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Mayor of Tromsø Jens Johan Hjort and EBL President Yves Aubry
Today sees the start of the Mixed Pairs Final, an all play all, with the 52 pairs contesting 102 deals. At the same time, the EBL Cup gets under way.
There is a severe weather alert for Tromsø - you can expect some very heavy rain today and even more so tomorrow.

We are sorry to learn about the death of Fulvio Colizzi. Many of you will remember him as the driving force behind the main office at a host of World and European Championships. We hope to publish a full obituary in a subsequent issue.


## TODAY'S SCHEDULE

MIXED PAIRS FINALS
10.00-11.30: Round 1
11.45-13.15: Round 2
14.30-16.00: Round 3
16.15-17.45: Round 4
18.00-19.45: Round 5

## OPEN PAIRS EBL

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


Peter Craeymeersch Director of the Ostend Office of Tourism Bart Magerman President of the Organising Committee Yves Aubry Presidentof the European Bridge League Marc de Pauw President of the Royal Belgium Bridge Federation

Signing the Contract for the 2018 European Team Championships 4-18 June Ostend

## NEW VIDEOS AVAILABLE


"Dennis's Solution"

"Prize Giving of the Mixed Teams"

"Test your play with Marion Michielsen"


White House Interview - Winners of the Mixed Teams

## EVERY MATCHPOINT COUNTS

by Mark Horton

Bridge can exercise a fascination all of its own and sometimes one can derive some succour from the most horrendous of results.
Australia's Justin Howard found his way into the Bulletin room to report this self-inflicted disaster:

Dealer South. All Vul
A A 10975
$\checkmark 5$
$\diamond$ Q 9852
\& Q J

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A Q |  | ¢ J 6432 |
| $\bigcirc$ AQ643 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc 108$ |
| $\diamond$ A K J 1064 | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | $\diamond-$ |
| of 2 |  | \& K 107543 |
| 9 | K 8 |  |
| $\checkmark$ | K J 972 |  |
| $\diamond$ | 73 |  |
| \& | A986 |  |


| West <br> Howard | North | East <br> Darling | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2 \diamond$ |  |  | $1 \checkmark$ |
| 3 NT | Pass | $2 \wedge$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Knowing that a double of $2 \diamond$ was coming his partner, Marina Darling, tried an advance rescue, but when her bid was taken seriously West soon found himself in very hot water (to be fair that is not necessarily such a bad thing in the Arctic Circle).

North led the five of hearts for the king and ace and when declarer played the queen of spades South won with the king and returned the jack of hearts, covered by the king and ruffed.
When North switched to the queen of clubs declarer ducked (Would you have found the brilliant defence of overtaking it with the ace and continuing with the nine of hearts, which will give the defenders seven tricks? I recall Roman Smolski making this type of play during the World Pairs Championships in Biarritz.) North continued with the jack of clubs, covered by the king and ruffed by declarer, who played the ace, king and jack of diamonds.

When North attempted to exit with the nine of diamonds declarer ducked!
North played the ace of spades, but declarer discarded a heart and now dummy could win the next spade with the jack and that, together with the ten of clubs provided parking places for the two losing hearts.
Four down would have given N/S almost all the match points but -800 was worth only $85 \%$.

Whilst admiring West's elegant play I should point out that he can win the diamond exit and play the six of hearts. South wins and plays a spade but declarer ruffs and plays the four of hearts. South wins but must return the two of hearts to West's three for the same -800.
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## FULL HOUSE VS A J DIAMONDS

by John Carruthers

## Mixed Teams Semifinal

Once the knockout rounds of a European Mixed Teams Championship are reached, any team can beat any other. Finishing in the top 18 percent of a two-day Swiss qualifier assures a degree of competence. Most of the names are familiar, if not the partnerships, and so it was with our semifinal match, featuring the transnational team FULL HOUSE (Karen McCallum, USA; Cecilia Rimstedt, Sweden; Cenk Tuncok, USA; Johan Upmark, Sweden), the second-place qualifier, and the all-Polish squad AJ DIAMONDS (Cathy Baldysz, Ewa Harasimowicz, Przemislaw Janiszewski, Andrzej Jaszczak, Anna Sarniak, Andrzej Wojcieszek), who had finished tenth.

Janiszewski upgraded his hand on the first board of the match, but Tuncok/McCallum defended carefully to make him pay the price.

Board 1. Dealer North, Neither Vul.

- 54
© 742
$\diamond$ AJ63
\& J J 1093


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sarniak | McCallum | JaniszewskiTuncok |  |
|  | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2ヶ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Tuncok led the queen of hearts, ducked by declarer. Having received a count card from McCallum, South began to work on severing the links between declarer's hand and the dummy by continuing with another heart. Declarer won this with dummy's ten and led a low spade to his king
and, when that held, continued with the ten of spades. South ducked that as well and declarer overtook it with the queen to lead a diamond to his king. When that held, he cashed his top clubs and exited with a spade, hoping that South would give him the dummy. Not today. Despite the early hour, Tuncok had had his early-morning Turkish coffee and was wide awake. He led a diamond to McCallum's ace and she had two club tricks to take for one off, +50 North/South.

Declarer could have made three no trumps. As the play went, when in dummy with the queen of spades, declarer cashes the ace of hearts, discarding his remaining spade as North's last major-suit card is removed. Then, three rounds of clubs puts North in to allow declarer two diamond tricks and a long club, however North plays. A finesse for the jack of diamonds may be necessary. Note that declarer cannot play diamonds before clubs as that allows North to score a long diamond.

Should declarer have played that way? North had given count in the majors to help South know when to take his winners there, so that line of play was not quite double dummy.

| At the other table: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak |
|  | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2\& | Pass | 2 $\diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | All Pass |  |  |

Upmark was a little more circumspect than Janiszewski had been, passing Rimstedt's invitation. He received a fourth-best spade lead, which he took with his king. He led the ten of spades, ducked, and another to South's ace. Jaszczak shifted to the queen of hearts, which Upmark won with the ace in dummy to cash his spade winner, discarding a club from hand. He continued with three rounds of clubs to North. She cashed her clubs then exited with a diamond to declarer's queen. When Upmark led a heart, South had to win his king. The defence then had to give declarer a red winner for his eighth trick for +120 and a 5-IMP gain to FULL HOUSE.


Upmark could also have made nine tricks, and more easily than Janiszewski. He needed to duck the first heart, Then West's major-suit winners would have forced two discards from North and allowed East to make four tricks in the minor suits.

Board 2 was a routine Weak Two/Multi Two Diamonds deal that resulted in +450 to both sides.

Board 3 was an almost-laydown six-spade slam on 16 opposite 11, bid very confidently on complex auctions by both North/South pairs for +980 .

