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Steve Sanborn, Lisa Berkowitz, Kerri Sanborn, David Berkowitz winners of the BAM teams
It was a historic day for bridge when the round of 16 match between Full House and Mortensen finished as a tie after the completion of 28 boards. The outcome was decided by a penalty shoot out play off of one extra deal. You can read all about it on Page 26.

Meanwhile the Mixed Teams Champions will be crowned tonight.
The last four teams standing are: White House, Zimmermann, A J Diamonds, Full House.


## MIXED TEAMS KO:

10.00-12.00: Semi Finals
12.15-14.15: Semi Finals
15.30-17.30: Final
17.45-19.45: Final

## TODAY'S SCHEDULE

## MIXED PAIRS:

10.00-11.30: Round 1
11.45-13.15: Round 2
14.30-16.00: Round 3
16.15-17.45: Round 4
18.00-19.30: Round 5

PRIZE GIVING CEREMONY: the prize giving ceremony for the European Open Mixed Teams Championship will take place today at 20.00 in the dedicated area at the far end of the cafeteria.
.
Tromse kommune

## TRICKY PLAYS AND DEFENSES

by Micke Melander

Round 7 presented a considerable number of opportunities for our players in the EBL Open Mixed Teams Qualifying Swiss to shine in glory. First out to take a shot at it was Katrine Bertheau for the Casino Floor team when she found a pretty defense against Badger.

Board 1. Dealer North. None.
4. 97
$\checkmark$ AJ 973
$\diamond$ A 1096
of K 10


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hoftaniska | Allerton | K.Bertheau | Leslie |
|  | 18 | Pass | $2 \%$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 24 |
| Dbl | Pass | Pass | $3 \%$ |
| Pass | 38 | Pass | 40 |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Osborne | Charlsen | Hinden | Larsson |
|  | $1 \Omega$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \hookleftarrow$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \uparrow$ |



Bertheau in the Open Room led a spade to West's ace. That player returned a second round to Katrine's jack. In tempo, she now played a third round, forcing declarer to ruff in hand attending to ensure that declarer would lose control over the trump suit, to establish the setting tricks with her fourth trump when the suit misbehaved.

Declarer played a diamond to the king and ran the queen of hearts, correctly ducked by Bertheau to complete her accurate defense. Declarer, who probably thought he was safe, could see the curtain fall when he continued with the ten of hearts and Bertheu won the trick to play a fourth round of spades for one down!

That might had been a great IMP swing if their team mates had managed to make a game at the other table. But Charlsen stood no chance of making his Five Clubs when the king of hearts was offside. With spades $4-4$, 3NT was the only making game today. Of course technically Four Hearts was also possible to make on any lead, if declarer could have avoided finessing hearts and instead cross-ruffed himself down to endplay East in trumps. But why would declarer choose to play a double-dummy line rather than following a practical line?

Board 3. Dealer South. EW Vul.


Open Room

| West <br> Hoftaniska | North <br> Allerton | East <br> K.Bertheau Leslie |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1 NT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \Omega$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room

| West <br> Osborne | North | Eharlsen | Hinden |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Larsson |
| Cass |

How Hoftaniska managed to make a take-out double over Two Hearts with that hand remains
a mystery, given that he had the strong notrump hand behind him. But never argue with success today it was a brilliant double and Bertheau had zero problems passing it out.

Two rounds of clubs were played by the defense. Declarer ruffed the third one in dummy but saw himself over-ruffed by Hoftaniskas ace. When the defense still had four trumps left to cash, the contract was an easy two down. And it would have been four down if Bertheau's clubs had been running...


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hoftaniska | Allerton | K.Bertheau Leslie |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Osborne | Charlsen | Hinden | Larsson |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | $3 \uparrow$ | Dbl | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Here Osborne had a chance to shine when Charlsen led a spade to South's ace (a heart to remove the entry for dummy's hearts would have left declarer with no chance to make the contract). Larsson returned a second spade and Osborne had to decide how to play what looked like a pretty easy contract.

Declarer went up with the king of spades, played a heart to the ace and then tried to cash the king and queen of hearts pitching his losing spade and club. But when South ruffed with the eight forcing declarer's ten, and declarer still had to ruff his losing spade in dummy with the queen, North's nine of trumps had suddenly become a winner!

That was a pretty unlucky distribution of the cards for declarer - who had to take the immediate finesse in spades to succeed in his mission. In the Open Room a spade was also led, but when Leslie returned the queen of spades, Hoftaniska had no problems getting home with eleven tricks.

Board 9. Dealer North. EW Vul.

- 7
$\checkmark$ A9864
$\diamond 32$
\& AKJ 94

| A K 4 | N | A Q J 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 5$ | W E $\odot$ | K 732 |
| $\diamond$ K J 10965 | S ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 874 |
| \& 10853 | 0 | Q 6 |
| 4 | 1098632 |  |
| $\checkmark$ | Q J 10 |  |
| $\diamond$ | A Q |  |
| 0 | 72 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Hoftaniska | Allerton | K.Bertheau Leslie |  |
|  | 10 | Pass | 10 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 20 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Osborne | Charlsen | Hinden | Larsson |
|  | $1 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |

All Pass
The last one to shine in this match was Charlsen, who got to declare Four Hearts. Note that Osbourne didn't double fourth suit, so he really didn't have a clue about what was going on when Hinden led the four of diamonds. Nevertheless Charlsen jumped up with the ace of diamonds, cashed the ace and king of clubs and was delighted to see the queen of clubs drop from East. Declarer then made his only mistake since Osborne got the opportunity to defeat the contract when North advanced the nine of clubs. When East pitched a spade he threw the diamond away from dummy! When Osborne didn't find the shift to a trump, declarer could ruff the diamond return and pull trumps for ten tricks.

In the Open Room, Allerton took the diamond finesse when a diamond was led. It was now impossible to get more than nine tricks. 18-4 to the Casino Floor who after a slow start climbed to the top spots in the standing!

| Go to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 3 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |  |

## TROMSØ 2015: KICKING PENALTIES

The 2015 Copa America is the main international football tournament for national teams in South America, and currently taking place in Chile between the dates of 11 June to 4 July 2015.
Argentina advanced to the semifinals when Carlos Tevez scored the winning spot kick as Argentina beat Colombia 5-4 on penalties after a goalless draw in which his side had dominated throughout. As Everton and Douglas Costa missed their penalties, Brazil was sent out of the tournament, following a penalty shootout loss to Paraguay.
In the semi-finals Chile faced Peru, while Argentina play Paraguay today, 30th June.
As in the Copa America, penalties are determining some matches in the European Mixed Teams Championship; and some players are shooting penalties to define boards...
The Breno team, who had finished second on the first day of the qualifying stage, took the lead after the first match of the day and eventually won the Round Robin. In the 9th Round in the Zaleski-Zimmermann match, Zaleski knowing that his team had enough of a lead, decided to score a winning spot kick...no luck this time.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zaleski | Multon | Olivieri | Willard |
|  |  | 1NT | Pass |
| $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass |
| $5 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ | Pass | $6 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |

After a transfer to hearts Zaleski invited a slam with a 5 NT call with no diamond control...
He kicked the ball expecting a diamond control in his partner's hand, as she had opened 1NT and all his points were outside the diamond suit.
Bad luck, Willard had $\diamond A K$ and the $\diamond A$ lead frustrated Zaleski's kick.


47 of the 87 tables decided to play slam on this deal, and all of them went down.

In the same round and match, but on board 28 Phillipe Cronier from the Zimmermann team, decided to kick the ball too...also with negative results.

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
A 95
$\bigcirc 875$
$\diamond$ AK 3
\& Q 10632


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier | Piscitelli | D'Ovidio | Manno |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $1 N T$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{\&}^{* *}$ | Pass | $40^{*}$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $6 \mathbf{4}$ | All Pass |

4\% Cue bid
$4 \bigcirc$ Cue bid

East showed her first control with $4 \bigcirc$ but Cronier with no diamond control, kicked the ball and said $5 \checkmark$. D'Ovidio was now sure that her partner had a diamond control and bid the slam.
Again a diamond lead frustrated the penalty kick. Again, 43 of the 87 tables played the slam in this board, but this time 20 defenders didn't find the diamond lead and the slam was made.
At the end of the match Fernando approached both players to ask the reasons for their actions. Zaleski told Fernando that he wanted to use his considerable advantage in the standings, and as his partner had a good chance of having a diamond control, he decided to jump and make the defense guess the lead.
Cronier in turn explained that it was possible that his partner with a singleton diamond, could have mentioned her heart control first, his $5 \triangle$ (giving the possibility of a response), and was a way to give her some space to review the situation, but d'Ovidio

had not interpreted his call in the same way.
Finally Silvie Willard and Andrea Manno, as their team's goalkeepers were able to stop the dangerous penalties.

## CAPTION CONTEST

## by The Bulletin \& the Press Room staffs



Press Room Manger Jan Swaan paid a visit to the Tourist Office (he is the one on the right).
Can you come up with a caption for this photograph?
Bring your suggestions to the Bulletin Room or email them to markhorton007@hotmail.com

## PENFOLD AGAINST BADGER

by Barry Rigal

For mature audiences only (juniors should be accompanied by adults...)

When the TD came across to ensure that the teams were sitting in the right direction and perpetrated an unfortunate lapsus linguae in reference to team Badger, I could see that we might be in for x-rated entertainment. The reader will have to draw their own conclusions... for this report the Seniors will be referred to by their first names, Nevena and Brian, to avoid confusion.

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { A } & 103 \\
\diamond & 97652 \\
\diamond & 7 \\
\text { \& } & \text { J } 10842
\end{array}
$$



Open Room

| West <br> Osborne | North <br> Nevena | East <br> Hinden | South <br> Trendafilou |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dble | $2 \boldsymbol{2 \%}$ | Pass | $3 \%$ |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \wedge$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | All Pass |



Nevena Senior's enterprising raise of the twocard club suit allowed Trendafilov to up the ante even further. But his opponents still found their way to a sensible contract. Graham Osborne covered the lead of 9 J and ruffed the next club. With no clue as to the heart break it seemed almost entirely normal to use his heart entry to dummy to take the diamond finesse, assuming that if South had long diamonds the spade queen would be favourite to fall. Unlucky.

Closed Room

| West <br> Brian | North <br> Allerton | East <br> Penfold | South <br> Leslie |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1 \%$ |
| Dble | $2 \uparrow$ | $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

The optimistic slam reached in this room lost the same tricks and went two down. No double, no trouble, just 2 IMPs away.

Hinden dodged a bullet on the next deal:

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Osborne | Nevena | Hinden | Trendafilov |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ |  |  |  |
|  | Inverted raise |  |  |

Cui culpa in the Open Room? Trendafilov got his side off to a winning start with a low club lead. Senior won her king and returned the club ten, covered all round. Trendafilov cashed the club jack, then heart ace, dummy having discarded two spades. When he played a fourth club, declarer sat up straighter, and after a moment's frenzied counting on her fingers, claimed the balance. The combination of the club ten play, the heart ace cash and the fourth club might all come under scrutiny. I think the \&10 was a mistake, given that North has a spade re-entry, but I'm not sure cashing the $\triangle A$ can ever be right unless it is on the theory that every IMP is important at this form of scoring.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brian | Allerton | Penfold | Leslie |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT* | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

2NT Forcing diamond raise
Leslie led a low heart against 3NT. Penfold won in hand with the king and tried a spade to the king and ace. Allerton won and... returned a heart. South cleared hearts and declarer claimed nine tricks. I'm not sure the defensive plays stand up to analysis here either, but in any event that was a very fine result for Penfold - but no swing.
Still 2-0 to Badger.
More opportunities went begging here too.
Board 13. Dealer North. Both Vul.

- 76
$\checkmark 763$
$\diamond$ A Q 6542
of 96

| A K543 |  | - J 92 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 1098 | N | $\bigcirc$ K 42 |
| $\diamond 10$ | W E | $\diamond$ J973 |
| \& AJ 82 |  | \& K 54 |
|  | - A Q 108 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q J 5 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 8 |  |
|  | \& Q 1073 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Osborne | Nevena | Hinden | Trendafilov |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \&$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Hinden received the lead of the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$, overtaken for a spade shift. She won the $\mathbf{~ K}$ and cashed two clubs via the finesse, then led the $\% \mathrm{~A}$, ruffed by Nevena with the $\triangle 7$ - a potentially critical spot. The defenders cashed two spades, and played a second diamond, ruffed in dummy. In this ending:


Hinden led the spade five from dummy. Nevena ruffed in with the $\triangle 6$, forcing the $\triangle K$. Now when declarer led a diamond from hand Trendafilov discarded his club, and was sure of two trump tricks in the three-card ending, thanks to the power of his $\triangle 5$. Had Hinden led a heart up, intending to insert the nine, Trendafilov would have had to split his honours. Hinden can win and ruff a club back to hand and score a trump from the $\bigcirc 10-9$.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brian | Allerton | Penfold | Leslie |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \%$ |
| Pass | 19** | Pass | 1NT |
| Dble | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| 30 | All Pass |  |  |

Brian Senior scrambled eight tricks in Three Hearts after a spade lead ducked to his king, when he played back the suit and the defence missed their way thereafter by playing on diamonds.
Another push.

