the committee will inform SF&OC but subject to their review and approval. vii) Backfill the post of Vice President: Due to Ricky Chu's resignation, according to M&A Council has the authority to appoint someone to backfill the position. Council agreed to appoint WK Lai as the Vice President for the 2 years term. And agreed to invite Tiffany Tse to backfill the position of Council member. viii) Endorsement of WBC representatives: Council endorsed Abby Chiu, Alan Sze, Jacky Ip, Sunny Mo, Zia Wai and Jim Lee to participate in the coming WBC (Bermuda Bowl). The team has nominated Patrick Choy as Non-playing captain and Chonia Yeung as the team manager but Council will not provide subsidy as Patrick Choy is not on the recognized list of NPC while no subsidy will be provided for team manager as per usual practice. 		
--	---	--	--

5	<p>External Affairs:</p> <p>i) 2022 Interport: Wait for Bux to update on the progress as they have to apply funding from Macau government.</p>		
6	<p>AOB:</p> <p>Nil.</p> <p>The next meeting will be held on February 10, 2022 (Thursday)</p>		

3rd Council Meeting Minutes

Date: February 10, 2022 (Thursday)

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Venue: Zoom

Present: Officers:

Derek Zen – President (DZ)
WK Lai - (WK)
Pearlie Chan – Secretary (PC)
Zia Wai - Treasurer (ZW)

Council members:

Crystal Tang (CT)
Charlie Lee (XL)
John Tsang (JT)
KF Mak (KF)
Kelvin Chan (KC)
Louis Tam (LT)
Tony Lau (TL)

Apologies: Council members:

Tiffany Tse (TT)

Item	Content	When	Action
1	Adopted minutes of last meeting.		
2	Follow up matters raised in last meeting (by minutes order): ix) Appeal case about Martin Poon's directorship has been handled by Appeals Committee and passed to TD side. KC to follow up and update.		KC
3	Financial Affairs: ii) Latest Bank Balance: HKD4.51million (received HKD1.125million for 2021-2022 IASS and HKD1.125million for 2021-2022 Tier B funding, received		

	<p>HKD871,660 for Asian Games Preparation Fund, and HKD543,200 for quarantine subsidy).</p> <p>4 Internal Affairs:</p> <p>x) HKCBA new website: missing and cannot find 2019 Intercity data for master point calculation, WK to follow up and update.</p> <p>xi) Asian Games Selection Committee update: due to the severe pandemic situation, the coming selection trial will be played at home instead of gathering in clubhouse.</p> <p>xii) Contract of Crystal Tang: will be changed from full time to part time contract.</p> <p>xiii) World Bridge Team Championships: Patrick Choy withdraw the post of NPC for Open Team as he could not go to Italy due to personal reason, Abby Chiu will be the Playing Captain for the team.</p> <p>5 External Affairs:</p> <p>ii) 2022 Interport: Wait for Bux to update on the progress as they have to apply funding from Macau government. PC will follow up with him.</p> <p>6 AOB: Nil.</p> <p>The next meeting will be held on March 10, 2022 (Thursday)</p>		<p>WK</p> <p>ZW</p> <p>PC</p>
--	--	--	-------------------------------

4th Council Meeting Minutes

Date: March 10, 2022 (Thursday)

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Venue: Zoom

Present: Officers:

Derek Zen – President (DZ)
WK Lai - (WK)
Pearlie Chan – Secretary (PC)
Zia Wai - Treasurer (ZW)

Council members:

Crystal Tang (CT)
Charlie Lee (XL)
John Tsang (JT)
KF Mak (KF)
Kelvin Chan (KC)
Louis Tam (LT)
Tiffany Tse (TT)
Tony Lau (TL)

