From 1st August 2017, Australia starts to use the new 2017 Laws.

## Quick overview.

- When have player has given wrong information about a partnership agreement and becomes aware of it during the auction, the player is no longer obliged to rectify it immediately, but may wait till the auction is completed. (Director may be called if needed)
- All players will now be permitted to ask one another about a possible revoke, including dummy to prevent any from committing an irregularity player (previously dummy could not)
- When both sides have revoked on the same trick and only one side has played to the next trick; both revokes must now be corrected. . (Director must be called)
- When a player claims/concedes, both sides (all four players) may now agree to continue play, rather than summon the Director. If you do however agree to play on, then the **table result will stand**.
- When a player makes a claim or concession, that player is now required to face his hand.
- If you replace an illegal call with a comparable call (Director must be called), The consequences will be less severe than in the present laws.
- When a player has a penalty card, information related to that card is authorized for their partner as long as that card stays on the table. It becomes unauthorized when that card is played or taken back into the hand
- When there is a scoring error discovered after the normal correction period, that error may still be corrected, but only when the Director is satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt that a mistake has been made

Explanation for some of the reasons for law changes

There was an introduction of the concept of a 'comparable call'.

Law makers embarked upon this approach within sufficient bids in 2007 and have now extended it to calls out of rotation.

An important benefit of this is that in most cases partner is no longer silenced for the entire auction, which in turn removes the need to select a unilateral (gambling) final action.

This also will reduce the frequency of when a lead penalty applies and they have taken this opportunity to also make Law 26 less complicated.

The number of instances within the laws where a Regulating Authority is presented with an option to vary the default position has been reduced in an effort to ensure greater global uniformity in the way the Laws are applied.

.