Penfold equalized the match at 2-2 when Nevena escaped for one undertrick fewer in a wildly optimistic 3NT with an ill-fitting 8HCP facing 15.
The critical deal of the match came up next.

| Go to Page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 7 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
4 A 10
$\checkmark 109632$
$\diamond$ A J 1092
\& 9

| 中 Q J 4 |  | 9 653 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc$ Q J 7 |
| $\diamond 543$ | S | $\diamond$ K Q 8 |
| \& A Q 10764 |  | \& K J 32 |
| A | K 9872 |  |
| $\checkmark$ | K 854 |  |
| $\diamond$ | 76 |  |
| 0 | 85 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Osborne | Nevena | Hinden | Trendafilov |
| 1\&* | $2 N T$ | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| 3NT | Pass | Pass | $4 \circlearrowleft$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

1\% $2+\infty$
2NT Red suits

Hinden knew what kind of hand she rated to be facing, but saw she had no tricks on the side after her heart stopper was knocked out. So she doubled $4 \diamond$ and after Osborne cashed $\triangle A$ and shifted to a top spade (this might have been a good moment for a deceptive $\mathbf{J}$ ?) Trendafilov could ruff out the spades, cross to his $\smile \mathrm{K}$ and lead winning spades, discarding a club and a diamond from dummy. Hinden discarded on the fourth and fifth spades, then won her $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$, cashed the $\checkmark \mathrm{Q}$, and led a club ruffed in dummy. But now declarer couldn't set up diamonds and had to lose one more trick. +100 wasn't great for EW but at least it was a plus score.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brian | Allerton | Penfold | Leslie |
| $1 \&$ | 2NT*$^{*}$ | 3NT | $4 \checkmark$ |
| 4NT | All Pass |  |  |

2NT Red suits
The defence in this room against 4NT saw Leslie lead a low heart, to the ace and ten. Declarer played a diamond, and North went in with the $\diamond A$ (why?) and played back a heart. That went to the queen and king, and South...played a third heart. You could argue that East is marked with 9 J so
unless partner has A you aren't beating 4NT. But maybe partner has $\% \mathrm{~K}$ ? Now it is clear why ducking the first diamond might be a good idea - declarer has to get to dummy to play another diamond, and the position becomes much clearer to South. Note that North knows declarer almost can't have K or he would play on spades at trick two.
Bottom line: Penfold had 11 IMPs to lead 11-2.
The next two boards saw more x-rated stuff costing nothing but overtricks (the defenders crashing their $\checkmark A K$ on one, declarer taking a winning practice finesse on the next) before more expensive carnage.

Board 19. Dealer South. EW Vul.

- A 962
$\checkmark$ Q 7
$\diamond$ Q 85
\& J 763


Open Room

| West | North | East | South <br> Osborne |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nevena |  |  |  |$\quad$| Hinden |
| :--- |
| Trendafilov |

Nevena Senior got to $4 \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\mathrm{x}}$ on a club lead from Hinden. With the trumps known not to be breaking, I think declarer should maybe just play on the side suits and settle for -300 . She played on hearts, and Hinden took the queen with her ace and played back the suit. When Senior won in dummy and led a trump to the ace, then a trump back, Hinden split her honours. Nevena now cashed the third heart, then ruffed a heart high, Hinden merely discarding a diamond. She ruffed the next club, played her master trump, and led $\diamond A$ and another, and all declarer could score was dummy's master trump. Down 500.

Closed Room

| West <br> Brian | North <br> Allerton | East <br> Penfold | South <br> Leslie <br> $1 \boldsymbol{Q}^{* *}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \Omega^{*}$ | Pass | $3 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Dble | Pass** $^{*}$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

## 1\% 2+ <br> $1 \checkmark$ Transfer to Spades

$3 \diamond$ Mini-splinter
Pass Constructive
Brian Senior led a low diamond against 4 $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{\mathrm{x}}$. Penfold somewhat unwisely went up with the $\diamond A$ and shifted to clubs. The defenders took their two aces fast and three trump tricks slowly for 300. That looked a perfectly healthy position, but it was 5 IMPs to Hinden, down 13-7.

One more opportunity for accurate declarer play or defence; the spectator was not holding his breath...

Board 20 Dealer West. Both Vul.
A K 5
$\checkmark$ K J 8732
$\diamond$ K 93
\& Q 9
A. A 942
$\bigcirc 10$
$\diamond$ Q 842
\& K 842


A Q 76
$\bigcirc 943$
$\diamond 105$
\& A J 1053
4. J 1083
$\checkmark$ AQ 6
$\diamond$ AJ 76
\& 76
Open and Closed Rooms

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Osborne | Nevena | Hinden | Trendafilou |
| Brian | Allerton | Penfold | Leslie |
| Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | $4 \Omega$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |



Both Easts unerringly (but forgivably) put their fingers on the one card calculated to improve declarer's spirits, the $\diamond 10$, covered by the $\diamond J$, $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ and $\diamond \mathrm{K}$. It feels right to draw two rounds of trumps ending in dummy with $\cap J$ and $\odot A$, planning to run the $\diamond 7$ if trumps break, doesn't it? Nevena Senior instead ran five rounds of trump, tested diamonds and had to guess spades when the diamonds behaved as expected. West had thrown club, spade, club, East a club then a spade. Senior followed Terence Reese's tip of playing the defender who let go a spade painlessly when she was known to have a club to spare (in this case East) to have the A not Q ; wrong!

Allerton reached almost exactly the same position with the same information and also misguessed spades. No swing, and the 13-8 score to Penfold left both teams still well placed to qualify so long as they avoided a heavy loss in either of their last two matches.

THE NEW APP ON BIDDING

FOR TABLETS AND SMARTPHONES

AVAILABLE IN THE APP STORE AND GOOGLE PLAY

MORE INFO:
jvcleeff@xs4all.nl

| Go to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |

## ROSENTHAL VS A J DIAMONDS

by Jos Jacobs

Mixed Teams Swiss, Final Round

When the final round of the Swiss came up, Rosenthal and AJ Diamonds were lying 15th and 16th so it was quite likely that a good win would see the winning team through to the round of 16 at the losing team's expense. A close result in this match, however, might well mean that both teams were in danger of being caught up by any of the other teams in contention just behind them.

Right on the first board, the AJ Diamonds Poles made their intentions clear:

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { s A 9 3 } \\
\diamond & \text { Q J } 10964 \\
\diamond & 52 \\
\& & 108
\end{array}
$$



| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jaszczak | Willenken | Baldysz | D. Berkowitz |
|  | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2 NT |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |

All Pass

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Welland | JaniszewskiAukenHarasimowicz |  |  |
|  | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | $3 \&$ | $4 \diamond^{*}$ |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |

All Pass

* $2 \diamond$ Multi
* $4 \diamond$ To play partner's major

With all the finesses wrong for EW, the contract had to go down four. Mind you, had it gone down a far less expensive three, this would probably have meant that $4 \triangle$ was not on.

Anyway: +800 and 12 IMPs to AJ Diamonds, their first step towards a possible qualification.

Next came:
Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
↔ 108765
$\bigcirc$ AKQ 94
$\diamond \mathrm{A}$
\& J 5

In the Open Room, NS had a costly misunderstanding.

Open Room
A normal weak two by North and a quiet approach by South led to a normal enough final contract. Non vulnerable, and even vulnerable as well, bidding a game on two finesses is very much against the odds and how were NS to know it was their lucky day? Rosenthal +170 .
In the other room, Eva Harasimowicz took the bull by the horns by forcing partner to bid his suit, thus inducing Welland to an expensive sacrifice at this vulnerability.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jaszczak | Willenken | Baldysz | D. Berkowitz |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dbl | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 1 NT |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

$2 \diamond$ was alerted by Willenken and no doubt meant as forcing checkback but for once, Berkowitz forgot about this and passed...One down, AJ Diamonds a surprise +100 .

The first-seat pre-empt by Auken prevented any chance of a low-level NS misunderstanding:

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South <br> JaniszewskiAukenHarasimowicz |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Welland |  | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
|  |  | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT

Well, sitting the double might have netted another 800 but the more normal score of +660 was already worth another 13 IMPs to AJ Diamonds who led 25-0 after just two boards.

The match looked almost over, or did it? This board came next. As you can see, $5 \%$ is the best contract with 4 4 a good runner-up, even more so at matchpoints. This type of hand more often than not is difficult to bid and in this match, the truth of this observation was proved at both tables.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- AJ 93
© J 5
$\diamond$ J 87
\& KQ65

| A 872 |  | N |  | 1065 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A974 |  | W E |  | K Q 1086 |
| $\diamond 10943$ |  | S | $\diamond$ | Q 652 |
| \& 104 |  |  | \& | 8 |
|  | 4 | K Q 4 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | 32 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | A K |  |  |
|  | 4 | A J 97 |  |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Jaszczak | North <br> Willenken | East | Baldysz |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| D. Berkowitz |
|  |
| Pass |




The NS bidding here had the advantage of simplicity but the distinct disadvantage of not exploring in full the possibilities of the hand. Had West found the heart lead, the Poles would have been well placed for a third consecutive doublefigure swing but when a diamond came out, South had 12 top tricks for the taking. Rosenthal +490 .

In the Closed Room, a wheel came off in the Polish Club auction:

Closed Room

$2 *$ confirmed clubs in a strong hand and $2 \diamond$ was a relay. Even after the possibly helpful double of $3 \backsim$, NS clearly were not on the same wavelength as to which player had shown a heart control, so they reached a slam that was easily defeated.

This was good for the match, as the swing of 11 IMPs now went to Rosenthal who thus trailed by just 14 instead of $36 \ldots$

So we would have to wait until the next big swing, if any, came up to find out what the eventual outcome of this match would be.
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The swing we were waiting for occurred on board 7:

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- 72
$\diamond$ A Q J 72
$\diamond J 62$
\&) J 97


In the Open Room, the Polish Club dealt with these EW hands quite smoothly:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jaszczak | Willenken | Baldysz | D. Berkowitz |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 2\% | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | 5\% | All Pass |

$2 \%$ was not necessarily natural but 3\% confirmed the suit and the rest was plain sailing. The success of the contract basically depended on the diamond finesse, so one would expect a one-
trick set. However, there were outside chances. South correctly led a heart to North's ace but then, rather than cashing the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ first, North shifted to a low diamond immediately. Declarer was not to be fooled, however. She went up with the ace, cashed a top trump, discarded her second heart on a top spade and led dummy's last diamond to her ten which forced South's king. One diamond ruff in dummy then ensured her contract. AJ Diamonds +600 .

In the other room, Auken-Welland became the victims of their own agreements, one might say:

Closed Room

| West <br> Welland | North <br> JaniszewskiAukenHarasimowicz |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| East | South <br> Pass |  |  |
| 20 | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 4}$ | Pass |
| 20 | Dble | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |

As $2 \%$ does not show clubs but rather a type of forcing 1 NT response, the clubs never came into the picture. EW thus had to be content with +110 for making just 2 - a fair enough result had the club game at the other table been defeated but a loss of 10 IMPs in reality.

So the AJ Diamonds lead had gone up to 24 which proved more than enough for them to win the match comfortably, and go through to the round of 16 .

## SOCIAL EVENING TOURNAMENT <br> EVENING TOURNAMENT

## AT HOTEL THE EDGE

## START 21:30

15 BOARDS // 150 NOK PER PAIR
PLAY BRIDGE TONIGHT!

12

| go to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
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## CHAMPIONSHIP DIARY \#2 <br> by Mark Horton

Tommy Sandsmark offers two more stories from the past:
Some years ago, one of the former Presidents of the Norwegian Bridge Federation was playing a team-of-four match against a team from the countryside. It must probably have been a disastrous half-round, for while waiting to compare the results, the President uttered: 'I have never played this badly before!'
The player to his right looked at him for some time, and then he said with some surprise: 'So you have played before, have you?'

Some years ago, the Norwegian Bridge Federation had a very strong-willed Secretary General, who nearly drove everybody crazy by making most of the decisions himself.
One day he had to go to hospital, and received the following letter from the Executive Committee: 'The Executive Committee of the NBF wishes you a speedy recovery by 4 votes to 3 !'

Among the names of the mixed teams, we noticed the following: PASS O DOUBLE, who will next compete in the ice dancing competition, and ANITAS DANS, who only dance to music by Gieg (answers on a postcard please - I give you a clue - Peer Gynt). But the prize for best name goes to TAKK, who combined their initials to form the Norwegian for 'Thank You'.