Item	Content	When	Action
1	Adopted minutes of last meeting.		
2	Follow up matters raised in last meeting (by minutes order): xiv) Appeal case about Martin Poon’s directorship has been handled by Appeals Committee and passed to TD side. KC to has followed up with Martin Poon for several times but he did not respond. He was supposed to redo the case the reply. KC to follow up one more time, if Martin still not respond then will pass the case to someone else.		KC
3	Financial Affairs: iii) Latest Bank Balance: HKD4.76million (received HKD1.125million for 2021-2022 IASS and HKD1.5million		

	for 2021-2022 Tier B funding, received HKD871,660 for Asian Games Preparation Fund, and HKD543,200 for quarantine subsidy).		
4	<p>Internal Affairs:</p> <p>xv) HKCBA new website: missing and cannot find 2019 Intercity data for master point calculation, WK to follow up and update. If still cannot find the data for 2019 by March 17 will go ahead to post the master point update.</p> <p>xvi) Asian Games Selection Committee update: Mr. Patrick Huang already provided the coach scores for Mixed Team selection, still waiting for Men's coach to give scores for Men's Team. Will send nominations to SF&OC by end of March.</p> <p>xvii) Asian Games Selection Appeals Committee: DZ is the chairperson of the Appeals Committee, members include Mr. Ricky Chu and Mr. Ng Wai Kit from Selection Committee, and DZ will invite Mr. Mario Yeung and Mr. Vincent Fung to join.</p> <p>xviii) Board of Director Reform: Council endorsed the proposal presented by TT.</p>		<p>WK</p> <p>DZ</p> <p>TT</p>
5	<p>External Affairs:</p> <p>Nil.</p>		
6	<p>AOB:</p> <p>Nil.</p>		
	The next meeting will be held on April 14, 2022 (Thursday)		

Appeals form

Event	Mixed Team
-------	------------

Round	5 (RR2)	Date	25 July 2021
-------	---------	------	--------------

Board	15	Result	3S, N, -2 NS -200
	S AJT8		
	H 6		
	D A54		
	C AQJ92		
S 742	N	S KQ	
H KQ93		H AJ82	
D T6		D KQ9873	
C K864		C T	
	S 9653		
	H T754		
	D J2		
	C 753		

Bidding				Play			
N	E	S	W	N	E	S	W
Sam Tseng	Lydia Fung	Niko Man	Wilson Leung	Sam Tseng	Lydia Fung	Niko Man	Wilson Leung
		P	P	CJ [^]	<u>CT</u>	C3	C6
1C*	1D	P	1NT*	<u>H6</u>	HJ	H4	HQ [^]
X	2D	P	P	D4	DK [^]	D2	<u>DT</u>
2S	P	P	3D	DA [^]	<u>DQ</u>	DJ	D6
P	P	3S	AP	<u>D5</u>	D7	S3	S4 [^]
* 1NT alerted and explained as clubs. After opening lead of CT, asked again 1NT = 5+C Actual agreement (after playing hand): 1NT = NAT to play Play: For trick 1 to 2, 4min 10sec are used.				S8 [^]	H2	H5	<u>H3</u>
				<u>SA</u> [^]	SQ	S5	S2
				<u>SJ</u>	SK [^]	S6	S7
				ST [^]	<u>H8</u>	H7	H9
				<u>CA</u> [^]	D3	C5	C4
				<u>CQ</u>	D8	C7	CK [^]
				C2	HA [^]	HT	<u>HK</u>
C9	<u>D9</u>	S9 [^]	C8				

Facts Presented

The Tournament Director (TD) was summoned by North after finished playing the hand.

North claims that he will bid 2S if 1NT = NAT non-forcing. In addition, after that East's 3D shows 6+D, he will then take another line of play to make 3S instead of 3S -2.

East thought they played Transfer Advance and 1NT = 5+C constructive.

After (P) P (1C) 1D (P) 1NT (2S), East says she will bid 3D.

Director's Ruling

Opinions collected with the following conditions:

Case 1: Table auction, 1NT = 5+C, North plays 3S

Case 2: Table auction, 1NT = NAT (partnership agreement), North plays 3S

All declarers know to ruff with S9, assuming (likely) 6-2 D distribution.

However, 5-3 D possible due to 3D by West (in bidding).

Hence, mis-explanation of 1NT by West.