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

$$
\text { A K Q J } 108
$$

$\checkmark 6$
$\diamond$ A J 93
\& 964

|  | A 7 |  | A 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | J 52 | N | $\bigcirc$ K 1083 |
| $\diamond$ | 854 | $\mathrm{W}^{\text {c }}$ E | $\diamond$ Q 10762 |
| - | J 10532 |  | \& Q 87 |
|  |  | ¢ 96542 |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ AQ 974 |  |
|  |  | $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ |  |
|  |  | \& AK |  |

Open Room

| West <br> Sarniak | North <br> McCallum | East <br> JaniszewskiTuncok |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \varsigma^{*}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\phi}^{*} \boldsymbol{\omega}^{*}$ |

All Pass

Every bid in the auction was alerted but for six spades. We were informed that one club was strong and that one heart showed a positive with spades. Beyond that, we were left adrift in a sea of ignorance. Be that as it may, Tuncok knew, by the time McCallum bid three no trumps, that slam was good and grand slam impossible. We suspect that some of the alerts (two hearts, three clubs and three hearts) were relays asking about controls and trump suit quality, which would explain his abrupt termination of the auction. There was little to the play.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak |
| Pass | 24** | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 24 | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 4* |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 4® |
| Pass | 4NT | Pass | 5® |
| Pass | 64 | All Pass |  |

Here, two clubs was natural or a game-forcing spade raise, to be revealed at North's next turn. The rest of the auction was fairly straightforward, with North insisting on spades, both partners control bidding, and finally North using Roman Key Card Blackwood to determine the final contract.

That was a very elegant flat board.
Board 4 was anything but flat, elegant or routine.

Board 4. Dealer West. Both Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sarniak | McCallum | JaniszewskiTuncok |  |
| $1 \otimes$ | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak |
| $1 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |

All Pass
McCallum made a thoughtful bid at her second turn and Tuncok had an easy conversion to the best game. Sarniak led the king of hearts against
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three notrump and took her heart winners when in with the ace of clubs to allow an overtrick, +630 to NS.

Baldysz made her system bid at her first turn to speak, but that meant Jaszczak had to guess at his side's best contract. He guessed wrongly and declarer lost the obvious three tricks for -100 and 12 IMPs to FULL HOUSE, now leading 17-0.

The next board was a push, but what a push it was!
Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
4 A J 3
$\checkmark$ K 65
$\diamond 54$
\& Q J 1086


| Open Room <br> West |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| North | East | South |  |
| Sarniak | $M c C a l l u m$ | JaniszewskiTuncok |  |
|  | $1 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| 2NT | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Double |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | Double | All Pass |  |

It's never easy to bid a cold game in the suit in which your opponents have opened. Nevertheless, playing a strong club, McCallum's one-diamond opening was merely a noise. Janiszewski's hand got better as the auction progressed. When the defence cashed a spade and a heart and never led trumps, declarer ruffed four clubs in hand to score +550 . The defence have to lead trumps twice to scuttle the game.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark | Jaszczak |
| $3 \diamond$ | $1 \boldsymbol{Q}^{*}$ | $1 ヵ$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | Double |

All Pass
Here, the defence got a round of trumps in, so declarer ruffed his three club losers in the dummy to score the same +550 for a flat board.

Board 6 was a club partial with overtricks, +150 each way. Still 17-0 FULL HOUSE.

Board 7 had the possibility for a potential disaster:

Board 7. Dealer South. Both Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South <br> Sarniak |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | McCallum |  | JaniszewskiTuncok |

All Pass

| 2NT | FG Relay |
| :--- | :--- |
| 3\% | Minimum |

Closed Room

| West <br> Rimstedt | North <br> Baldysz | East <br> Upmark | South <br> Jaszczak |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1 \%$ <br> Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |  |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Baldysz/Jaszczak had what looks like a normal Polish Club auction to the top spot, four hearts. Upmark led a spade and Baldysz knocked out the top hearts and made 11 tricks for +450 .

It appears that Tuncok intended his four diamonds as a control-bid in support of hearts and that McCallum took it as natural. Otherwise. her pass of five diamonds is mysterious at best. Sarniak led a spade and Tuncok was soon wrapping up 11 tricks, losing only 2 IMPs. Had Sarniak been prescient enough to start with the ace of hearts, Tuncok/McCallum would have been -50.

As it was, AJ DIAMONDS won 2 IMPs to get on the scoreboard; 17-2 FULL HOUSE.

Board 8 was 2 IMPs the other way in one notrump at both tables; +120 to AJ DIAMONDS and +210 to FULL HOUSE at the other table. Board 9 was a push in a normal four-spade game and FULL HOUSE won 3 more in a partscore battle on Board 10; 22-2 FULL HOUSE now.

On Board 11, Rimstedt/Upmark bid to a normal three notrump, making three for +400 . However, their teammates were caught speeding in two diamonds doubled for 500 after an 11-13 weak notrump, so that was 3 IMPs to AJ DIAMONDS, making the running score 22-5.

There was a bit of amusement on Board 12. McCallum/Tuncok made three trump tricks defending against four hearts with a combined trump holding of ace-seven-six opposite jackthree. However, the result of all this bounty in the trump suit meant that McCallum became endplayed in the mid-game, and had to lead a diamond from the king into declarer's ace-queen. At the other table, declarer lost two diamonds and just one heart. Both sides made +420 .

On the penultimate board, both sides declared three notrump with a 6-2 heart fit when four hearts was slightly the better contract; +660 and another flat board. Still 22-5 for FULL HOUSE.

Board 14. Dealer East. Neither Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sarniak | McCallum | JaniszewskiTuncok |  |
|  |  | Pass | 1NT* |
| Double | Pass* | Pass* | Redouble* |
| 2\& | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |



The match was broadcast live on Youtube

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rimstedt | Baldysz | Upmark <br> Jaszczak |  |
| $1 \%$ |  | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \%$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \%$ | All Pass |  |  |

Rimstedt and Upmark had a normal auction in these days of feather-light opening bids, where West might have had an ace less for her bidding. Rimstedt made ten tricks, for +130 .

Tuncok's one no trump was an emaciated 1113 and McCallum's pass forced redouble, either to play there or to run. Janiszewski's pass promised some values and Sarniak said that her double was based on a good club suit.

Janiszewski received the three of hearts for an opening lead. He ducked that to North's king and North knocked out dummy's ace of hearts at trick two. Declarer led the jack of clubs, holding the trick, crossed to the ace of spades and led a club from hand. South went up with the ace, North discarding the nine of diamonds, and shifted to the jack of spades, which Janiszewski allowed to hold. South got out with his third heart and declarer cashed both heart winners, South discarding a spade. The spades were now good, so East cashed both of those, enveloping Tuncok in a show-up squeeze in the minors for an overtrick. Plus 430 against -130 sent 7 IMPs AJ DIAMONDS' way.

The final score of the set was FULL HOUSE 22 - AJ DIAMONDS 12. It had been an engaging set, despite the lack of big swings, and both teams had played pretty well.
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A few days ago we published in csbnews. org an article written in 2006 by Justin Lall entitled Consistency in which he begins with:
Constructive bidding is all about describing your hand until somebody can place the contract. You start with a very general description, like a 1 opener showing $5+$ spades, $11-21 \mathrm{HCP}$, and then refine that description with each bid. Since you are refining your hand based on previous bids, you are stuck with your prior judgment of the hand. You cannot change your mind.
In the first set of the European Mixed Teams Championship some players would have benefited from Justin's advice:

QF Set 1, Board 13. Dealer North. All Vul.
A J10854
$\odot 98752$
$\diamond$ K 103

|  | 96 |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | AQ 3 |
| $\diamond$ | 9752 |
| \& | K 952 |


A A 2
$\diamond$
$\diamond$ K J
$\diamond$ Q 86
\& Q 8763

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { s } & \text { K Q } 73 \\
\diamond & 1064 \\
\diamond & \text { A } 4 \\
\text { \& A J } 105
\end{array}
$$

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lindaas | McCallum | Ringseth | Tuncok |
|  | Pass | $1 \%^{*}$ | Dble |
| $2 \%$ | 24 | $3 \%$ | Pass |
| Pass | 30 | Pass | 44 |

All Pass
1\% Might be strong
After West's Pass, McCallum re-opened with her second suit and now Tuncok, feeling guilty about having an exceptionally strong hand in support of spades...trying to compensate, jumped to game. Three hearts and the trump ace sealed the contract's fate, one down. At the other table South acted more consistently and drew water for his mill.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Upmark | Fredin | Rimstedt | Blaagestad |
|  | Pass | $1 \propto \%$ | Pass |
| 19* | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \varnothing$ | 2NT | Pass |
| 3\& | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

1\% Could be strong
14 Balanced, 9+
After North's protective action South was happy to double; one down and 7 IMPs.