Following on from Sunday's observation about next year's European Team Championships we can reveal that possible destinations after that are Budapest (2016) Montecatini (2017) and Oostende (2018) (spelling by Herman).

With two boards to go in the Mixed teams qualifying event teams Badger and De Botton were locked in a deathly struggle for the last
qualifying spot. De Botton dropped an IMP on board nine and Badger moved from .30 of a VP behind to .03 of a VP in front.

Board ten was all about overtricks in a major-suit game or a no-trump game: not an exciting deal, but team Hinden did not cash out against no-trump and declarer gained an IMP. De Botton went in front by .31 of a VP; cruising to victory? Not so fast. Team De Botton dropped the same IMP against their opponents - and the score obstinately
refused to register on the screen...even though all the players were long out of the playing room and had recorded their scores; the issue was what percentage of a VP THAT IMP would cost! The answer was .30 - so De Botton held on to win by .01 of a VP - after roundings!

We are anxious to quell rumours that the traditional staff dinner at the end of the Championships will be in the open air.

Make sure you checkout the superb videos about every aspect of the Championships at www. eurobridge.org and the EBL's Facebook page.

For a number of years I have been writing that in the event of a tie in a knock out match there should be a one board 'penalty' shoot out. Top marks to the EBL for being the first major body to adopt this method, which was used to good effect in the match between Full House and Mortensen.

We are using a convoluted route to simplify the entry of deals into the Bulletins, which involves our resident Greek, Fotis,sending the deals to Ron, who then resends them (in a revised form) to Herman, who uploads them.
When the deals did not arrive on Monday I pointed out that all Greek banks were closed for the week - and that clearly included databanks.
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## ZIMMERMANN VS SOLHEIM

## Mixed Teams Swiss Round 7

In Round 6 both Zimmermann and the allNorwegian team Solheim had good wins to propel them into the top ten. Both teams would be eager to consolidate their position. If you were ten VPs behind that vital sixteenth spot then you would be a further twenty-six places behind. So even one poor score would plummet you into the pack.

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.
ヘ 97
© AJ 973
$\diamond$ A 1096
\& K 10


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Markussen | Multon | Asla | Willard |
|  | 18 | Pass | 2\% |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 24* |
| Pass | 34** | Pass | 38 |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pa |  |

After Willard's fourth-suit forcing 24, Multon showed tolerance for clubs and likewise Willard showed tolerance for hearts. Multon took a punt at the major-suit game and received the lead of the six of spades, which was won by Markussen with his ace and he continued with a small one to Asla's jack. A third round followed forcing Multon to ruff. He then led the ten of clubs to dummy's queen and played the queen of hearts from dummy. Asla fell from grace when she took this trick with her king. Declarer was now home trivially. If East had ducked declarer can no longer make his contract, since if he essays a second heart finesse East can win now and force declarer with a spade. Now East has more trumps than North. If declarer tries any other variant he either loses a diamond or a winning club gets ruffed.
(At double dummy declarer can make $4 \checkmark$ by cross ruffing and then endplaying East in the trump suit. Editor)

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Zimmermann Solheim |  |  |  |

In the Closed Room the first five bids were identical but Anfinsen preferred the minor suit contract. With the heart king offside, declarer could not avoid her three losers. 10 IMPs to Zimmermann. With spades 4-4 3NT is laydown.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { A A Q } 7 \\ \diamond & \text { J 6 } \\ \diamond & \text { AK J } 5 \\ \& & 9765 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 今 } \mathrm{K} 864 \\ & \diamond \\ & \text { A 5 } \\ & \diamond \text { 10 } 8763 \\ & \text { \& } \mathrm{Q} 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | A J 53 |
|  | N | $\bigcirc$ K Q 109 |
|  | $\mathrm{w}^{\text {E }}$ | $\diamond 9$ |
|  |  | \& AK 842 |
|  | * 1092 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 87432$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 42 |  |
|  | \& J 10 |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Markussen | North <br> Multon | East <br> Asla | South <br> Willard <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | 1 NT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

There was little declarer could do and he finished a sad two off - 100 .

Closed Room

| West <br> Zimmermann | Northeim |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$| East |
| :--- |
| SolhowskaAnfinsen |
| Zochows |

Dble One short minor - normally 4-3 majors
2\% Pass or correct

In this room Zochowska had a weapon in her armoury to describe her hand and took the opportunity to use it. The double showed a minorsuit shortage and probably $4-3$ in the majors. Zimmermann's $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ seems to a pass-or-correct variant and partner was happy to pass. The contract was never in any real danger and a slight misdefence enabled Zimmermann to make an overtrick so the board was flattened.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

- 972
© K 732
$\diamond K$ Q
\& J 852


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Markussen | Multon | Asla | Willard |
| 1NT | All Pass |  |  |

After an auction we can all understand Multon led a traditional fourth-best of his longest and strongest, viz. the two of hearts. Willard captured this with her ace and continued with the nine to partner's king. A third round of hearts was taken by declarer in his hand with the queen. He now ducked a diamond to Multon's queen who cashed the thirteenth heart drawing a club from dummy, the five of spades from partner and a small spade from declarer. Multon continued with his nine of spades which declarer took in hand with his king. He ducked another diamond to North's king who continued with a small spade to dummy's king, at which point now declarer fell from grace. He cashed his two diamonds and was then forced to lead away from his club holding and so lost a club and a spade for one off. He did not even try exiting with the queen of clubs which would have given some chances if the hand with three clubs had the king.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Zimmermann Solheim |
| ZochowskaAnfinsen |

Could Zimmermann bring home the contract that had failed in the other room? The lead was the same heart to Anfisen's ace and Zimmermann dropped his queen. The nine of hearts was returned and Solheim ducked and dummy's jack took the trick. Declarer now immediately took the successful club finesse. He continued with the ace, dropping the king, and another to North's jack, thereby establishing the ten of clubs in dummy. Solheim persevered with a small spade taken by declarer in hand. Zimmermann ducked a diamond and had the rest of the tricks, thanks to the king and queen of diamonds being doubleton. +1 and 6 IMPs to Zimmermann.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AJ742 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | - | K Q 105 |
| $\bigcirc$ K 3 |  |  | 10754 |
| $\diamond 9752$ |  |  |  |
| \& J 6 |  | 8 | K 94 |
|  | - 63 |  |  |
|  | © Q982 |  |  |
|  | $\stackrel{*}{\text { A }} 1084$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Markussen | Multon | Asla | Willard |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | 10 | Pass | 10 |
| 14 | Dble* | 2 | 34 |
| Pass | 4* | Pass | 5\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

North's double showed three hearts. Would you describe West's 14 overcall as brave? The upshot was that North/South rose towards the sun on wings attached with wax. There was no play for the contract which failed by one trick.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zimmermann Solheim |  |  |  | | ZochowskaAnfinsen |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

Zimmermann valued his nine-count as a 'light' vulnerable opening. This time it was East/West who
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soared skyward, only to plummet back to earth and hand back 6 IMPs.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.


| Open Room <br> West <br> Markussen | North | Multon |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | East |
| :--- |
| Asla | | South |
| :--- |
| Willard |

How and why the bidding reached game on a 4-3 fit with a combined twenty count is a mystery to me. Although there are only three top losers there are not enough winners and the contract was one off -100.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Zimmermann Solheim |  | ZochowskaAnfinsen |  |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \%$ | Pass | $1 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| $10^{*}$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 20** | All Pass |  |  |
| $1 \diamond$ Heart suit |  |  |  |
| 10 Three or | more he |  |  |
| 2\% Six clubs | and three | earts |  |

This was a much more sober auction. Zochowska realised that her hand was not worth much opposite a six-card club suit and put the brakes on and left Zimmermann in $2 \uparrow$, a contract that was destined to make with the fortunate lie of the trump suit. 5 IMPs back.


Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

$\checkmark$ A9864
$\diamond 32$
\& AKJ 94


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Markussen | Multon | Asla | Willard |
|  | $1 \varnothing$ | Dble | Redble |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Asla led a small diamond; Multon played the queen from dummy, which lost to Markussen's king. He now correctly returned his trump, the only card that gave the defence a chance of beating the contract if declarer played well. Multon ducked this to Asla's king and she continued with a small trump won by dummy's jack. Declarer cashed the ace and king of clubs and ruffed a small one in dummy. He now led a small spade off dummy towards the closed hand. West had a chance to shine by rising with his king, but alas he played small and so East was obliged to win the trick now any return allowed declarer to draw trumps and claim the rest. If West had played his king of spades he could have returned his remaining club for East to ruff and beat the contract.
(You can make $4 \checkmark$ by rising with the ace of diamonds and cashing the top clubs, continuing with the jack when the queen falls. Micke Melander will describe how this came to pass in his report on this round. Editor)

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South <br> ZochowskaAnfinsen |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Zimmermann Solheim |  |  |  |

Zochowska chose the attacking lead of the ace of spades and continuing the suit. Declarer perforce had to ruff and then took the losing diamond finesse.

Zimmermann was not hard pressed to find the winning return of his trump singleton taken by East's king. East continued the spade attack and now East had more trumps than declarer. The contract was now hopeless. BBO says declarer claimed eight tricks when it appeared it was impossible not to take nine. But the result was 11 IMPs to Zimmermann who won the match $35-7$ or $17.51-2.49 \mathrm{VPs}$. Zimmermann moved up to third place whilst Solheim slipped to twenty-fifth.
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## by David Bird

Mixed Teams, Round of 16 - First Half
There were four double-figure IMP swings in the first half of this match. We will take a look at them and try to decide if they were well deserved or if there was a smattering of luck involved.

Board 3. Dealer South.E/W Vul.


Open Room

| West <br> Bakkeren | North <br> N.Senior | East <br> L.Madsen | South <br> Trendafilov |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $4 \&$ | $1 \&$ |

Christina Lund Madsen launched her splendid hand with a splinter bid (rather than an immediate RKCB 4NT) and this allowed 4d from South. When East bid 4NT on the next round, Roumen Trendafilov continued to describe his hand with $5 \%$. West's pass over this showed one keycard and the excellent $6 \diamond$ was reached. Trendafilov had nothing more to say but Nevena Senior sacrificed in 6 on the known double fit. The penalty was just 500 .
This was the spectacular bidding in the Closed Room:

| West <br> B.Senior | North <br> Wortel | East <br> Penfold | South <br> Hop |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ |  |  | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $4 \&$ | $6 \uparrow \%$ |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

All 13 tricks were made for a swing of 13 IMPs. The outcome largely turned on South's action, first to speak. Do you like Pass, 1\&, 3\& or even $4 \%$ ? (Not to mention 5\%. Editor) It was a good moment for $1 \&$, which located the double fit for N/S.
There was some fortune involved in the next big swing too:

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bakkeren | N.Senior | L.Madsen | Trendafilou |
| 2NT* | Pass | 3^* | Dble |
| 4\& | Pass | $5 \%$ | All Pass |

What action do you like on the East cards facing a 2NT opening? At the other table Sandra Penfold passed and Brian Senior collected +120 . Some players would raise to 3NT, gambling that the diamonds would produce some tricks. ('If the diamond suit doesn't come in, 2NT will probably go down,' is the frequently heard justification.) Lund Madsen chose to bid minor-suit Stayman, although she would need plenty of good cards for eleven tricks to be made in a minor.
Ton Bakkeren held a treasure-trove of high cards and would be assisted by Dame Fortune in the play. He won the spade lead and led a diamond, North rising with the ace and playing another spade. South now had a spade winner. It may seem that declarer is destined to lose a spade and a trump, for one down. He cashed two top trumps and cross-ruffed in the red suits, poor North having to follow suit all the way. At Trick 13

Nevena Senior had to ruff her partner's carefully established spade winner! That was +600 for E-W and a swing of 10 IMPs.
We will fast-forward to Board 7:
Board 7. Dealer South. Both Vul.
A 73
© K Q 93
$\diamond 74$
of K 10986


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B.Senior | Wortel | Penfold <br> Hop |  |
|  |  |  | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\rho}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |

All Pass
Would you lead a spade or a diamond from the West hand? Some players shy away from majorsuit leads on the auction shown ('because North used Stayman, partner'). There's little sense in that. They should think instead that South has denied a 4 -card major and is likely to be well-stocked in the minors. So, you should lean towards a major-suit lead when Stayman has drawn a $2 \diamond$ response. If I had to guess the result of a computer simulation on that West hand, I would say that spade and diamond leads are equally good. The diamond lead is safer with the top cards touching, but the indicated major-suit bias counters that.
In the Open Room Bakkeren led the 10 after which declarer had no chance as the cards lie, ending two down. In the Closed Room Brian Senior led the $\diamond J$, which was safe for the moment. Jacco Hop won with the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$, ran the $\& \mathrm{~J}$ to the $\Leftrightarrow \mathrm{Q}$ and won the diamond return with the ace. A second round of clubs went to West's ace. A spade switch is needed at this stage. Misreading the lie of the diamonds, Senior returned a third round from his $\diamond 10-8$ into South's $\diamond \mathrm{K}-9-6$. Hop could then score five diamonds, three clubs, a spade and a heart for +630 and 13 IMPs.
The next board provided the last of the 'Big Four' swings.