Consultation begins with

Situation 1: P (P) 1C (1D) P (1NT)

Players' consideration of other (possible) calls are also asked (and about what they are thinking) and what if with a weaker LHO (mixed team, an intermediate player). Players' choices include P (mainly), DBL, 2C, 2S

Situation 2: (P) P (1C) 1D (P) 1NT (DBL)

Table results stand (3S by N -2)

Consultation then starts with other choices:

A. (P) P (1C) 1D (P) 1NT (P)

B. (P) P (1C) 1D (P) 1NT (2C)

C. (P) P (1C) 1D (P) 1NT (2S)

The consultation returns too many possible outcomes. Therefore, an artificial score was

awarded with the following ratios:

45% 3S N = +140

15% 3S N -2 -200

20% 3D E +1 -130

10% 3H E +1 -170

10% 4H E = -420

Law reference: 75B, 21B, 12C1.

Facts Confirmed		Facts Confirmed
Sam Tseng	Niko Man	Wilson Leung, Lydia Fung
Appellant 1	Appellant 2	Opposing Pair

Reasons for Appeal

First of all, North has told the TD that 2S was taken out and then East said, 'Wait a moment, I need to alert 1NT'. After hearing East's explanation, North changed his bid to DBL. We do not understand why the TD has to consult 2S as what has been done should not be changed in our opinion. It was also not mentioned in the TD's facts provided, so we can only assume that the TD has forgotten this piece of information.

Secondly, North now played D to be in 5-3 break instead of 6-2, leading to a failing result at the table. If correct information is given, by no means North would have taken the wrong guess since West only showed a balanced hand and East voluntarily bid D on her own accord even under the current bidding sequence instead of choosing 2D over 1NT or 2C. We have also stated the line of play to the TD which would result in 10 tricks on the spot. We do not understand the 15% 3S N -2 results which is based on the misinformation given.

Thirdly, during the TD's consultation, North-South's teammates and East-West's teammates were first consulted on what we would bid if North has bid 2S after 1NT. I was astonished after knowing that the case happened at the other table and right after we have finished playing the boards. Also I was never told that 1NT means C, so I do doubt if the TD has given the correct information to players who got to be consulted at the same position, that is, whether East would only know what she remembered at the table instead of the actual agreement. In that case, why H were not bid at the table but would have been bid under some certain sequence? Also, as mentioned in another letter to the council, we have concerns about the definition of same class of players being consulted, and would like to raise this issue once again.

Finally, West has UI regarding the misinformation from East. Has the TD considered if the UI has affected his decision in saying that he would bid 4D in the 1C-1D-P-1NT-2S-3D-3S situation? And what are the major concerns that made West not bidding 4D in the current bidding sequence but the other? The TD has not asked West why he would bid 4D instead when West said ‘我梗係會叫’ after asking if West would bid after 3S. The question was asked after the match when the TD was discussing the case with our team. He said, I would also need to know if West would bid 4D (under a certain sequence) and found that West was at the bar area discussing the hand with his partner. We would like to know if this question ‘What would you bid?’ (instead of ‘What would you do?’) is a guiding question at that context. We do understand that TDs often ask players ‘What would you bid?’ meaning the same as ‘What would you do?’ but under the conversation at that moment, will it lead to a guiding question to West? In addition, the TD didn’t show any evidence in taking care of the possible UI which might have affected West’s choice as well. I think the TD might consider giving a fuller explanation to us to help us understand the difference in strength and length for East in these two sequences, which did not convey effectively at the bridge table during the match.

TD Comments on the above reasons for appeal

(1) About ‘2S was taken out’

North summoned the TD after finished playing the hand and this is NOT stated at the table. After the day, while the TD was tidying up, there was a long chat with the North-South team at the TD table, the other team was also staying around, chatting on their own. North-South stated that they mentioned about ‘2S was taken out’ during the chat. So, the TD’s comment: TD didn’t get this.

(2) Opinions on declarer’s play were collected.