In the other match the same situation arose.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zimmermann | Charlsen | Zocho | Larsson |
|  | Pass | 1\% | Pass |
| 1NT | 2\%** | Pass | 49 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| 24 Majors |  |  |  |

Larsson, with a double fit, and KQxx in spades, feeling guilty about having an exceptionally strong hand in support of spades...tried to compensate , and jumped to game. One down.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hoftaniska | Cronier | KBertheaud'Ovidio |  |
|  | Pass | $1 \propto$ | Pass |
| 1 NT | Pass | $2 \%$ | Pass |
| $3 \%$ | All Pass |  |  |

At the other table d'Ovidio was all consistency... she never opened her mouth and her silence gave her team 5 IMPs.
Justin asks in his article:
How often do you see people feeling guilty about having an exceptionally strong or weak hand for their bidding and trying to compensate?
It sounds familiar?
You watch or you suffer?

$$
\Delta \diamond \diamond d
$$



## 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

## Captions received so far:

I know it's freezing, but bear with me, please," said Jan, icily.

EOK

Mmm...I like this hand.

Let's play this hand.
Gimme five.

Jan, you know I won't seal this treaty
I'd rather you treated me with a seal.
Tu veux ma cygnaature ?
(Swan $->$ cygne $->$ signature)
to be pronounced with a heavy parisian accent.
Tu veux que je te fasse le coup de l'ours en plus?
Pascal Nermel, France
We are all human.
DCuIngen
Yuck! Unbearable hand!

THE NEW APP ON BIDDING

FOR TABLETS AND SMARTPHONES

## AVAILABLE IN THE APP

 STORE AND GOOGLE PLAYMORE INFO:
jvcleeff@xs4all.nl
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## WHITE HOUSE VS ZIMMERMANN

by Ram Soffer

The first session of the Mixed Teams semifinals produced low scores in both matches. The more swingy deals of the second half decided the identity of the finalists.
White House had led 25:12 at half time, and this lead was almost doubled within a single board.

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

```
A KJ
    \diamond K Q J 9 5 2
    \diamond K J 8 4
    & }
```



| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multon | Wortel | Willard | Hop |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 1NT | $2 \diamond$ | 38 | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | 44 | All Pass |

A good slam with 24 HCP , not easy to find. There was no way for East to tell that her partner held the perfect cards. In the other semifinal, after a similar auction. West bid 4at his second turn and it propelled the auction towards a slam. Multon wasn't excited by his 4-3-3-3 15-count, and his cautious 3 bid was followed by a sign-off in 4 4 .

| West <br> Bakkeren | North <br> Cronier | East <br> L.Madsen | South <br> D'Ovidio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass |  |  |  |

Due to systemic reasons Bakkeren didn't open 1NT, and his second bid was a jump to 3 . This sounded much more encouraging to East. It's the kind of hand where once you start cuebidding,
you get to a slam. The play was not an issue, since with a doubleton $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{KJ}$ onside there was no way to fail. 11 IMPs to White House.

Franck Multon shone in the next board, preventing another big swing in White House's favour.

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

| - | A Q J |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ | 1084 |
| $\diamond$ | 107652 |
|  | K 9 |



| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Wortel | Willard | Hop |
| $1 \& 6$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

A fancy $4 \diamond$ bid by Jacco Hop shut out any further competition by E/W. His partner raised to game. Multon realized that his team needed urgent IMPs and made a penalty double based on his two aces plus the fact that the opponent's bidding sounded weak.
The real problem was finding the way to set the contract. Declarer has four immediate losers, but he is threatening to get rid of two of them by a ruffing finesse in spades.
A black suit lead would have been fatal, but Multon chose the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$. South's weak bidding indicated that East holds either $\smile \mathrm{K}$ or $\& \mathrm{~A}$ (maybe both). Multon chose the practical continuation of $\checkmark A$ in order to get a signal from partner.
The spectators could see that switching to a small heart would have put the contract down two, but that play was far too risky to be considered seriously.
When the defence took $๑ \mathrm{~A}$ followed by $\smile \mathrm{K}$, N/S were -100.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bakkeren | Cronier | L.Madsen D'Ovidio |  |
| 1\& | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| 3\& | 3NT | $4 \uparrow$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

At the other table N/S attempted 3NT (going down after a heart switch, but making if the defence persists with spades). After Lund-Madsen competed to $4 \uparrow$, Cronier had no interest in $5 \diamond$, preferring to collect a sure profit to the tune of +200 , as declarer had two inevitable losers in both black suits. Luckily for him, North's club ruff comes at the expense of a natural trump trick. E/W -200, and 7 IMPs to Zimmermann.

The next few deals included some partscores, as well as marginal games. On Board 18 Zimmermann bid 4ヵ, which had no play, while White House stopped in 24. Two boards later both teams stopped in $2 \mathbf{N}$, making 10 and 11 tricks respectively, when a trump lead was the only one to set 4.
On Board 23 White House erred by failing to bid a game which required little more that a 3-2 trump break, conceding 9 IMPs to Zimmermann. At that stage their lead was down to 42:30, and the next few deals were crucial.

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.
A 108543
$\checkmark$ A 3
$\diamond 1063$
of A 95


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Wortel | Willard | Hop |
| 1NT | All Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bakkeren | Cronier | L.Madsen D'Ovidio |  |
| 1NT | All Pass |  |  |

This was a pretty exciting 1 NT ! According to the computer West is cold for eight tricks, but this
requires some good guessing at the table.
Wortel started off with a spade won by declarer's ゅK. Multon continued $\ominus \mathrm{J}$. Wortel took her $๑ \mathrm{~A}$ immediately and continued spades.
So far, so good. At that stage Multon had five sure tricks. Both red suits gave options for two extra tricks, and it was possible to combine them by starting with $\diamond \mathrm{AK}$, then finessing hearts if $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ doesn't drop.
However, in the heat of battle even the very best sometimes miss simple ideas. Multon cashed just one high diamond, and it turned out to be his last trick! The heart finesse lost to Hop's $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$, and the $\% \mathrm{~J}$ followed. North had three good spades at that stage, so declarer was already booked for down two, but when Multon covered the second round of clubs, it became an unpleasant down four. West ended up with three tricks, having started with four tricks off the top. It was a blow from which Zimmermann's team could not recover.
At the other room Bakkeren's play was not perfect either. This time North didn't cover $\oslash \mathrm{J}$ with the ace at trick two. It was South's $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ which won the trick, after declarer didn't guess to put up the ๑K. A club switch ensured down one, but at least spades were not yet set up, so declarer had time for 4 diamond tricks. The difference between -50 and -200 was 4 important IMPs to White House.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- AK 102
$\checkmark 74$
$\diamond$ K 532
\& Q 53

| A 97 |  | ^ Q J 8653 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ K 2 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ - | $\checkmark$ AJ5 |
| $\diamond$ A J 109 | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond 876$ |
| \& A 10972 |  | - J |
| , | 4 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | Q 109863 | 3 |
| $\diamond$ | Q 4 |  |
| \& | K 864 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Wortel | Willard | Hop |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | $1 \uparrow$ | 30 |
| 3NT | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