Board 8 Dealer West Neither Vul.


There are four possible first moves on the North cards: Pass, $1 \circlearrowleft, 2 \circlearrowleft$ and $3 \circlearrowleft$. Which would you choose? I don't like Pass at all. As I see it, there should be no gap between $2 \circlearrowleft$ and $1 \circlearrowleft$ when you have a suit of the required quality. If you think the playing potential with the void spade is too high for a weak-two, you should open $1 \circlearrowleft$. Nevena Senior opened $2 \Omega$, which is fine, but this turned out unluckily; it made it difficult for her partner to show his clubs. The E/W cards fit well and the BBO commentators were a bit surprised when Lund Madsen did not raise to game. Nine tricks were taken for +140 , but of course North-South had missed a club game. What would happen at the other table?

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B.Senior | Wortel | Penfold | Hop |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ |
| 3 | $5 \&$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Scorning the advice of the learned writer of this article, Meike Wortel passed on the North cards. Her action worked a treat! Partner was able to show his excellent clubs and +550 resulted, good for +12 IMPs.
You can make up your own mind which side had the better of the luck. What cannot be denied is that White House won the first half of this match by 44 IMPs to 13 . Whether this was enough for an eventual win, you can read elsewhere!

## BRENO VS ZIMMERMANN

## by Ram Soffer

The deals for the penultimate round of the Swiss qualification were quite testing, with high scores all around, the most remarkable being Robertson's 69:24 thrashing of Www guts com.
Team Breno, which led the event comfortably after 8 rounds, made a poor start due to some unfortunate bidding decisions:

Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier | Piscitelli | D'Ovidio | Manno |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| $5 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

D'Ovidio bid her one-suited hand slowly, starting with a takeout double. As a result N/S enjoyed a comfortable informative auction to 4A. When West sacrificed to $5 \%$, Andrea Manno expressed his opinion that his cards were not good enough for the five-level. Nevertheless he was overruled by his partner Francesca Piscitelli.
The defenders had to cash their club trick immediately to prevent a discard, and Philippe Cronier's ワJ lead sufficed.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zaleski | Multon | Olivieri | Willard |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \%$ | Dble |
| $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $5 \%$ | 5 |

At the Closed Room the tempo of the auction was much faster. Sylvie Willard could not show
her long spades below the five-level, and her partner's 4\% bid (under pressure) was much more encouraging than the simple raise to $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ at the Open Room. 5 failed after a club lead.
A push, but I regard it as a missed opportunity by Breno to gain 9 IMPs by sitting for the double of 5\% and defending accurately (maybe only 5 IMPs if they do not switch to diamonds in time).

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul

|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { A } & 762 \\ \diamond & 652 \\ \diamond & \text { Q } 85 \\ \& & 7654 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| © K J 5 <br> $\checkmark$ AKQ 84 <br> $\diamond 32$ <br> \& K K 102 |  | ¢ A Q 94 |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ J 97 |
|  | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ J 104 |
|  | S | \& A Q J |
|  | * 1083 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 103$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AK 976 |  |
|  | \& 983 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cronier | Piscitelli | D'Ovidio | Manno |
|  |  | 1NT | Pass |
| $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |

The French pair were using a forcing 2NT continuation after the transfer, which allowed them to cuebid comfortably below the game level and sign off in $4 \triangle$ after finding out about the diamond problem. E/W +650.
Contrast this with the unscientific auction in the Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zaleski | Multon | Olivieri | Willard |
| $2 \diamond^{*}$ |  | $1 N T$ | Pass |
| 5NT | Pass | $2 \Phi$ | Pass |
|  | Pass | $6 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |

It must be said that Zaleski's approach might have worked out in a different layout, as the
slam would have been made in the absence of a diamond lead.
Unfortunately the $\diamond$ AK were dealt in the leader's hand, so this time the scientific method prevailed. E/W -100 and 13 IMPs to Zimmermann.

Later in the set, this board actually had a companion:

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
A 95
$\bigcirc 875$
$\diamond$ AK 3
\& Q 10632


Another possible slam for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ that may only be defeated by a diamond lead. The bidding at the Open Room was quite amazing. Cronier-D'Ovidio told the world that they were missing a diamond control, yet bid the slam anyway (probably due to a misunderstanding). Manno took notice and led the $\diamond 2 \ldots \mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}-100$.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cronier | Piscitelli | D'Ovidio | Manno |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 1NT | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| $4 \%$ | Pass | 45 | Pass |
| $5 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 6 | All Pass |

At the other table the problem was diagnosed in time. $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+450$.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zaleski | Multon | Olivieri | Willard |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 1ヵ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | All Pass |

Let's return to the chronological order of the deals. Breno conceded 10 more IMPs in Board 23 after some over-sophisticated bidding which allowed Manno/Piscitelli to stop in $4 \diamond$ when a cold vulnerable $5 \diamond$ was bid and made at the
other room. At that stage Zimmermann led 23:0. Breno opened their account in Board 25 thanks to a dubious action by Franck Multon.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
A 643
$\checkmark$ J
$\diamond$ K Q J 1062
\& J 42
ค A 107
$\checkmark$ A 105
$\diamond$ A 73
\&f AK 96

$\checkmark 87$
$\diamond 94$
\& Q 3

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cronier | Piscitelli | D'Ovidio | Manno |
|  | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Dbl | Pass | $5 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |

A preemptive barrage didn't allow $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ to assess their cards properly, and they landed in $5 \circlearrowleft$ when cold for 12 tricks.Zimmermann +680 .
It seems that the only way for $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ to reach $6 \checkmark$ voluntarily is for East to overcall $3 \checkmark$ - that's exactly what Marion Michielsen did for the Rosenthal team! Many experts will abhor the idea of overcalling with 5 HCP , but it's the result (in this case $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}+1430$ ) that counts.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zaleski | Multon | Olivieri | Willard |
|  | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \wedge$ |
| Dble | Pass | $5 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| 5NT | Pass | $6 \Omega$ | Pass |
| Pass | 6ヘ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Up to $5 \circlearrowleft$ the auction was identical to the Open Room. Then Multon decided on an apparently cheap sacrifice which turned out to be a very dangerous adventure.
The 54 bid appears tempting, but the experts advise us not to take another bid after preempting, because our partner knows much more about our hand than we know about his. In this case South was weaker than expected, and N/S should have been happy to see their opponents stop at the five-level.
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Olivieri's Pass of 54 showed a good hand, after which $6 \triangle$ was duly bid. Multon took full responsibility of the hand by bidding on to 64, but this was no longer a cheap sacrifice.
Luckily for Zimmerman, their opponents missed a chance for down five. Zaleski led the $\% \mathrm{~A}$ and failed to make the rather obvious trump switch. Willard got rid of her second heart loser, escaping for -800.

In Board 26 Oliveri-Zaleski who held 23 HCPs allowed their opponents to play $2 \triangle$ in a 9 -card fit for -100 . Apparently a poor decision by Total Tricks standards, but at the other table D'OvidioCronier reached the hopeless 3NT rather than the laydown 4 , and it was 7 more IMPs for Breno.
The interesting fact about Board 27 is that $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ were cold for $4 \bigcirc$, yet hearts were never mentioned at both tables!

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.


| West <br> Cronier | North <br> Piscitelli | East <br> D'Ovidio | South <br> Manno <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Pass |
| $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Zaleski | Multon | Olivieri | Willard |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $3 \&$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| $4 \&$ | All Pass |  |  |

It seems that a weak two-suited bid of $2 \triangle$ was not part of the system of both N/S pairs.
44 was down one while 4\%, reached after Olivieri's two-suited 3\% overcall, actually made for another 5 IMP to Breno. Following the abovementioned slam swing in Board 28, they even took the lead - 26:24.

In the last board Zimmermann made +140 in both tables to swing the match their way, but a narrow defeat by 5 IMPs didn't trouble Breno. The Italians still had a cushion of almost 10 VPs going into the final round of the Swiss.

"Winter is coming": Interviews with some players

"To Duck or Not To Duck" - Horton's Corner Kathrine Bertheau explains her defense


Being a T.D. - "Quiz n ${ }^{\circ} 1$ " - Antonio Riccardi post a quiz

## More videos are coming soon!
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by Mark Horton

Part of the fascination of bridge is the infinite number of possibilities that are contained on even the simplest looking deal.
This was Board 24 from the round of 16 :


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Zimmermann | Cope | ZochowskaRobertson |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

There was some criticism of West's failure to bid $2 \checkmark$ rather than $2 \diamond$, but one brought up in the

French school of bidding would ever contemplate raising with only three card support.
However, it seems fairly clear for West to bid 3 on the next round which would see East go on to game.
Keep in mind that if West does raise to $2 \boldsymbol{d}$ then North might double. If East then bids 4 South might double.
I can't be sure if that was the auction in the other room, but the final contract was $4 \boldsymbol{d}$ doubled.
There is no way to defeat that contract - the best shot is to lead a top trump, but declarer wins in dummy and cannot be prevented from securing one ruff in dummy to go with seven trumps and two aces.
However, if you exchange the seven and eight of spades then South can lead the queen of spades. If declarer wins in dummy and then plays the ace of hearts and a heart North ducks and South wins with the jack and plays the jack of spades. Declarer wins and can still ruff a heart in dummy, but then South's eight of spades will come into its own.
Even if North wins the second hearts and plays a club declarer should not come to more than nine tricks, as South will get in with a club at some point to play the jack of spades.


Madeira offers a unique opportunity to enjoy a natural environment bathed by a mild climate all year round, with extraordinary landscapes such as tropical gardens, a deep blue Ocean, and the natural hospitality of its people which makes Madeira a high-quality
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by Micke Melander

In Round of 16, the first KO-round of the European Mixed Team Championships Gunsmoke was up against www.guts.com. in one of the matches. The first half gave us two large swings, one in each direction - and it was all about sacrifices.

Board 3. Dealer South. EW Vul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A K } 943 \\
& \diamond 1098 \\
& \diamond 72 \\
& \diamond \text { Q } 974
\end{aligned}
$$



Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| F. Helness | Ringseth | HellemannLindaas <br> Ho |  |
| Pass | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | All Pass |


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Fredin | T.Helness | BlaagestadG.Helness |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Pass | $5 \%$ | $5 \Omega$ | Pass |
| $6 毋$ | $7 \%$ | Dble | All Pass |

When F. Helness in the Open Room didn't bid to slam, N-S saw no reason to sacrifice against their opponent's game. Things went differently in the Closed Room, when Fredin as West bid the slam. Tor Helness believed the opponents and took the insurance by sacrificing in Seven Clubs.

Helleman had no problem getting twelve tricks for 680 in the Open Room after the defense had cashed the ace of clubs. The question was, how expensive would Seven Clubs be?
Fredin started with the king of diamonds, which held the trick, and shifted to a heart to Blaagestad's ace. East then tried to cash the ace of diamonds
but declarer ruffed, drew the trump and played a spade towards dummy. Fredin could now have played the queen, to ensure that they got 800 from their opponents sacrifice but decided to gamble to see if it could be even 1100 by playing low from his queen-jack-seven. When Gun Helness called for the king of spades, the 1100 became a reality. 9 IMPs to www.guts.com.

A couple of boards later it was time to sacrifice again...

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.


Closed Room

| West | North | East $\quad$ South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fredin | T.Helness | BlaagestadG.Helness |  |
| Pass | $1 \Omega$ | $2 \Omega$ | $3 \%$ |
| $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \%$ | All Pass |  |

Both West players found the diamond lead through dummy. In the Open Room the defense cashed their two diamonds to defeat the slam and declarer could claim the rest. Gun Helness had to work harder in Closed Room, when East just covered dummy's jack with the queen and shifted to a trump removing declarers possibility of crossruffing the eleven tricks she needed.

| Go to PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |

The board however didn't present any serious problem for Helness, when she decided to set up dummy's hearts for the last extra trick she needed to make her contract. Since East-West could make Four Spades here, a sacrifice would have been justified to save some IMPs, as it was 10 IMPs to Gunsmoke.

The first half ended 21-18 to Gunsmoke after some small turnovers here and there. A sacrifice against Five Clubs on board eight would have made the match even tighter than it now was.

The second half kicked off with 7 IMPs to guts. com when they managed to buy the contract at Two Spades in the Open Room and Two Hearts in the Closed Room, both making. Then we were back on track; time for some sacrificing again...

Board 16. Dealer East. E-W Vul.

- 9

๑ K 953
$\diamond$ A Q 6
\& A 10985


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ringseth | F. Helness | Lindaas | Hellemann |
| Pass | $1 \propto$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |

All Pass
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| T. Helness | Fredin | G.Helness Blaagestad |  |
| Pass | $1 \%$ | 14 | Dble |
| $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Ringseth choose to pre-empt partner's overcall assuming it would be sound at this vulnerability and Hellemann made sure to take the maximum out of it by a double. With five rather quick losers it was 500 to Gunsmoke.

