

FINAL COMMENTS

Wildavsky Appeals Committees (ACs) heard five cases in Boston and changed the tournament director's (TD) ruling in one of them. That one change, on case NABC+ Five, was in my view an improvement. In effect it changed half the ruling, giving the worst of things to both sides. This will never please the players involved, but must be done when called for by the laws.

Panels heard ten cases and changed one ruling. I thought that change, on case Non-NABC+ Three, was too close to call.

Caseloads per table were nearly as low as they've ever been, for both ACs and panels.

The small caseloads and the small number of rulings changed are both signs that TD rulings are getting better and better. I'm delighted and look forward to the continuation of the trend.

All was not perfect. I disagreed strongly with the TD and AC rulings on case NABC+ One. I can only repeat my call for ACs to take an expansive view of logical alternatives. Subsequent polling inevitably reveals that the spectrum of actions chosen by players is wider than most AC members believe.

Panels assessed an AWMW in two of nine cases. I thought that five of the remaining seven cases deserved an AWMW. The write-ups show that panels and I tend to agree as to whether an appeal has merit. However panels often choose not to assess an AWMW in favor of what they refer to as education. An AWMW is an educational measure -- it is after all only a warning. I'd like to see panels assess an AWMW whenever it is deserved. This will help continue the trend toward fewer appeals.

My figures, including table counts and appeals per table, can always be found at my web site:

<http://tameware.com/adam/bridge/laws>

I welcome suggestions for improvement of the appeals process. Please look me up at an NABC or drop me a line. My address is adam@tameware.com