In order to make 4 $\boldsymbol{A}$, Sylvie Willard had to cater for the 4-1 trump break, which she didn't. South led \&6, won by dummy's $\$ 7$. The $\mathbf{7}$ was overtaken by $\boldsymbol{\top}$, and the $\diamond 8$ was covered by South's $\diamond Q$ and dummy's $\diamond \mathrm{A}$.
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At this point the contract could have been made by ruffing a club in order to shorten declarer's trumps. Essentially this is a variant of the trump coup. The idea is to eliminate all of North's nontrump cards and only then lead the 9 . The problem is that there is no line of playing working against both 4-1 and 3-2 trump splits. Meike Wortel did very well not to double 44, which would have helped declarer to guess the actual distribution.
After declarer found out that trumps were 4-1, it was too late to execute the coup: 9 was taken with $\$$, and North returned a heart. Eventually Willard ruffed one club, but in the endgame she still held one more trump than North, so the A 10 won the final two tricks.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bakkeren | Cronier | L.Madsen D'Ovidio |  |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 ヵ$ | Dble |
| Rdbl | Pass | Pass | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass

Bakkeren took a less optimistic view of his cards and his only action was redoubling to show points. South bought the contract in $3 \checkmark$. The defence managed only one club ruff, but it was sufficient to set the contract by one trick. +50 and +100 from the other room translated into 4 IMPs for White House in a deal which could have been a big swing against them.

The next deal put the final nail in the coffin.


Ton Bakkeren, team White House


Team White House, winner of the Mixed Teams
Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { s } & 7632 \\
\diamond & \text { K } 8 \\
\diamond & \text { A Q J 3 } \\
\& & \text { K } 84
\end{array}
$$

A K J
© J 10652
$\diamond$ K 5
\& 9532


A Q 1085
$\odot 3$
$\diamond 8742$
\& J 76

- 94
® AQ 974
$\diamond 1096$
\& A Q 10

| West <br> Multon | North <br> Wortel | East <br> Willard | South <br> Hop |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\text { Pass }}$ | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |  |
| Pass | $2 \Omega$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | 2NT |
|  |  | All Pass |  |

North started with an artificial 2\& response, after which East could neither enter the bidding nor double for a lead. South became the declarer and Multon could not fathom the need for a spade lead. Any other lead allows at least 10 tricks to be made, and his actual choice of V 5 allowed 11. $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}+660$.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bakkeren | Cronier | L.Madsen D'Ovidio |  |
|  |  | Pass | 10 |
| Pass | $1 ヵ$ | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | 3NT | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | $4 \Omega$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

D'Ovidio/Cronier took the natural route to 3NT, but the contract was doomed when Lund-Madsen took the opportunity to double for a spade lead (a somewhat risky double which might have not worked, had the $\mathbf{\$ K}$ been with North).
The attempt to play $4 \bigcirc$ didn't turn out better: -200 and 13 IMPs to White House. Their final margin of victory was 66:33.

## UPSIDE DOWN

With the Mixed Teams Championships over, all the players have now moved over to the Mixed Pairs which started qualifying yesterday morning. One of the pairs doing very well on the first day was Penfold-Senior, England, and we followed them on the first two boards to see what was going on with them.

Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.

- K 52
$\checkmark$ Q 9
$\diamond 95$
\& K Q J 432


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Upmark | Penfold | Rimstedt | Senior |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | $4 \uparrow$ |

Upmark led the ace and king of diamonds, to learn that partner had four of them by the up-side

down count given by Rimstedt. West then shifted to the ten of hearts, Senior tried the queen of hearts from dummy which was covered by the king and his ace. Senior then played the eight of clubs, Upmark rose with the ace to see the ten coming from partner. Now it was very straightforward to return a club for partner to ruff to set the contract two tricks. The point is that the ten of clubs meant that she couldn't have two clubs any longer.

One down would have been 41-37 (almost average) in MPs while two down gave E-W 57-21 to E-W.

Board 2. Dealer East. N-S Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Upmark | Penfold | Rimstedt <br> Senior |  |
| 4ヵ |  | Pass | Pass |

Penfold led the ace of hearts and quickly switched to a trump when seeing what came down in dummy. With that defence declarer's possibility to ruff a diamond in dummy was gone and Penfold had beaten the contract. When diamonds were 3-3, which was the best declarer could hope for, the score reversed the loss from the first board of the round since $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ retrieved 58-20 in MPs.

It is worth mentioning that at eleven tables, E-W played Two or Three Spades, and that -140 was the average score on the board. One might expect differently when these kind of distributions are being dealt.
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## MIXED TEAMS FINAL, FIRST HALF

by Jos Jacobs

On the last three boards of their semi-final match, Poland's AJ Diamonds had secured their place in the final, beating a Full House of opponents.
In the other semi, the White House had secured entry into the final at a much earlier stage, having led the Zimmermann team for most of the match by a much bigger margin than the Poles had ever reached against Full House.

Anyone who would have thought that, on the basis of all this, that White House were favourites for the final, would have felt quite happy after seeing the Dutch take the lead, 1-0, on the opening board.

On the next board, however, they started talking business:

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


In the Open Room, East had a systemic opening available to show her main suit:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek | Wortel | Sarniak | J Hop |
| $2 \diamond$ |  | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | All Pass |

Red v. green, South could not produce a spade overcall as he lacked the high-card values for it. North had the reverse problem: she had more than enough points but no shape whatsoever with which to reasonably enter the bidding. So the Dutch could think of nothing better than sell out to $3 \%$ which lost the obvious five tricks, the White House +50 .

In the Closed Room, East did not open:
Closed Room

| West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| LundMadsen Baldysz |$\quad$| Bakkeren Jaszczak |
| :--- |

Given a free run, NS had little trouble in reaching their game once South decided to open a Multi. Top club lead ruffed, diamond to the king and ace, two rounds of trumps, club ruff, two more trumps. Now, declarer decided to run the 9 J , which held, after which he had 11 tricks since West was squeezed in the reds as well. AJ Diamonds +650 and 12 IMPs to open their account in a much better way.

On the next board, AJ Diamonds gained another 5 IMPs by making a correct KJ guess in a side suit to land a partscore that went down in the other room. On board 5, the Poles added another 5 IMPs when their Polish Club kept them out of trouble:

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.




Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek | Wortel | Sarniak | JHop |
|  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{6}$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

$1 \%$ is forcing in Poland and the $3 \checkmark$ rebid showed
a GF hand so West's raise to game was mandatory with nothing better to show. On the actual layout, 10 tricks proved easy. AJ Diamonds +420 .