Fredin in the Closed Room got to declare Four Hearts. East led the king of spades, declarer rose with the ace from dummy and played a heart to his king, which held the trick. Another trump followed and West got in with the ace of trumps. Another spade followed, ruffed by declarer. Fredin then cashed the queen of diamonds, in the small hope of getting some information from the defenders. When that wasn't the case and both followed low he had to decide how to play clubs. He knew that he needed the honors divided or West with both of them. But what was must likely if they were 3-2: was it East or West who would have three? Fredin played a small club towards dummy guessing that the hand who had overcalled with One Spade had two clubs. That was not the case and when Gun Helness after a very long thought played low from her queen-third it was game over, down one.

Four Spades in the Open Room had suddenly become a phantom sacrifice... 11 IMPs to Gunsmoke.

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ringseth | F. Helness | Lindaas | Hellemann |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |


| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| T. Helness | Fredin | G.Helness Blaagestad |  |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | $1 \checkmark$ |
| 24 | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |

Neither of the North players was able to stop bidding their diamonds until they had reached the five-level, East happily doubled at both tables
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with ace-queen-jack-fourth behind... The main difference was that Tor Helness managed to steer his partner right on the opening lead by bidding clubs first. The club lead got the contract down three, for another 5 IMPs, when a spade lead in the Open Room only meant down two. Declarer was able to throw the losing club on the king of spades and the king of hearts was the needed entry.

A couple of boards later came one of those boards that will go to the bridge history archives in the chapter of "Magic Fredin Doubles".

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

|  | A Q 97 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 82 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 942 |  |
|  | \& 852 |  |
| A A 54 |  | A J 10 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q J 93 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\bigcirc$ K 65 |
| $\diamond 73$ | ${ }^{\mathbf{N}}{ }_{\text {S }}$ | $\diamond$ A J 1086 |
| \& K Q 63 |  | \& A 109 |
|  | A K8632 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1074$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 5 |  |
|  | \& J 74 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ringseth | F.Helness | Lindaas | Hellemann <br> Pass |
| $1 \propto$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Closed Room

| West <br> T. Helness | North <br> Fredin | East <br> G.Helness | South <br> Blaagestad |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass |  |  |  |

In the Open Room South led a low spade, declarer ducked twice, won third round and pitched a diamond from hand. East then established the hearts and when North had the ace of hearts and clubs were 3-3, nine tricks were in the bag.

Far more interesting things happened in the Closed Room. Fredin's double really rocked the boat. He even managed to block the spade suit by leading the seven of spades. Helness went into the tank when he saw the seven of spades going to the
ten and king before playing any further. Suddenly he went up with the ace to play a heart towards dummy! Fredin rose with the ace, cashed queennine of spades and returned a low heart. Helness won the trick in dummy, played a club to the king and another club to the ten in dummy! When South scored the jack and could cash two more spades a cold contract suddenly was down two for 500 , and 15 IMPs to www.guts.com.

On the next board Gunsmoke took back 6 IMPs when their opponents didn't have the "guts" to bid game and stopped in a part score. Then Tor Helness got into problems again, what to bid?
^1062 ऽAJ32 厄AK109 \&84

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| T. Helness | Fredin | G.Helness Blaagestad |  |
|  | Pass | $1 \%$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass |
| 2 | Dble | $3 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| $?$ |  |  |  |

Helness eventually passed the board out, which might have been correct. But when two opening hands meet you can be quite sure that thr opponents are in game somewhere. West was probably somehow affected by the previous experience in 3NT which was doubled and went for 500 when it actually was cold, since he didn't do the right thing again. Partner made Three Hearts on a safety play, but when the opponents had bid Five Clubs and made it at the other table that was another 10 IMPs in the Norwegian Sea.

If first half was a "low-scoring" 21-18, the second half was the opposite with 51-33 in favor of www.guts.com. They had turned the match round, making it to the quarterfinals.



## GOALAAAAAAAA!

by Mark Horton

Everyone (well, everyone English) knows that football is a game of 90 minutes after which Germany wins on penalties (and this applies equally to the German Women's football team).
To the best of my knowledge no German players were involved in the Round of 16 match between Full House and Mortensen, but it proved to an historic encounter.
At the end of full time the scores were tied and extra boards were required. However, in a time saving device the organisers had decided that such ties would be resolved by adopting the Editor's idea of playing one deal at a time.

This was number 1 :
Dealer North. None Vul.

- A 2
$\checkmark$ AQJ 9
$\diamond$ AK 52
\& 853


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lybaek | McCallum | Ellingse | Tuncok |
|  | 1\%** | Pass | $1 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Pass | 14** | Pass | $20^{*}$ |
| Pass | 24* | Pass | 3\%* |
| Dble | $3 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 30* |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Against this uninformative auction (in the sense that I have no time to find out what it meant) East led the six of clubs and declarer won with dummy's ace and played a heart to the queen. East won and the defenders took their tricks, leaving declarer with the nine she needed, +400 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Upmark | Hegge <br>  <br> Hass | $1 \diamond$ | Rimstead Mortensen |

$4 \checkmark$ Cue bid
5\% Cue bid
When East led the six of clubs declarer won and took a heart finesse. When that lost the defenders could cash a club, and although it appears that East did not manage to score a trick with the king of spades one down was enough for a win and a place in the quarter finals.

Is this the right moment to observe that the longest ever penalty shoot out took place in 2005 when the Namibian Cup had to be settled by a record-breaking 48 spot-kicks.
In that game, KK Palace held their nerve to defeat the Civics 17-16 following a 2-2 draw in normal time.

## EBL SOCIAL ACCOUNTS
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## ZIMMERMANN VS ROBERTSON / VYTAS VS AJ DIAMONDS

## Mixed Teams, Round of 16, First Segment

In this combined report, I will pay attention to the highlights of both Round of 16 -matches mentioned above. More often than not, interesting boards prove interesting in more than one match though these two matches did not always stick to this rule.

Vytas and Robertson had taken a small lead on the first board, but then, after a routine game on board 2 , the stakes got higher on board 3:

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A QJ7 <br> © Q54 | N | $\rightarrow \stackrel{A}{\circ}$ | A6 |
|  | W |  | KJ76 2 |
| ¢0 2 |  |  |  |
|  | A 1085 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 3$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 4$ |  |  |
|  | $\%$ AKJ | 10863 |  |
| Zimmerman | n v. Robe | rtson: |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Skorchev | P Cronier | Malakova | va D'Ovidio |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 10 | $3 \%$ |
| Pass | 5\% | 5NT | Pass |
| $6 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | 7\% |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

For Robertson, the Bulgarian EW had no trouble in reaching a slam once West could open the bidding after South's initial pass, so the French had to take the sacrifice which cost them 800. This looked very much like a par result.

In the Closed Room, the British beat par by quite a lot.

Closed Room

| West | North | East <br> Multon | Cope |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | Willard |
| :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Robertson |
| $3 \propto$ |

South opened 3\% and North raised to five, giving Sylvie Willard a nasty problem at her first turn. When West went for what looked like a sure plus score, his side had lost another 11 IMPs to trail by 15 when $5 \%$ was only down two for -300 .

## Vytas v. AJ Diamonds:

In the other match, South for Vytas passed as dealer in the open room and the following auction developed:

| Open Room <br> West | North |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek |  | Gromov | East | Sarniak |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Gromova |
| Pass |

All quite normal but as the slam looked to have been bid under some pressure, the Poles were allowed to play it for an overtrick and +1390 . They too had beaten par by a lot, albeit the other way round.

In the Closed Room, South found an opening bid:

| Closed Room <br> West <br> Ponomareva | North |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Baldysz |  |$\quad$| East |
| :--- |
| Dubinin | | South |
| :--- |
| Jaszzzak |

Suddenly, after South's opening bid, both bidding the slam and taking the sacrifice had become far more attractive; I'm not sure what that proves. Vytas +800 but 11 IMPs to the Polish Diamonds.
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Two boards later, Zimmermann registered an interesting swing:

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Skorchev | P Cronier | Malakova D'Ovidio |  |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Catherine D'Ovidio bid a courageous and inspired 4 4 at her second turn, vulnerable against not. Though this contract should have gone down two for -500 , she managed to save a trick when the defence started off with two rounds of hearts rather than finding the club shift.

She ruffed the second heart and played off $\rightarrow \mathrm{A}$ and $\mathbf{M} \mathrm{Q}$. West won his king but with the clubs blocked, declarer could not lose more than one club and the J from this point. Had she played a low spade instead of the queen, East could still have got her club ruff for the same one down. But would she? Robertson +200 .

In the Closed Room, Robertson did not show the same inspiration:

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Cope | Willard | Robertson |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \boldsymbol{}$ | Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |

One overtrick, Zimmermann +450 and 6 IMPs.
In the other match, both teams played in $4 \checkmark$ for no swing.
Two boards later, three of our four featured NS pairs went overboard.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

$$
473
$$

$\checkmark$ KQ93
$\diamond 74$
\& K 10986

In the Zimmermann-Robertson match, they played in 3NT at both tables, down two.

The Russians also found themselves overboard:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek | Gromov | Sarniak | Gromova <br> $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{6}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Even 2NT was far too high when declarer won the third round of spades and led a heart up to dummy's queen, smoothly ducked by Anna Sarniak! This led to declarer misguessing the hearts later on and thus going two down even in 2NT. AJ Diamonds +200.

In the Closed Room, the Poles quickly reached a decent contract:

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ponomareva | Baldysz | Dubinin | Jaszczak |
|  |  | 1NT |  |

All Pass

When West led the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ which was ducked by declarer, West continued the suit. Nicely done by Jaszczak, who actually ended up with an overtrick for a gain of 8 IMPs from almost nowhere.

On the next board, both sides had a cold game available but only one out of our eight featured pairs reached the promised land.
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Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

- J 762
$\checkmark 62$
$\diamond$ K J 9876
\& 7
A KQ105
๑K632
$\diamond 942$
of 76


ค A9762
$\checkmark$ Q 5
$\diamond A$ Q 1083
-4 3

- J843
$\checkmark$ J
$\diamond 75$
\& AKQ942
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Skorchev | P Cronier | Malakova D'Ovidio |  |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \$$ | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| $3 \Upsilon$ (Fit) | $4 \Omega$ | $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \%$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Spade raises and fitbids all round but 5\% cannot not possibly be defeated as declarer can always set up two hearts, even on a trump lead. Zimmermann a fine +400 .

Please note North's decision not to launch a weak two.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Cope | Willard | Robertson |
| Pass | 29 | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| $3 \mathbf{4}$ | All Pass |  |  |



At the other table, North did open a weak two and from there, South was afraid to show her clubs, no doubt fearing a misfit with her singleton heart. So the British sold out to $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$. The French had missed game (with all the diamonds being well placed) but their two overtricks and +200 still added up to a 12 -IMP gain on the board for them to take the lead in the match for the first time: 24-15.

The next board was amusing, since South had an $8-5$ chance to find the right lead:

Board: 9. Dlr: North/EW
AK Q 7
-AK J 97
$\diamond 862$
\& 7

A 1086
$\bigcirc 43$
$\diamond-$
\& AKJ 108542
© 52
$\diamond 97543$
\&963

In the Zimmermann-Robertson match, both Norths opened 1NT and both Easts overcalled 3of which became the final contract. When both Souths led a diamond, there was no swing as 11 tricks were suddenly assured.

In the Vytas-AJ Diamonds match, they had other ideas:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek | Gromov | Sarniak | Gromova |
|  | $1 \circlearrowleft$ | $4 \%$ | All Pass |

One might say the level of overcalling clubs was irrelevant as the success of any club contract would depend on the lead only. The difference was that Gromov had not opened 1NT as they did in our other match but had preferred to show his good five-card major first. So Gromova duly led her partner's suit for an easy two down. Vytas +200 .

Yet another variation we saw in the Closed Room here.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ponomareva | Baldysz | Dubinin | Jaszczak |
|  | $1 \Omega$ | $3 \propto$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Once again, a "more normal" $1 \checkmark$ opening bid but here, East only bid $3 \%$. When this came round to North, she doubled and South made the obvious bid of $3 \diamond$. West did not openly express her opinion on this action but instead collected a quiet +150 for three down, not counting the 150 honours. The swing thus was 350 or 8 IMPs to Vytas.

