

Final Comments

Wildavsky

Appeals Committees (AC) heard 17 cases in St. Louis, a dramatic leap from the five in Honolulu and four in Chicago. Only two TD rulings were changed, one for the worse in my opinion, so I can't attribute the increase to poorer TD rulings. I expect the jump is due in part to the different mix of events between the NABCs, in part to normal statistical variation, and in part to AC's and panel's refusal to award AWMWs even for appeals they judge meritless. The AC ruled as the TD did in 15 cases. I thought the AC improved the TD's ruling in case NABC+ NINE and worsened it in case NABC+ THIRTEEN.

Panels heard eight cases, up from three in Honolulu. On six they ruled as the TD did. On cases two and eight I thought they worsened the TD's ruling.

ACs awarded five AWMWs whereas I thought they should have awarded nine. Granted, one of those was a case where they adjusted the score in favor of the appellants. Panels awarded two AWMWs when I thought they ought to have awarded four. In my view an AWMW ought to be awarded anytime an appeal is without merit. It is in no way a judgment of the appellants themselves. To do otherwise both infantilizes players, implying that they are not responsible for their own actions, and unfairly stigmatizes those who do receive an AWMW. Before deciding not to award an AWMW the members of each AC and panel ought to ask themselves whether they can hold their heads high and claim, "This appeal had substantial merit."

As always, data and trend analysis for appeals dating back to 2001 can be found on my web site:

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

Note that when I say "I agree with Jeff Goldsmith" I do not mean to imply that I disagree with the other panelists. It's just that Jeff's are the only comments I saw before the submission deadline. My use of the phrase indicates that he caught something that I missed.