In the Closed Room, East did not open with a one-round forcing bid:

Closed Room

| West $\quad$ North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LundMadsen Baldysz | Bakkeren Jaszczak |  |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

When West could not even produce a courtesy raise, holding four-card support, the auction came to rest in 14. Twelve tricks for +230 to the Dutch, but another 5 IMPs to the Poles who suddenly led 23-1.

On the next board, the Poles got the chance to put the match almost out of reach of their opponents but, surprisingly in my opinion, they failed:

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


In the Closed Room, the Dutch bid a not very ambitious game:

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| LundMadsen | Baldysz | Bakkeren | Jaszczak |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 28 | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Ton Bakkeren got the normal $\boldsymbol{\$} \mathrm{J}$ lead, which he won with the ace. He continued $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and a diamond to the ten (the correct percentage play). North won her king and continued the A Q . Bakkeren ducked this, to rectify the count for a double squeeze, always a pretty sight. North
played another spade, which Bakkeren won with the king. Then came three top hearts and the two remaining diamond winners, ending in hand. With North holding the last heart and South the last spade, neither defender could keep a club guard...+660 to the White House.

This should have been a routine slam hand, one might think, as $6 \diamond$ may not be laydown but is cold on the same percentage play in diamonds. In the Open Room, the Poles did indeed get to slam, and they did so very smoothly:

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek | Wortel | Sarniak <br> J Hop |  |
| $3 \diamond$ |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 N T$ | Pass |
| $5 \&$ | Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |

34 splinter, 4\% cuebid, RKC (1 keycard) and there you are. Declarer won the $\triangle 8$ lead in hand and immediately led a low diamond to the queen, probably intending to just draw two rounds of trumps without losing a trick, and then continuing on cross-ruff lines. In retrospect, this looks like a line of play that is about as good as any because you would need decent breaks in most suits anyway. Best seems to try to ruff two clubs in hand, a plan that would have worked, had the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ held the trick, but also after $\diamond A$ and a diamond to the ten losing to the king, if North did not hold a third trump.
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Two boards later, both teams were offered a chance to score heavily:


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek | Wortel | Sarniak | J Hop |
| $1 \Omega$ | $2 \Omega$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 \uparrow$ | Dble | $4 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Meike Wortel's $2 \circlearrowleft$ two-suited overcall was very aggressive and might very well have backfired, had West realised what was going on. To me, a clear penalty double of 3 after South's invitational action was just what Sarniak had been hoping for when she cleverly passed $2 \Omega$, but this sort of double should imply some useful values in the minors too. Had West realised this, he would certainly have doubled and led a trump on general principles. This would probably have netted +800 .



At the table, West did not double. He led his singleton spade, which enabled declarer to win the ace and return the suit. East won the jack and led the $\diamond 7$ through to West's queen. Then, finally came a trump to dummy's ten and East's king. East returned a low spade which was ruffed and overruffed but with only red cards left, West did not realise or, maybe, could not read, that $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ was a safe exit. When he continued the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and another, declarer got rid of one more losing spade and thus escaped for down two, +100 to AJ Diamonds.
In the other room, the auction was short:
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| LundMadsen | Baldysz | Bakkeren Jaszczak |  |
| Pass | 2ム | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

When Baldysz decided to open her black twosuiter in 2nd position, Jaszczak saw no reason to rescue himself at the three-level. East led a heart which declarer ran to her queen, so West won the king and continued the $\% 9$ to the ten and king. East next led another heart which cost the defence a diamond trick when dummy's ace won, declarer shedding a diamond. She then ruffed a heart in hand, scoring a low trump, and played her last diamond to the king and ace. A fourth heart from West was ruffed by declarer's three and overruffed with the four. At this point, East could safely start drawing trumps by playing the AK. So the contract went down three for +500 and 9 IMPs to the White House to reduce their deficit to just 3 IMPs.
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On the next board, Christina Lund Madsen seemed to fall from grace:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
ค AKQ964
$\checkmark$ J 1093
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$
of K 2

| A 105 |  |  | 4 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 62 |  | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathbf{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc$ | K Q 854 |
| $\diamond 732$ |  | ${ }_{\text {S }}$ | $\diamond$ | A K 6 |
| ¢ Q J 753 |  |  | \& | 10864 |
|  |  | J 872 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | 7 |  |  |
|  |  | J 1098 | 4 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek | Wortel | Sarniak | JHop |
|  | $1 \Phi$ | $2 \Phi$ | $4 \Phi$ |

One overtrick in what should have been a deal without history. The White House +450 .

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LundMadsen Baldysz | Bakkeren Jaszzzak |  |  |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 ๑$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

The reasons to include this hand in my report are many. First of all, I have no idea as to the merit of West's double. Maybe, she thought that partner's overcall should show a much stronger hand, an idea with which I tend to sympathise. Another reason is that I do not understand the result: only +590 . I can imagine declarer played very safe for his 10 tricks but a doubled overtrick would be worth another 2 IMPs whereas the risk of going down is close to zero.

The third reason to include this deal is in fact the most remarkable of all: the 4 IMPs scored by AJ Diamonds were their last entry on the score sheet of an IMP number bigger than 2. They managed only 7 IMPs on the remaining 19 boards, consisting of five singles and one two. I graciously admit that their opponents fared little better: apart from the two major swings reported below, they could not score more than 3 IMPs over the last 16 boards, consisting of a two and a one.

Over now to the two boards that did trouble the scorers in a more significant way.

This was the first:
Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.
A J 9652
$\checkmark$ AK 92
$\diamond 7$
of 1065


| Open Room <br> West | North | East | South <br> Wojcieszek |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wortel | Sarniak | JHop <br> $2 \diamond$ |  |
| 2ヵ |  |  | Pass |
| 3NT | ANT | Pass |  |

If the J comes down on the second or third spade, you might even make 3NT on a good day. But on last Tuesday, this was asking far too much.

South led a low diamond to declarer's eight and a low heart was won by North with the king. Back came a club, won by declarer's jack. Sarniak's next move was to overtake the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$ with dummy's ace, but when she next cashed the M Q , the roof fell in when South showed out. She could play the $\diamond A$ to South's ace, win the club return in dummy and establish a diamond trick, but that was all. Down two for a normal enough +100 to the White House.

At the other table, something odd happened.
Closed Room

| West <br> LundMadsen Bardysz | North <br> East <br> Bakkeren | South <br> Jaszzzak |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1ヵ | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2@ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Against the same contract, South led the same low diamond but Bakkeren put up dummy's queen,
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which held the trick. He next unblocked his $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, noting that it took a short extra time for South to follow suit. When he next crossed to dummy's \&A to start cashing the spades, he found out that South had taken some time to follow suit despite holding a singleton. On the A, South discarded a club.

After the A, declarer led a low diamond to South's king, North shedding a spade, and South continued a heart to dummy's queen and partner's king. Had North returned her last club, all would have been well for the defence but when she continued the $\checkmark A$ followed by the $\triangle 9$, declarer could win his jack, drive out the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and claim his contract. The White House +400 and an unexpected 11 IMPs to take the lead: 34-30.

When they finished the board, EW called the TD as they wanted to draw attention to the general slowness of play so far. When the TD was at the table, they informed him about the time problem that might arise and as a side issue, they also mentioned the play of the slow singleton on the board they had just finished.

Before they started playing the next board, South left the room for a while, apparently not feeling happy about what had happened on it, as it is difficult to find another explanation for his actions on the next board.

Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
A 932
$\checkmark$ K J 10754
$\diamond K$
\& 982

| A 76 |  | ค A Q 108 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 92$ | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\bigcirc$ AQ |
| $\diamond$ Q 10652 | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ J9743 |
| \& A Q J 6 |  | \& 73 |
|  | ^ KJ54 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 863$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 8 |  |
|  | \& K 1054 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wojcieszek | Wortel | Sarniak | J Hop |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

In the Open Room, the Poles reached a sensible contract in peace and quiet (South discreetly staying silent throughout) for an easy +130 to them.

For the action, one had to turn to the Closed Room, where Baldysz' Multi set the table on fire.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LundMadsen Baldysz | Bakkeren Jaszzzak |  |  |
| Pass | 2 | Dble | 3^ |
| Dble | Pass | 3ム | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| 4 | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Bakkeren found a light take-out double over $2 \diamond$, which only showed points as EW did not have any more specific agreement against the Multi. Christina Lund Madsen then made an equally light pointshowing responsive double over the pass-or-correct $3 ๑$. Of course, Bakkeren showed his spades over the double and now, EW looked in trouble as 3NT, which was intended by West to show minors, was taken as "to play," and understandably so, by East. South might, and probably should, have passed 3NT to collect +150 and 7 IMPs but he could not resist temptation, no doubt expecting his would be the final word in this auction. When West turned up with a rescue action after all, South could not believe that she had been right in doing so and doubled again...thus turning a possible 7-IMP gain (and regaining the lead) into a 9-IMP loss. What is more: had South left $4 \diamond$ alone, the match would have ended in a tie...

At halftime, the score thus stood at 43-30 to The White House.
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(2)SIDEGAMES USING BRIDGE+MORE
by Herman De Wael

The Norwegian sidegames (10:00 and 14:30 every day) have been played since this Wednesday morning with the new Bridge+More device. An explanation for the readers of the Daily Bulletin.

Rather than using boards and duplication machines, the deals are duplicated at the table itself. In the middle of the table sits a squarish device that shows dealer and vulnerability. When asked to do so, the machine hands out 13 cards to every player. They bid and play normally, after which they put the cards back into the machine. Meanwhile, the device has duplicated the next board and the hands are given to the players. Thus, the table needs only two decks of cards to play the entire tournament.

A tablet is available at every table, on which the bidding sequence, lead, and final result are entered.
But the main advantage is that while distributing


Christian Fredrik Johnsen, Tron Håland, Ingrid Marie Simson, Grete Schjoll Erichsen
the cards for the third deal, the machine reads the cards of the first deal, in the order that they are put into it. Provided the players do not shuffle the hand after playing it, this represents the actual order in which the cards were played. It does not matter in which order the players return their cards to the machine since the system knows who the cards belong to. The computer will provide a printout of the 52 cards, and even indicate whether or not the order is possible. If any hand has been shuffled, the printout will indicate it, but of course a detective might be able to deduce which hands are still in correct order and determine the play from there. Similarly, a claim will see the last tricks remain out of order, the printout will show those tricks in red but the meaning is simple.
For more details go to the side game in the building or visit:
$\boldsymbol{w} \boldsymbol{w} \boldsymbol{w}$.
bridgecompany .com

## PLAY BRIDGE TONIGHT! SOCIAL EVENING TOURNAMENT

AT HOTEL THE EDGE

START 21:30

15 BOARDS // 150 NOK PER PAIR
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## PAIRS QUALIFIER DAY ONE

by Barry Rigal

I came in to watch the last two sessions, to see whether the players could provide any good stories, or produce a few disasters for the bulletin. They did not disappoint.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } 87532 \\ & \diamond \text { 654 } \\ & \diamond \text { Q9 } \\ & \& \quad 943 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ - 72 | N | A AKQJ |
| $\bigcirc$ KQ 72 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc 109$ |
| $\diamond 7654$ | ${ }^{\mathbf{S}}$ S | $\diamond$ AK 832 |
| K WJ 86 |  | ¢ 107 |
|  | ¢ 10964 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ 83 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 10 |  |
|  | \& A 52 |  |


| West | North <br> Malinowska Levitina | East <br> Lev |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |  |

Sam Lev has acquired (despite his best endeavours) the reputation of a man for whom the end justifies the means in the auction. After his partner's uncultured jump rebid of 2NT (I am reliably informed that her bidding box had no 14 call in it) Lev had a very awkward decision. He judged to go past 3NT by jumping to $4 \diamond$ and then to cuebid $5 \%$ at his next turn. Levitina doubtless expected at least an ace and a trump honour, but when playing with Lev it pays to assume he has already bid one of your aces. Rune Hauge was on safe ground when he doubled, and only the 2-2 trump break held the loss to down 100. That was 199/207 for N/S.

A couple of boards later I saw the reverse result:

$\diamond$ KJ987643
Q 7

Say you open $1 \diamond$ and hear $2 *$ to your left, $2 \diamond$ from partner, 44 to the right. You bid $5 \circlearrowleft$ and the tray stays some while on the other side of the screen, coming back with $5 \boldsymbol{A}$ and a red card on it. At the table I'm not sure whether it was in a quixotic attempt to be ethical that he passed (as it turned out the 59 bidder was the one taking the time and the double had been administered at the speed of light) but our hero passed, and this was the full story:

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


While passing seems nothing short of suicidal to me, it is certainly possible that East improved his score by so doing. If East had bid 6 $\diamond$, North would surely have 'saved' in 64 so EW would have recorded -1210 for 1MP instead of -750 for 42 MP . So I suppose we can say 'Well Bid'.


The next board was an 'Eye of the Storm' result at my featured table.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- A 10975
$\checkmark 5$
$\diamond$ Q 9852
\& Q J


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Manno | S.Sanborn | Piscitelli | K.Sanborn |
|  |  |  | $1 \Omega$ |

Had Kerri Sanborn dredged up a re-opening double, it might have led to the carnage that ensued at a few other tables (including one involving a Monegasque Norwegian and wife) when South passed for penalty and East redoubled. But you can surely understand Kerri's reluctance to double and hear partner bid spades, can't you?
Steve Sanborn led his singleton heart - yes one can certainly make the case for the top club lead. Andrea Manno won in hand and cashed his two top trumps then sneaked the $\diamond 10$ past North as South discarded an encouraging club. The Q went round to the A , and Kerri led

the $\odot J$, which held, and the $\triangle 9$ covered and ruffed. Steve Sanborn cashed his master trump and exited with $\boldsymbol{A}$, letting declarer ruff and build his $\triangle 4$ into his seventh trick. Best defence might net a seventh trick, perhaps, but even +200 would have been no more than an average. A third of the field went for 500 or more as EW.

For board 9 I moved on to watch Thomas Bessis and Benedicte Cronier against the Miyakunis. Put yourself in South's position; and cover the North and East cards to make it a fair challenge.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\infty}$ | Pass | $2 \Phi$ |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Your lead of $\diamond 7$ goes to dummy's king as partner follows with an upside-down $\diamond 5$. The $\propto \mathrm{K}$ from dummy goes $\% 5, \bigcirc 5$ and you take the ace. How now, brown cow?
At the table Kenji exited passively with a diamond. Declarer won in dummy and ruffed a club high, led a spade to the nine, ruffed a club high, drew the last trump and ran clubs pitching his hearts, taking the last two tricks with his diamonds. A very elegant +680 and a demonstration that at MP overtricks are king this was worth $171 / 206$.