The next board was an example of a natural system v. Strong Club in the ZimmermannRobertson match:

Board: 10. Dlr: East/All

- 4
$\checkmark$ K Q 6
$\diamond 87654$
\& A J 104

| A J 10765๑A532 | 5 N | A 32 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc$ J 108 |
| \& AK -- | ${ }^{\text {W }}$ | $\diamond$ J 932 |
|  |  | \& Q 852 |
|  | A K Q 98 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 974$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 10$ |  |
|  | \& K 9763 |  |

For Robertson, the Bulgarian Strong Club EW reached relatively astronomical heights:

Open Room

| West | North <br> Skorchev | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | Pass | Malakova |
| D'Ovidio |  |  |  |
| Pass |  |  |  |

In fact, this contract might well have had play against a few friendly distributions, but they were not available here this time. Down two, when declarer ran out of trumps eventually, having been forced in clubs on too many occasions.


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Cope | Willard | Robertson |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 14 | All Pass |  |  |

Standard français clearly proved its value here, as Willard saw no reason to bid on her unpromising hand. One overtrick when the defence did not find the club force, and 7 IMPs to Zimmermann.

In the other match, we saw quite different judgements:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wojcieszek | Gromov | Sarniak | Gromova |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \%$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| 20 | All Pass |  |  |

This was Polish Club so East could not pass 14. The final contract was decent enough apart from the trifling fact that it had no play with the spades $4-1$. One down on a diamond lead, Vytas +100.

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Ponomareva | Baldysz | Dubinin | Jaszczak |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 1\% | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 14 | All Pas |  |  |

The Russians could pass 10 and when they duly did, a plus score had been reached. One overtrick and 5 IMPs more to Vytas.
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The scores at halftime:
Vytas-AJ Diamonds 29-20
Zimmermann-Robertson 33-15
With both these matches still wide open with 14 boards to play, my decision as to which matches to watch in the second half was made easy. So here we go with the decisive segment in both of them.

In both our matches, the halftime leaders had slightly extended their lead on the first three boards but they both suffered a severe setback on the next:


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Malakova | Multon | Skorchev Willard |  |
|  |  | $1 \uparrow$ | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

North led a heart and continued the suit after winning his $\%$ A. This way, declarer had 11 tricks when the spades were $3-3$. Robertson +460 , a routine result and a flat board, one would think.

At the other table, Blackwood was of no use any more once clubs were set as trumps.

## Closed Room

| West North <br> Zimmermann  <br> Cope  | East <br> ZochowskaRobertson |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | South |


| 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Robertson had closed their deficit to 9 IMPs when board 24 arrived.

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Malakova | Multon | Skorchev Willard |  |
| $1 \diamond!$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | $3 \searrow$ |
| $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

This looks a sensible auction overall but sometimes, a contract cannot be defeated just because you have 22 HCP. This proved the case here, Robertson +590 .

In the other room, they all stayed pretty quiet:

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Zimmermann Cope | ZochowskaRobertson |  |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

The same ten tricks, of course, but 9IMPs to Robertson to level their match with just four more boards to play.

In the other match, we saw basically the same two auctions in both the open and the closed room:

| Open Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jaszczak | Gromov | Baldysz | Gromova |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

AJ Diamonds +590 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Vainikonis | JaniszewskiGulevich | Harasim. |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Vytas +170 so 9 IMPs to AJ Diamonds who thus had suddenly leapt into the lead.

The next board was yet another example of how difficult it can be to reach 5\% when this is the proper contract:

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
A Q 75
$\checkmark 1075$
$\diamond$ Q 8764
\& J 7


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Malakova | Multon | Skorchev Willard |  |
|  | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Dble | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

Two Clubs showed the suit at once, of course, but 2NT may well have suggested a different shape to Malakova. As declarer needed both red finesses to work to have any chance at all to get to nine tricks, he was very quickly three down when the diamond finesse failed. Zimmermann +300 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zimmermann | Cope | ZochowskaRobertson |  |

The ZZ partnership as EW had a very neat sequence (A for effort?) to land in the proper contract. They were duly rewarded with +600 and 14 IMPs to take the lead once again this time with only three boards to play.
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In the other match, the Poles were well on their way but the fierce intervention made it hard for them to judge precisely what was going on.

## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jaszczak | Gromov | Baldysz | Gromova |
|  | Pass | $1 \&$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| Dble | $3 凶$ | Pass | $3 \wedge$ |
| Dble | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | All Pass |

$2 \diamond$ was Multi and $3 \diamond$ showed both major suit fits. Holding only a small doubleton in clubs, can West be blamed for not raising? I doubt it...
Anyway, 11 tricks were there when the trumps broke in not too unfriendly fashion, so AJ Diamonds scored +150 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Vainikonis | JaniszewskiGulevich | Harasim. |  |
|  | Pass | 1\& | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Dble | $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $5 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

Wonderful judgement by Gulevich here: first passing 3 on what was notly a very strong hand in HCP, then going all out when West could speak once more. A well-deserved +600 and 10 IMPs back to Vytas who were trailing by 10 now with three to play.


On the next board, a speculative (and unfortunate) lead by Gromova put paid to the Vytas chances:

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jaszczak | Gromov | Baldysz <br> Gromova |  |
| $2 \diamond$ |  | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Admittedly, clubs looked very much like the unbid suit. But on the actual layout, a diamond lead would have hit the jackpot. On the actual \& Q lead, declarer won the king and went after the hearts. When they turned out to be 3-3, she had an easy enough overtrick. AJ Diamonds +630 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Vainikonis | Janiszewsk | iGulevich | Harasim, |
|  |  | 14 | Pass |
| 29 | Pass | 24 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

With West the declarer, North led a diamond into the tenace but declarer, not being clairvoyant, tried to establish dummy's spades rather than his own hearts, since he now had only one side entry left to enjoy any heart winners. This line was bound to fail today, as South was looking at all the spades. So the contract ended with only seven tricks for declarer, another +200 to AJ Diamonds, who now led by 23 with just two boards left. This match was over, the final score being 76-55 to the Poles.

Zimmermann still led by 14 when the last board in that match came up.

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

> \& A 4 3 2
> $\diamond ~ 43$
> $\diamond$ AK Q 53
> $\& 42$

A Q 76
$\bigcirc 1097$
$\diamond 84$
\& 98763


A J 10
$\checkmark$ K Q J 85
$\diamond 62$
\& $A K$ Q J
4 K 985
© A 62
$\diamond$ J 1097
\& 105
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Malakova | Multon | Skorchev Willard |  |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \Omega$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \propto$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| $5 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |

When NS bid their game in convincing style, West thought that sacrificing would be the best thing to do. When the clubs turned out to be 2-2 with NS (and the hearts 3-2, for that matter), her decision proved costly. Zimmermann +500 as there were five losers in $5 \%$.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zimmermann | Cope | ZochowskaRobertson |  |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Pass | $3 \Delta$ | Dble | $4 \Delta$ | All Pass

When Zochowska doubled 3 rather than bid 4\%, Zimmermann had no reason whatsoever to disturb 4A. This might have been costly for the reasons suggested above but as it happened, it was the right decision. Four Spades duly went one off for another +100 and 12 IMPs to Zimmermann who thus had brought home the bacon by 68-42 to move into the quarterfinals as well.


ALZADA
Lisbeth GROVE
Maria J. F. QUINTANA
Sverre KARLSEN
Are SIVERTSEN
Henrik GOSVIG
ANITAS SANS
Geir ENGEBRETSEN
Hilde Anita LARSEN
Finn G. OVSTEDAL Anita OWER
Helge LARSEN

## BADGER

Frances HINDEN Graham OSBORNE Jeffrey ALLERTON
Paula LESLIE
Ingar K. HANSEN

## BEIJING TRINERGY

Dong LU
Xiaoyi LI
Yanhong WANG
Shaolin SUN
Yan HUANG
Shaohong WU
Dong LU captain
Dong LU coach

## BERGEN AK

Tor BAKKE
Kristine BREIVIK
Sven Olai HOYLAND
Solvi REMEN

## BOHNSACK

Henning BOHNSACK Susanne BOHNSACK Gisela SMYKALLA Michael SCHNEIDER

BRIDGE OF KING F1
Maxim FEOFANOV Elena KHONICHEVA Viacheslav GUSEV Alexandra NIKITINA
CAYNE
Jimmy CAYNE
Patricia CAYNE
Dano DE FALCO
Jacqui MITCHELL
CHINA GEELY AUTO
Bangxiang ZHANG
Shengyue GUI
Liping WANG
Wen Fei WANG
Jianming DAI
Qi SHEN (1)

## DARLING

Marina DARLING
Justin HOWARD
Liv BUGGE
Reidar JOHNSEN

## GAMMA GRAFISK

Turid BONES
Vegard BREKKE
Ellen KJAER
Geir Egil BERGHEIM

## GOLD

David GOLD
Catherine CURTIS
Paul FEGARTY
Susanna GROSS

## GRAIZER

N. GRAIZER-HORWITZ

Micha MARK
Sonia MARK
Gabi MERMELSTEIN
Nurit NAVEH

## HIMANI

Himani KHANDELWAL
Rajeev KHANDELWAL
Barbara GOTARD
Tomasz GOTARD

## HOFFEMAN

David HOFFMAN
Sue PICUS
Andrew BRAITHWAITE
SUSAN BRAITHWAITE
INOVENIIO KOLBOTTEN
Baard LIAN
Gunn ROBERTSEN
Einar KNUTSEN
Gerd Irene KNUTSEN
Baard LIAN captain

## KIBE

Ayse OZGUNES
Basak KUTUK
Dogan UZUM
Omer KIZILOK
Ayse OZGUNES cpt
KURTS ANGELS
Kurt-Ove THOMASSEN
Simon HINGE
Ranja SIVERTSVIK
Stine HOLMOY
Ann-Mari MIRKOVIC
Jon-Egil FURUNES

## LEGEANKA

Gerd Inger AUSTLI
Lennart JANSSON
Anton THORSTENSEN
Kari BAKKE

## LES MISERABLES

Haavard MOE
Oddrun GODEJORD
Knut PETTERSEN
Ann Marie PETTERSEN

## MAHAFFEY

Jim MAHAFFEY
Judi RADIN
Irina LEVITINA
Sam LEV
Tonje A. BROGELAND
Boye BROGELAND
Jim MAHAFFEY cpt

## MALUISH

Annette E. MALUISH
Andrew John MILL
Anisia SHAMI
Owen CAMP

## MARIE

Marie EGGELING
Rosaline BARENDREGT
Yngue LAMO
Thomas GOTARD
Tomasz GOTARD
MELBOURNE 1
William FRISBY
Eva CAPLAN
Cathy MILL
Grant KILVINGTON
Rachel FRENKEL
Henry SAWICKI
MELWOOD
Tor Eivind GRUDE
David UELAND
Tommy SOOILAND
Ragnar DAVIDSEN
MIKLAGARD
Erdem OZTURK
Ferda CAKICI
Linnea EDLUND
Robert LARSSON

## MINA

Victor ARONOV
Ahu ZOBU
Enver KOKSOY
Umran SEMERCI
Victor ARONOV cpt

## MIXED

Ronnie BARR
Eldad GINOSSAR
Ron PACHTMAN
Clara HETZ
Nathan HETZ
Tone T. SVENDSEN

## MOSTINGAN

Hege Charlotte FABER
Kjell Ove HELMERSEN
Finn. NICOLAYSEN
Sissel SNEVE
Ola RONNING

## NI LLIV

Tor Einar ERLANDSEN
Trude SELFORS
Kay STRAND
Anette VAAGLAND

## NONSTOP

Anne Lise FJAELBERG
Reidar LERBREKK
Kirsten DUBLAND
Vegard HERMANSEN

## OPTIMISTS

Lisbeth Aulid EIDE
Terje LOBBEN
Erling BREKKA
Inger Skogly
ROLFSTAD

## PANDORA

Agnes WESSELING
Niels VAN DER GAAST
Paula McLEISH
David Whalley McLEISH

## PASSO DOUBLE

Ragnhild SOLUM
Oystein GARVIK
Gerd LARSEN
Hagbart NILSEN
Else UNDEM
Rolf UNDEM

## PUNCH

Sam PUNCH
Tim REES
James THROWER
Sarah TESHOME

## ROSENTHAL

Andrew ROSENTHAL
Marion MICHIELSEN
Roy WELLAND
Sabine AUKEN
Chris WILLENKEN
Dana BERKOWITZ
Andrew ROSENTHAL cpt

## ROSSARD

Martine ROSSARD
Jerzy ROMANOWSKI
Wojciech GAWEL
Grazyna BREWIAK
Danielle AVON
Jean-Michel VOLDOIRE

| SANBORN |
| :--- |
| Kerri SANBORN |
| Steve SANBORN |
| David BERKOWITZ |
| Lisa BERKOWITZ |
| SILVERFOX |
| Geir-Olav TISLEVOLL |
| Faith MAYER |
| Michael CORNELL |
| Vivien CORNELL |
| Geir-Olav TISLEVOLL cpt |
|  |
| SJODAL |
| Stig DYBDAHL |
| Elisabeth G. SJODAL |
| Rolf SJODAL |
| Sofie Grasholt SJODAL |
| SOLHEIM |
| Eli SOLHEIM |
| Ivar M. ANFINSEN |
| Svein MARKUSSEN |
| Ronnaug ASLA |
| Jan FJAELBERG |
| Bente M. BIRKELAND |