When declarer knows 1NT = 5+C and the CT lead, all declarers (two actually) know that 1NT = 5+C was mis-explanation. They also state that there was no need for East to bid 2D after North’s DBL, and thus 2D = 6+D (very likely) though 5-3 D possible as West raised to 3D.

(3) No one bid 4D in other sequences.

They basically think that 1NT was overbid. West’s ‘我梗係會叫’ (4D) was not quite valid.

Comments by Opposing Pair

After the lead, the table fact has already contradicted to the original explanation. Therefore, the declarer should be able to work out the misunderstanding and the play line was his own

responsibility. So, I suggest
45% 3S +1 and 15% 3S -2 changing to 60% 3S -2.

Deposit Received	Tournament Director
\$1000	Martin Poon

Decision of Appeals Committee

The committee has discussed and agreed the following:

- There is misinformation.
- The committee is not convinced that the adjusted score complies to Law 12C1(b): 'seek to recover as nearly as possible the probable outcome of the board had the infraction not occurred'.

The committee has revisited the Conditions of Contest of this tournament and found that the committee should conduct the Review process only in this case. Hence, the committee does not suggest a particular ruling, but raises the points it found problematic in the case that the TD presented:

- East's mis-explanation of her partner's bid was evident to declarer at trick 1. North had then apparently taken an inferior line of play. The TD should have mentioned (1) whether the misinformation affected the play, if so, why (also, in this case, if the misinformation has affected the play, adjusting the score based on the whole line of play should be considered, not only at trick 5.); and if not, (2) whether the inferior line of play is an extremely serious error, as in Law 12C1(e).
- How the mixture of results concluded was unclear to the committee. It is doubtful whether the consultation process was done properly, and how the final weights were calculated was a mystery. Granting a significant proportion to 3H and 4H is not convincing to say the least, if no further reasoning is presented, given what has happened at the table. In the ruling process, it is important that the concept of Law 12C1(b) is followed: 'had the infraction not occurred'. In this case, East always thought 1NT = 5+C and the other three players knew the actual meaning of 1NT = NAT.
- The TD has mentioned to the committee that the weights of results are given in a way allowed by the scoring software. The committee found this argument unacceptable. The

capability of the scoring software should never hinder the TD to do his job properly. Since this is a team match, an adjustment to the final IMPs would be a simple work-around.

- The TD had mentioned several times that there were “too many possible outcomes”. Noting Law 12C1(d), “If the possibilities are numerous or not obvious, the Director may award an artificial adjusted score.” While it is not required to assign an artificial adjusted score, some justification should be presented for not doing so.
- The time of delivery of the ruling is comparatively unacceptable. The case happened in July and the ruling was delivered in September. Though there is not yet a guideline on when the ruling of a case should be given, the chance of collecting all the necessary facts correctly decreases over time. For example, in the later stage of the ruling process, if there is new finding which needs players’ clarification, it is more likely the players have already forgotten after a long time. And in this case, some new points were presented by the appellants, these could be verified by the CCTV footage had the case presented in time. Whether North had taken out the 2S bid before East alerted was crucial in the ruling process, but now there are no other ways than applying Law 85A, which would have been unnecessary.

The committee would like to take this opportunity to remind all TDs to collect all facts promptly at the table before working on the consultation. During the consultation process, TDs are reminded to pay extra attention on their wordings such as ‘call’ vs ‘bid’ in order to avoid giving unnecessary directions given to the players unintentionally. The committee suggests the Board of Tournament Directors could consider to incorporate some guidelines in their TD training regarding fact collection and consultation. In addition, all players should fully disclose their partnership understandings, both explicit and implicit, to their opponents at the table, and to the TD when they are relevant as stated in Law 40A1.

Finally, the committee agrees that the TD has rooms to do better in the process. Hence, it was suggested to re-iterate the ruling process by the TD and the consultation should be done with the players of similar caliber and not consulted before. The deposit has to be returned.

Chairperson’s Signature

如有會員有興趣投稿, 歡迎電郵到 wklai2@yahoo.com, 或與 Dicky Lai 聯絡(電話 94152075)