In the fifth set I watched then-leaders Brian Senior and Sandra Penfold at work. David Bird would be delighted to know that the more interesting play deals all involved partscores.
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Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { s } 872 \\
\diamond & \text { K Q 654 } \\
\diamond & \text { Q 106 } \\
\& & 103
\end{array}
$$



| Dobrowolski | Penfold | Maduzia | Senior |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
|  |  |  | 1\% |
| 14 | Dble | Rdbl* | Pass |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | Pass |
| 24 | All Pass |  |  |

*Rosenkranz promising a high spade honour
My Polish is not great but I'm prepared to bet that the torrent of words issued by West as dummy came down did not include "Well bid partner!" Perhaps upset by his partnership's inability to wield the axe against $2 \Omega$, Dobrowolski did not give $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ his best efforts. A reasonable approach might be to win $\& \mathrm{~K}$, finesse in spades, lead toward the $\checkmark \mathrm{AJ}$, forcing West to split her honours, and lead a second spade. South can win and lead a third club, but you ruff high and draw trumps, coming to nine tricks.
Declarer actually won two clubs ending in hand and led to the $\circlearrowleft A$ to play a third top club. The defence ruffed and played $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$, which held, then took the high heart and a heart ruff. There were two trump tricks still to come, for down one and a 175/206 result for N/S.
The next hand I watched involving Senior-Penfold was a far harder declarer play hand. Again, the winning line was not found.


Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

$\begin{array}{ll} & \text { QJ } 9 \\ \diamond & 10643 \\ \diamond & \text { KJ } 82 \\ \& & \text { Q } 8\end{array}$

Penfold opened $1 \diamond$ and played there - Senior resisting the urge to respond $1 \checkmark$, which might have led to Penfold declaring 14. David Ueland led a top heart against $1 \diamond$. Penfold won and played three rounds of spades, letting Lisbeth Glaerum win the third and lead back a heart. Ueland unblocked the jack under the ace, and now declarer was at the cross-roads. She chose to play a fourth spade, discarding dummy's heart. Ueland ruffed in with the $\diamond 5$, cashed $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, and played a third heart. The defenders now had no trouble in scoring one trick in each side suit, a spade ruff and three trumps. Down one; but had Penfold not led the fourth spade, but played a club instead, East wins, leads to his partner's $\vee 10$, and the 13th heart is ruffed with $\diamond 9$ and overruffed with $\diamond A$. In this ending East is on lead and the defenders have four tricks:


West's trumps must be worth three tricks? Apparently not. If East plays a club declarer wins in dummy and ruffs a club as low as she is permitted to do so and has a sure trump trick left. If East plays $\diamond 7$, best, this is ducked round to North who must exit with a low trump not a spade. It would not help East if he could win this. Whichever defender takes the trick must give declarer access to dummy for the trump coup or lead trumps again and abandon their extra trick in the suit!

```
Go to page: \(\quad 1\)\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllll} 
& 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 & 14 & 15
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllll}
16 & 17 & 18 & 19 & 20 & 21 & 22 & 23 & 24 & 25 & 26 & 27 & 28 & 29 & 30
\end{tabular}
```


## FROM ALL ROUND THE WORLD

by Jos Jacobs

## Mixed Pairs, Semifinal A

During yesterday's second session of the Mixed Semis, I had a good look at the play of six boards only. Still, in that short period of time I managed to see players from Norway, the UK and New Zealand facing opponents with Eastern European roots but now living in the USA. That's really what an Open Championship is all about.

Taking into account that it's matchpoints now, the boards I saw were not without interest either. This was board 11:

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul.

| Q Q J 32$\bullet$ J |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\diamond$ AK98753 |  |  |  |
| 8 - |  |  |  |
| A 8764 N ${ }^{\text {a }}$ N 10 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J 4 S ${ }^{\text {S }} 106$ |  |  |  |
| \& 33 |  |  |  |
| ¢ A95 |  |  |  |
|  | $\cdots$ A95 |  |  |
| $\diamond$ Q 2 |  |  |  |
| \& K9542 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Senior | Lev | Penfold | Levitina |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $3 \%$ | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The defence are looking at three top tricks and this is all they can get. It would need a heart lead and a few spade discards from West to give declarer an 11th trick but this is exactly what happened. +460 was worth $85.5 \%$ to NS.



Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Senior | Lev | Penfold | Levitina |
| 1NT | $2 \downarrow$ | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

The British would get their revenge on the next board of the round in a typical British way. West decided to open a weak NT, popular all over Britain, on his slightly off-shape hand. This proved very effective as there is no way to beat 3NT if played by West. As the 2 overcall had been alerted as spades and a minor, even 11 tricks are there for the taking by cashing two rounds of hearts, dropping the queen in the process, followed by the $\circlearrowleft \mathrm{J}$ and a club to North to force a spade lead away from the ace. Though North had discarded three spades and a club, this endplay was something for the double-dummy specialists rather than at the table where declarer knew he
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would have a good score by playing the contract from the West position. +430 was already worth 71,5 \% to EW.
The next board was sort of a routine $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ :


| West | North | East $\quad$ South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| M. Homme | Lev | E. HommeLevitina |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass 2NT |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |

It all depends on the way declarer tackles the hearts after drawing trumps and eliminating the minors. Both $\triangle \mathrm{A}$, small heart and running dummy's jack would work here so one might wonder why +620 was still worth as much as $67.1 \%$ of the matchpoints. The answer is that declarer has a perfectly decent alternative line of playing for $\circlearrowleft K Q$ to be together. He could tackle hearts by leading low from hand to the ten.
The reason why the winning line might be best is that if your opponents (as so many here, both Norwegians and other Europeans) lead $\diamond 6$ to the first trick, playing 3rd/5th, you can build up a clear picture at the critical moment of East as 1-4-4-4 pattern. His play in clubs, diamonds and spades will strongly suggest his actual pattern. That being so, playing for a doubleton honour must be right, since East might well have led from $\triangle K Q$ at trick one.
In turn that might encourage you as East the next time round to return $\$ 9$ at trick three. If partner isn't ruffing the club, your spots are irrelevant for trick-taking, but not for misleading declarer.

On the next board, it was shown that leading partner's suit is not always the best defence against the contract, though it would occasionally help to save a partnership.

Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.
A KQJ76
$\checkmark$ AQ 3
$\diamond$ J 105
\& 72


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M. Homme | Lev | E. HommeLevitina |  |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \Omega$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \%$ | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |

When West, no doubt with ruffing visions, led her partner's suit rather than a top club or two first, Levitina immediately seized her chance. She won East's king with her ace and played three rounds of spades, successfully discarding a club. Her second club went on the 4th spade and thereafter, she only lost to the $\searrow \mathrm{K}$. The overtrick brought her a $96 \%$ score...

Over now from Norway to New Zealand.
Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
A K 963
৩J985432
$\diamond$ A 4
of $Q$


| West <br> V. Cornell | North Lev | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | M. Cornell Levitina |  |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | 20 | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | 38 |

All Pass
The actual vulnerability asks for a double of $3 毋$, in my opinion, trying to put the kiss of death on
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this contract. More important is that it would have worked, as would a (possibly unlikely) conversion to 3NT. Scoring just +100 was worth only $21 \%$ to EW.