## TAKK

Teruko NISHIMURA
Ayako MIYAKUNI
Kenji MIYAKUNI
Kazuo FURUTA
TEAM ATLANTIC
Anton Reynir GUNNARSSON
Erik RYNNING
Eva HAGEN
Vigdis THOREN
THE PATRIOTS
Magnus WEIMAN
Maureen WEIMAN
Matthew FIENBERG
Jill HUNTER
Magnus WEIMAN cpt
TOGRAM
Magne EIDE
Rolf HANSEN
Margot ALFHEIM
Krista THARALDSEN

TOMFOOLERY
Catherine SEALE
Thomas PASKE
Tommy H SANDSMARK
Nils-Otto ELIASSEN

## TRONDERMIX

Arne Georg AUNOIEN
Helen JOHANSEN
Eivind KANDAHL
Britt Helene SOLVANG

## TUPPEN

Kristine KVERNSTROM
Siri BRAATANE
Svein Arild N. OLSEN
Bo Andreas BERG

## VI E KLAR

Margrethe LINDQUIST
Ingunn SKRE
Ludvig KRISTOFFERSEN
Egil Inge REITAN

## VIDIGAL

Migry ZUR-CAMPANILE

John MCALLISTER
Ana Carolina VIDIGAL Louk VERHEES Jr

## WARD PLATT

Kiki WARD-PLATT
Bernard CABANES
Benedicte CRONIER
Thomas BESSIS

## WITO

Willy Roger OTTEMO
Tore HANSSEN
Marianne ERIKSEN
Solbritt LINDAHL

## YABBIES

Richard J BRIGHTLING Leone MOFFAT Pam CRICHTON Ross CRICHTON

## ZEN

Thierry DE MENDEZ
Sybil BRAGADIR
Laurence DUC
Stephan MAGNUSSON

## RESULTS

| 1 | SANBORN | 64.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | GAMMA GRAFISK | 62.40 |
|  | MOSTINGAN | 62.40 |
| 4 | GRAIZER | 61.00 |
| 5 | KIBE | 60.40 |
| 6 | BEIJING TRINERGY | 60.00 |
| 7 | ROSENTHAL | 59.20 |
| 8 | ALZADA | 58.40 |
| 9 | BADGER | 56.40 |
|  | TAKK | 56.40 |
|  | SJODAL | 56.40 |
| 12 | SOLHEIM | 55.60 |
| 13 | MAHAFFEY | 55.40 |
| 14 | SILVERFOX | 54.40 |
|  | YABBIES | 54.40 |
| 16 | CHINA GEELY AUTO | 54.00 |
| 17 | PUNCH | 53.60 |
| 18 | ROSSARD | 53.40 |
|  | BOHNSACK | 53.40 |
|  | BRIDGE OF KING F1 | 53.40 |
| 21 | MARIE | 53.20 |
| 22 | MIKLAGARD | 53.00 |
| 23 | DARLING | 52.20 |
| 24 | KURTS ANGELS | 52.00 |
|  | TOMFOOLERY | 52.00 |
| 26 | GOLD | 51.60 |
| 27 | VIDIGAL | 51.40 |


| 28 | MELWOOD | 50.80 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | CAYNE | 50.80 |
| 30 | WARD PLATT | 50.00 |
|  | PASSO DOUBLE | 50.00 |
|  | TRONDERMIX | 50.00 |
| TUPPEN | 50.00 |  |
| 34 MALUISH | 49.40 |  |
|  | WITO | 49.40 |
| 36 | BERGEN AK | 49.20 |
| 37 | ANITAS SANS | 47.40 |
|  | OPTIMISTS | 47.40 |
| 39 | ZEN | 47.00 |
| 40 | NONSTOP | 45.40 |
| 41 | MINA | 44.40 |
| 42 | MELBOURNE 1 | 44.00 |
| 43 | MIXED | 43.80 |
| 44 | TOGRAM | 42.40 |
| 45 | LES MISERABLES | 42.00 |
|  | NI LLIV | 42.00 |
| 47 | THE PATRIOTS | 40.40 |
| 48 | HOFFEMAN | 40.00 |
| 49 | TEAM ATLANTIC | 39.00 |
| 50 | LEGEANKA | 38.20 |
| 51 | INOVENTIO K. | 37.20 |
| 52 | PANDORA | 31.00 |
| 53 | VI E KLAR | 28.00 |
| 54 | BYE | 0.00 |


| 1 | LANZAROTTI Massimo | GOLIN Cristina | 1,72 | 103 | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | FJAELBERG Jan | BIRKELAND B. M. | 1,53 | 92 | 60 |
| 3 | WANG Liping | GUI Shengyue | 1,37 | 96 | 70 |
| 4 | GROMOVA Victoria | GROMOV Andrey | 1,26 | 101 | 80 |
| 5 | COPE Simon | ROBERTSON Marion | 1,25 | 125 | 100 |
| 6 | BESSIS Thomas | CRONIER Benedicte | 1,10 | 108 | 98 |
| 7 | RINGSETH Jorn Arild | LINDAAS Pernille | 1,09 | 109 | 100 |
| 8 | SAELENSMINDE Erik | MALINOWSKI Anna | 1,08 | 65 | 60 |
| 9 | JAKOBSEN Arild | DANIELSEN Ann-Elin | 1,08 | 108 | 100 |
| 10 | BOGEN Anne Irene | BOGEN Frank | 1,02 | 61 | 60 |
| 11 | CRONIER Philippe | D'OVIDIO Catherine | 0,98 | 78 | 80 |
| 12 | HELNESS Tor | HELNESS Gunn | 0,96 | 96 | 100 |
| 13 | CHARLSEN Thomas | LARSSON Jessica | 0,95 | 95 | 100 |
| 14 | TISLEVOLL Geir-Olav | MAYER Faith | 0,93 | 93 | 100 |
| 15 | BANASZKIEWICZ Ewa | BREDE Lukasz | 0,92 | 92 | 100 |
| 16 | AUKEN Sabine | WELLAND Roy | 0,91 | 64 | 70 |
| 17 | SANBORN Kerri | SANBORN Steve | 0,84 | 84 | 100 |
| 18 | UPMARK Johan | RIMSTEDT Cecilia | 0,84 | 84 | 100 |
| 19 | FURUNES Jon-Egil | SIVERTSVIK Ranja | 0,81 | 57 | 70 |
| 20 | MORTENSEN Maria Dam | HEGGE Kristoffer | 0,78 | 78 | 100 |
| 21 | MIYAKUNI Ayako | MIYAKUNI Kenji | 0,77 | 77 | 100 |
| 22 | THORSTENSEN Anton | BAKKE Kari | 0,77 | 77 | 100 |
| 23 | SVENDSEN Odin | WENNEVOLD Ida | 0,76 | 76 | 100 |
| 24 | KOVACHEV Valentin | MARQUARDT Diana | 0,72 | 72 | 100 |
| 25 | HETZ Clara | PACHTMAN Ron | 0,71 | 50 | 70 |
| 26 | GLAERUM Lisbeth | UELAND David | 0,68 | 61 | 90 |
| 27 | GAVIARD Daniele | MARRO Christophe | 0,66 | 53 | 80 |
| 28 | COOPER Kitty | KOLESNIK Alex | 0,64 | 64 | 100 |
| 29 | HOMME Marianne | HOMME Egil | 0,64 | 64 | 100 |
| 30 | JASZCZAK Andrzej | BALDYSZ Cathy | 0,63 | 57 | 90 |
| 31 | KAZMUCHA Danuta | SEREK Cezary | 0,63 | 38 | 60 |
| 32 | GOLD David | GROSS Susanna | 0,63 | 63 | 100 |
| 33 | CAPLAN Eva | FRISBY William | 0,63 | 50 | 80 |
| 34 | NIKITINA Alexandra | GUSEV Viacheslav | 0,62 | 62 | 100 |
| 35 | ZOBU Ahu | ARONOV Victor | 0,61 | 55 | 90 |
| 36 | ZOCHOWSKA Joanna | ZIMMERMANN Pierre | 0,59 | 35 | 59 |
| 37 | BROCK Sally | MYERS Barry | 0,57 | 40 | 70 |
| 38 | PISCITELLI Francesca | MANNO Andrea | 0,55 | 33 | 60 |
| 39 | VAN DER GAAST Niels | WESSELING Agnes | 0,55 | 55 | 100 |
| 40 | McCALLUM Karen | TUNCOK Cenk | 0,55 | 55 | 100 |
| 41 | HINDEN Frances | OSBORNE Graham | 0,51 | 51 | 100 |
| 42 | ISPORSKI Vladislav Nikolov | NIKOLOVA MARTA | 0,45 | 45 | 100 |
| 43 | BRAGADIR Sybil | DE MENDEZ Thierry | 0,44 | 44 | 100 |
| 44 | STANGHELLE Helge | HARDING Gerd Marit | 0,43 | 43 | 100 |
| 45 | TRENDAFILOV Roumen | SENIOR Nevena | 0,40 | 40 | 100 |
| 46 | SVINDAHL Frank | VIST Gunn Tove | 0,38 | 37 | 98 |
| 47 | MICHIELSEN Marion | ROSENTHAL Andrew | 0,37 | 22 | 60 |
| 48 | WANG Yanhong | LI Xiaoyi | 0,36 | 29 | 80 |
| 49 | SHAMI Anisia | CAMP Owen | 0,36 | 36 | 100 |
| 50 | HAALAND Aud | HELMERSEN Kjell Ove | 0,35 | 35 | 99 |


| 51 | EDLUND Linnea | LARSSON Robert | 0,35 | 35 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52 | HELGEMO Geir | LANGELAND Aase | 0,35 | 35 | 100 |
| 53 | REES Tim | PUNCH Sam | 0,35 | 35 | 100 |
| 54 | SENIOR Brian | PENFOLD Sandra | 0,34 | 34 | 100 |
| 55 | SMYKALLA Gisela | SCHNEIDER Michael | 0,34 | 34 | 100 |
| 56 | FAGERDAL Roger | ANDERSEN Wibeke | 0,34 | 34 | 100 |
| 57 | BROGELAND Boye | BROGELAND T. A. | 0,34 | 27 | 80 |
| 58 | REMEN Solvi | BAKKE Tor | 0,33 | 33 | 100 |
| 59 | BARENDREGT Rosaline | LAMO Yngve | 0,33 | 23 | 70 |
| 60 | WELANDER Unni | LISLAND Trygue | 0,32 | 32 | 99 |
| 61 | HOP Jacco | WORTEL Meike | 0,32 | 32 | 100 |
| 62 | BREIVIK Kristine | HOYLAND Sven Olai | 0,29 | 29 | 100 |
| 63 | SUN Shaolin | WU Shaohong | 0,28 | 17 | 60 |
| 64 | BAKKEREN Ton | MADSEN Christina Lund | 0,28 | 28 | 100 |
| 65 | KHONICHEVA Elena | FEOFANOV Maxim | 0,26 | 26 | 100 |
| 66 | HELLEMANN Anne-Lill | HELNESS Fredrik | 0,24 | 24 | 100 |
| 67 | KOKSOY Enver | SEMERCI Umran | 0,24 | 19 | 80 |
| 68 | BERGHEIM Geir Egil | KJAER Ellen | 0,23 | 23 | 100 |
| 69 | SOLUM Skjalg Nyheim | SOLUM Brit-Helen N. | 0,22 | 22 | 100 |
| 70 | VERHEES Jr Louk | VIDIGAL Ana Carolina | 0,20 | 20 | 100 |
| 71 | LESLIE Paula | ALLERTON Jeffrey | 0,20 | 20 | 100 |
| 72 | STABELL Leif-Erik | CAMERON Gail | 0,19 | 19 | 100 |
| 73 | GUNNARSSON Anton Reynir | HAGEN Eva | 0,18 | 18 | 100 |
| 74 | SKORCHEV Stefan | MALAKOVA Desislava | 0,17 | 17 | 100 |
| 75 | THORESEN Siv | HOILAND Tom | 0,17 | 17 | 100 |
| 76 | WANG Wen Fei | ZHANG Bangxiang | 0,16 | 11 | 70 |
| 77 | LEV Sam | LEVITINA Irina | 0,16 | 14 | 90 |
| 78 | BRENNE Einar Asbjorn | MOEN Vigdis | 0,15 | 15 | 100 |
| 79 | HOWARD Justin | DARLING Marina | 0,15 | 13 | 89 |
| 80 | SARNIAK Anna | WOJCIESZEK Jakub | 0,14 | 11 | 80 |
| 81 | HAUGEN Annika | BJERKSET Stein | 0,12 | 12 | 100 |
| 82 | OLIVIERI Gabriella | ZALESKI Romain | 0,11 | 9 | 80 |
| 83 | HOFTANISKA Thor Erik | BERTHEAU Kathrine | 0,09 | 9 | 100 |
| 84 | GINOSSAR Eldad | BARR Ronnie | 0,09 | 6 | 70 |
| 85 | ZUR-CAMPANILE Migry | MCALLISTER John | 0,07 | 7 | 100 |
| 86 | BRAATANE Siri | BERG Bo Andreas | 0,07 | 7 | 100 |
| 87 | HOCHEKER Danuta | CICHOCKI Miroslaw | 0,05 | 5 | 100 |
| 88 | FURUTA Kazuo | NISHIMURA Teruko | 0,05 | 5 | 100 |
| 89 | BUGGE Liv | JOHNSEN Reidar | 0,04 | 4 | 89 |
| 90 | GOTARD Barbara | GOTARD Tomasz | 0,04 | 4 | 90 |
| 91 | BRAITHWAITE Andrew | BRAITHWAITE SUSAN | 0,03 | 3 | 90 |
| 92 | BREWIAK Grazyna | GAWEL Wojciech | 0,03 | 2 | 80 |
| 93 | KOWALSKI Apolinary | MISZEWSKA Ewa | 0,01 | 1 | 80 |
| 94 | ELIASSEN Erik | BJORLO Hilde | 0,01 | 1 | 99 |
| 95 | TESHOME Sarah | THROWER James | 0,01 | 1 | 100 |
| 96 | OVESEN Jo-Arne | HESKJE Torild | 0,01 | 1 | 100 |
| 97 | SNEVE Sissel | RONNING Ola | 0,00 | 0 | 100 |
| 98 | MIRKOVIC Ann-Mari | HINGE Simon | 0,00 | 0 | 60 |
| 99 | SKJETNE Erlend | STOEN Tove | -0,01 | -1 | 70 |
| 100 | BREKKE Vegard | BONES Turid | -0,03 | -3 | 100 |
| 101 | BREKKA Erling | ROLFSTAD Inger Skogly | -0,05 | -5 | 100 |
| 102 | LINDAHL Solbritt | HANSSEN Tore | -0,05 | -5 | 100 |
| 103 | DYBDAHL Stig | SJODAL Sofie Grasholt | -0,06 | -6 | 100 |
| 104 | GRUDE Tor Eivind | GRUDE Marian | -0,07 | -5 | 70 |
| 105 | ENGEBRETSEN Geir | OWER Anita | -0,08 | -8 | 99 |
| 106 | EIDE Magne | ALFHEIM Margot | -0,09 | -9 | 100 |


