

WBF LC Commentary

Law 86B1 – Non-Comparable Result in Team Play (Singular)

This law is only applicable in those situations where a score has been obtained at one table, with no corresponding score available from the other table. Typical examples where this might occur are when the Director cancels a partially played board due to extraneous information received from an outside source (as per Law 16D); where a table plays a board to completion with one hand containing 14 cards and another containing only 12 cards; or when a table never commences a board due to slow play or misadventure.

When (in team-play) a board for whatever reason cannot be played at a table and it has already been played at the other table it will sometimes be necessary to award an assigned adjusted score (Law 12C1), rather than the more routine artificial adjusted score (Law 12C2). In order to determine the applicability of Law 86B1, the TD must first decide if the single (non-comparable) result obtained fulfils the criterion of being ‘clearly favourable’.

The preferred approach is to estimate a weighted result based upon the range of probable outcomes for the board in question [Law 12C1(c)] and then compare it with the existing result

from the first table. If the expected gain (or loss) on the board is greater than 3 IMPs, then we consider the result ‘clearly favourable’ and apply Law 86B1. Otherwise, the TD should just apply Law 12C2 and award an artificial adjusted score (i.e., +/-3 IMPs depending upon each side’s degree of culpability).

Some NBOs may wish to apply Law 86B1 only when the result qualifies as ‘unexpected’. This still requires the TD to estimate the likelihood of the non-comparable result being replicated at the second table. If a Regulating Authority prefers this alternative definition of a ‘clearly favourable result’, then it needs to be formalised via regulation.

As with most situations involving a weighted [Law 12C1(c)] adjustment, if only one side is considered to be responsible for the non-result at the second table, then the TD should adjust the percentages obtained via polling in order to slightly favour the non-offending side (as per the ‘benefit of doubt’ section).

Law 86B2 – Multiple Non-Comparable Results in Team Play

This Law applies whenever more than one non-comparable result is obtained between the same contestants. This includes any fouled or mis-duplicated board (see Laws footnote 27), as well as any other irregularity that requires the Director to award more than one adjusted score.

Law 86B3 – Authority to Regulate

The WBFLC recommends that each NBO avail itself of the regulatory options allowed by this provision.

NBOs may exercise the RA powers conferred by Law 86B3 for all situations, except those which fall within the remit of Law 86B1. If there is no Law 86B3 regulation in place, the Director applies the default procedures as specified in Laws 86B2(a-c).