| go to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |


| 107 | MAGNUSSON Stephan | DUC Laurence | -0,12 | -12 | 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 108 | CRICHTON Ross | CRICHTON Pam | -0,12 | -12 | 100 |
| 109 | OZTURK Erdem | CAKICI Ferda | -0,12 | -12 | 100 |
| 110 | FREDIN Peter | BLAAGESTAD Lise | -0,13 | -13 | 100 |
| 111 | HUANG Yan | LU Dong | -0,13 | -8 | 60 |
| 112 | LYBAEK Astrid Steen | ELLINGSEN Kristian | -0,15 | -15 | 100 |
| 113 | SOLVANG Britt Helene | KANDAHL Eivind | -0,15 | -15 | 100 |
| 114 | ROSSARD Martine | ROMANOWSKI Jerzy | -0,15 | -9 | 60 |
| 115 | OPSAL Kari-Anne | GOSVIG Henrik | -0,16 | -16 | 100 |
| 116 | NORENG Hans | NILSEN Solfrid | -0,16 | -16 | 100 |
| 117 | GRAIZER Nurit | HORVITZ Shimshon | -0,17 | -10 | 60 |
| 118 | PONOMAREVA Tatiana | DUBININ Alexander | -0,20 | -18 | 90 |
| 119 | UZUM Dogan | OZGUNES Ayse | -0,20 | -20 | 100 |
| 120 | NEDREBO Sjur | LINDSTROEM Mona | -0,20 | -20 | 99 |
| 121 | ASLA Ronnaug | MARKUSSEN Svein | -0,23 | -16 | 70 |
| 122 | FUGLESTAD Ann Karin | BREKKA Geir | -0,23 | -23 | 100 |
| 123 | SJODAL Elisabeth Grasholt | SJODAL Rolf | -0,23 | -23 | 100 |
| 124 | NAVEH Nurit | MERMELSTEIN Gabi | -0,25 | -15 | 60 |
| 125 | SALONEN Irmeli | MORAWSKI Dariusz | -0,27 | -27 | 99 |
| 126 | VOLDOIRE Jean-Michel | AVON Danielle | -0,28 | -17 | 60 |
| 127 | BERKOWITZ Lisa | BERKOWITZ David | -0,30 | -30 | 100 |
| 128 | CURTIS Catherine | FEGARTY Paul | -0,30 | -30 | 100 |
| 129 | RYNNING Erik | THOREN Vigdis | -0,31 | -31 | 100 |
| 130 | HALFON Nesim Mihail | HALFON Tola | -0,31 | -31 | 100 |
| 131 | THARALDSEN Krista | HANSEN Rolf | -0,32 | -32 | 100 |
| 132 | DE FALCO Dano | CAYNE Patricia | -0,33 | -33 | 100 |
| 133 | BANKOGLU Ergun | BANKOGLU Lelia | -0,33 | -33 | 100 |
| 134 | ERIKSEN Marianne | OTTEMO Willy Roger | -0,34 | -34 | 100 |
| 135 | KIZILOK Omer | KUTUK Basak | -0,35 | -35 | 100 |
| 136 | MILL Cathy | KILVINGTON Grant | -0,38 | -23 | 60 |
| 137 | HANSEN Jonny | FOSSUM Ann Birgitte | -0,39 | -38 | 98 |
| 138 | JENSSEN Ingebrigt | RUBACH Berit | -0,39 | -39 | 100 |
| 139 | BRENNER Anne | CAPRERA David | -0,40 | -40 | 100 |
| 140 | VOLL Charlotte | SOOILAND Tommy | -0,41 | -37 | 90 |
| 141 | THOMASSEN Kurt-Ove | HOLMOY Stine | -0,43 | -30 | 70 |
| 142 | BOHNSACK Susanne | BOHNSACK Henning | -0,44 | -44 | 100 |
| 143 | STABELL Tolle | VOS Vanessa | -0,46 | -46 | 100 |
| 144 | DAI Jianming | SHEN (1) Qi | -0,47 | -28 | 60 |
| 145 | PASKE Thomas | SEALE Catherine | -0,47 | -28 | 60 |
| 146 | JOHANSEN Lars Arthur | KLINGEN Marte Haugen | -0,51 | -46 | 90 |
| 147 | PETTERSEN Ann Marie | PETTERSEN Knut | -0,52 | -47 | 90 |
| 148 | MITCHELL Jacqui | CAYNE Jimmy | -0,53 | -53 | 100 |
| 149 | LIAN Baard | ROBERTSEN Gunn | -0,56 | -45 | 80 |
| 150 | KHANDELWAL Rajeev | KHANDELWAL Himani | -0,57 | -51 | 90 |
| 151 | ANFINSEN Ivar M. | SOLHEIM Eli | -0,57 | -40 | 70 |
| 152 | SIVERTSEN Are | GROVE Lisbeth | -0,59 | -59 | 100 |
| 153 | KVERNSTROM Kristine | HUGLEN Harald | -0,60 | -60 | 100 |
| 154 | PICUS Sue | HOFFMAN David | -0,60 | -60 | 100 |
| 155 | WILLENKEN Chris | BERKOWITZ Dana | -0,60 | -36 | 60 |
| 156 | EIDE Lisbeth Aulid | LOBBEN Terje | -0,61 | -61 | 100 |
| 157 | NICOLAYSEN Finn Robert | FABER Hege Charlotte | -0,69 | -68 | 99 |
| 158 | DUBLAND Kirsten | HERMANSEN Vegard | -0,69 | -62 | 90 |
| 159 | BRIGHTLING Richard J | MOFFAT Leone | -0,70 | -70 | 100 |
| 160 | CORNELL Michael | CORNELL Vivien | -0,71 | -71 | 100 |
| 161 | UNDEM Else | UNDEM Rolf | -0,72 | -65 | 90 |
| 162 | SELFORS Trude | ERLANDSEN Tor Einar | -0,73 | -58 | 80 |


| 163 | PEREZ Nicole | PEREZ Henri | $-0,73$ | -58 | 80 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 164 | OVSTEDAL Finn Gunnar | LARSEN Hilde Anita | $-0,73$ | -44 | 60 |
| 165 | JOHANSEN Helen | AUNOIEN Arne Georg | $-0,75$ | -75 | 100 |
| 166 | HERLAND John Helge | NYHEIM Randi | $-0,76$ | -76 | 100 |
| 167 | FENESS Jorunn | KOPSTAD Kjell Otto | $-0,77$ | -77 | 100 |
| 168 | STRAND Kay | VAAGLAND Anette | $-0,79$ | -70 | 89 |
| 169 | FRENKEL Rachel | SAWICKI Henry | $-0,82$ | -49 | 60 |
| 170 | HETZ Nathan | SVENDSEN Tone Torkelsen-0,92 | -55 | 60 |  |
| 171 | REITAN Egil Inge | SKRE Ingunn | $-0,92$ | -83 | 90 |
| 172 | KRISTIANSEN Tommy | ELSTAD Stine | $-0,93$ | -93 | 100 |
| 173 | SOLUM Ragnhild | GARVIK Oystein | $-0,93$ | -84 | 90 |
| 174 | CABANES Bernard | WARD-PLATT Kiki | $-0,94$ | -92 | 98 |
| 175 | HUNTER Jill | FIENBERG Matthew | $-0,94$ | -85 | 90 |
| 176 | MOE Haavard | GODEJORD Oddrun | $-0,97$ | -87 | 90 |
| 177 | EGGELING Marie | GOTARD Thomas | $-1,04$ | -73 | 70 |
| 178 | WEIMAN Magnus | WEIMAN Maureen | $-1,06$ | -95 | 90 |
| 179 | MARK Micha | MARK Sonia | $-1,07$ | -64 | 60 |
| 180 | MALUISH Annette Elizabeth | MILL Andrew John | $-1,14$ | -114 | 100 |
| 181 | LINDQUIST Margrethe | KRISTOFFERSEN Ludvig | $-1,18$ | -106 | 90 |
| 182 | HARDING Marianne | GILLIS Simon | $-1,26$ | -126 | 100 |
| 183 | AUSTLI Gerd Inger | JANSSON Lennart | $-1,30$ | -130 | 100 |
| 184 | McLEISH Paula | McLEISH David Whalley | $-1,42$ | -142 | 100 |
| 185 | KNUTSEN Einar | KNUTSEN Gerd Irene | $-1,46$ | -117 | 80 |
| 186 | FJAELBERG Anne Lise | LERBREKK Reidar | $-1,88$ | -169 | 90 |

## MIXED PAIRS FORMAT

After the Qualification stage (50 boards on Tuesday) a total of 80 pairs will qualify to Semifinal A ( 50 boards on Wednesday), including the drop in pairs from semifinals and final of the Mixed Teams.
The remaining pairs will play Semi Final B (50 boards on Wednesday).
There will be a linear carry-over from Qualification to Semifinal A: the top ranked pair will get 120 mp (approximately 1,5 tops), the last ranked will get 0 mp . The exact value of each step will be known only when the exact numbers will be known, and immediately published.
The drop in pairs will get a carry-over of 60 mp .
There will be a linear carry-over from Qualification to Semifinal B: the top ranked pair will get 0,5 top, the last ranked will get 0 mp . Each step depending on the value of the top (unknown at the moment).
A total of 52 Pairs will qualify to the Final: 46 from Semifinal A and 6 from Semifinal B There will be a linear carry-over from Semifinal A and from Semifinal B to the Final:

- the top tanked team of Semifinal A will get 90 mp (almost two tops)
- the 46th ranked of Semifinal A will get 0 mp
- the pairs ranked from 6th to 1 st of Semifinal B will get $0,8,16,24,32$ and 40 mp respectively

The Final will be played over two days, on Thursday and Friday. The movement will be a Barometer Howell (Endless Howell) with all pairs meeting each other, and same boards played simultaneously on every table. 52 boards on Thursday in five sessions of 10, 10, 10, 10, and 12 respectively, and 50 on Friday.

The pairs not qualified to the Final can play the EBL Cup (five sessions of 10 boards each on Thursday and Friday) free of charge, provided they register before 21.00 h ., on Wednesday.

## TIME SCHEDULE

(The starting time of all sessions is the same in each of the three stages of the Mixed Pairs and $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { in the EBL Cup) } & 10.00 & 11.45 & 14.30 & 16.15 & 18.00\end{array}$

go to page: |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

| 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## MIXED TEAMS KNOCKOUT