The next board again brought the new Americans a good score:

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- 942
$\checkmark$ K 4
$\diamond$ Q 87
\& A Q 874


| West | North | East $\quad$ South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| V. Cornell | Lev | M. CornellLevitina |  |
| Pass | $1 \&$ | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $1 N T$ | $2 \diamond$ | 3 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Once again, the principle of leading your partner's suit produced a bad score for the defenders. The opening diamond lead to the nine and king was OK but West might have considered shifting to a heart after winning the A on
the second round of that suit. That would have put 34 one down instead of letting it through, though even +50 would not have been a good compensation for the heart game EW could have made. Is West's unpromising heart suit really good enough to introduce it over 14?
Anyway, +140 gave NS another fine score of $85,5 \%$ so it was no surprise that they finished the session with $64,8 \%$ over the full ten boards, thus rising to 7th in the day's overall standings.

At another table where Faith Mayer and GeO Tislevoll were West and East respectively, this was the action:

| West <br> Mayer | North | East <br> $G e O$ | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{4}$ | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | $3 \uparrow$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

The defenders led spades. Declarer won the A and finessed in diamonds. South won and forced declarer with a spade (best). Declarer ruffed, played $\diamond A$, and led a third spade. When South ruffed in with $\triangle 6$, this allowed GeO to overruff and draw trumps, then run the diamonds. Had South discarded on the third diamond, GeO would have ruffed and drawn two rounds of trumps, then run diamonds. South can ruff in but declarer overruffs and leads a club up toward his king to force an entry to the diamonds.

## DUPLIMATE

The Duplimates used to duplicate the championship boards in Tromso are sold out but you can pre-order a Duplimate to be used at the World Championships in later on this year on the same terms, i.e. EUR
1999. Contact Jannerstens at the bridge stall in the bridge plaza, or drop a line to per@jannersten.com.
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7th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS

## MASTERPOINT RACE

AFTER MIXED TEAMS AND OPEN BAM 1

| HOP | Jacco | 60 | HELMERSEN | Kjell Ove | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WORTEL | Meike | 60 | NAVEH | Nurit | 4 |
| BAKKEREN | Ton | 60 | MERMELSTEIN | Gabi | 4 |
| MADSEN | Christina Lund | 60 | GRAIZER | Nurit | 4 |
| SARNIAK | Anna | 40 | HORVITZ | Shimshon | 4 |
| HARASIMOWICZ | Ewa | 40 | MARK | Micha | 4 |
| JANISZEWSKI | Przemyslaw | 40 | MARK | Sonia | 4 |
| JASZCZAK | Andrzej | 40 | UZUM | Dogan | 2 |
| BALDYSZ | Cathy | 40 | KIZILOK | Omer | 2 |
| WOJCIESZEK | Jakub | 40 | OZGUNES | Ayse | 2 |
| WERNLE | Alexander | 19 | KUTUK | Basak | 2 |
| UPMARK | Johan | 19 | DE BOTTON | Janet | 2 |
| McCALLUM | Karen | 19 | MYERS | Barry | 2 |
| RIMSTEDT | Cecilia | 19 | HELNESS | Tor | 2 |
| TUNCOK | Cenk | 19 | HELLEMANN | Anne-Lill | 2 |
| CRONIER | Philippe | 19 | HELNESS | Gunn | 2 |
| ZOCHOWSKA | Joanna | 19 | HELNESS | Fredrik | 2 |
| MULTON | Franck | 19 | SKORCHEV | Stefan | 2 |
| D'OVIDIO | Catherine | 19 | COPE | Simon | 2 |
| WILLARD | Sylvie | 19 | ROBERTSON | Marion | 2 |
| ZIMMERMANN | Pierre | 19 | MALAKOVA | Desislava | 2 |
| BERKOWITZ | Lisa | 10 | GROMOVA | Victoria | 2 |
| SANBORN | Kerri | 10 | PONOMAREVA | Tatiana | 2 |
| SANBORN | Steve | 10 | GROMOV | Andrey | 2 |
| BERKOWITZ | David | 10 | DUBININ | Alexander | 2 |
| OLIVIERI | Gabriella | 8 | VAINIKONIS | Vytautas | 2 |
| LANZAROTTI | Massimo | 8 | GULEVICH | Anna | 2 |
| PISCITELLI | Francesca | 8 | BANASZKIEWICZ | Ewa | 2 |
| MANNO | Andrea | 8 | BREDE | Lukasz | 2 |
| GOLIN | Cristina | 8 | SALONEN | Irmeli | 2 |
| ZALESKI | Romain | 8 | MORAWSKI | Dariusz | 2 |
| BOGEN | Anne Irene | 8 | ISPORSKI | Vladislav Nikolov | 2 |
| BOGEN | Haakon | 8 | KOVACHEV | Valentin | 2 |
| STANGHELLE | Helge | 8 | NIKOLOVA | MARTA | 2 |
| HARDING | Gerd Marit | 8 | MARQUARDT | Diana | 2 |
| BOGEN | Frank | 8 | LYBAEK | Astrid Steen | 2 |
| CHARLSEN | Thomas | 8 | MORTENSEN | Maria Dam | 2 |
| HOFTANISKA | Thor Erik | 8 | HEGGE | Kristoffer | 2 |
| LARSSON | Jessica | 8 | ELLINGSEN | Kristian | 2 |
| BERTHEAU | Kathrine | 8 | SENIOR | Brian | 2 |
| RINGSETH | Jorn Arild | 8 | TRENDAFILOV | Roumen | 2 |
| FREDIN | Peter | 8 | PENFOLD | Sandra | 2 |
| BLAAGESTAD | Lise | 8 | SENIOR | Nevena | 2 |
| LINDAAS | Pernille | 8 | BROCK | Sally | 2 |
| BREKKE | Vegard | 7 | MALINOWSKI | Artur | 2 |
| BONES | Turid | 7 | KOWALSKI | Apolinary | 2 |
| BERGHEIM | Geir Egil | 7 | MISZEWSKA | Ewa | 2 |
| KJAER | Ellen | 7 | WANG | Yanhong | 1 |
| SNEVE | Sissel | 7 | SUN | Shaolin |  |
| RONNING | Ola | 7 | LI | Xiaoyi | 1 |
| NICOLAYSEN | Finn Robert | 7 | HUANG | Yan | 1 |
| FABER | Hege Charlotte | 7 | WU | Shaohong | 1 |
| NORENG | Hans | 7 | LU | Dong | 1 |

## MIXED PAIRS - SEMIFINAL A

RESULTS

47 COOPER K. - KOLESNIK A. 1,904.30 49.28
48 CICHOCKI M. - HOCHEKER D. 1,974.87 49.13

# Results are subject to confirmation 

| 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 |


| 1 | HELNESS G. - HELNESS T. | $4,224.18$ | 63.36 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | BOHNSACK - BOHNSACK S | $4,100.66$ | 61.51 |
| 3 | HAYMAN PIAFSKY J. - KALITA | $4,007.16$ | 60.10 |
| 4 | GOLD D. - GROSS S. | $3,954.15$ | 59.31 |
| 5 | BLAAGESTAD L. - FREDIN P. | $3,952.82$ | 59.29 |
| 6 | SHI B. - TIAN W. | $3,940.65$ | 59.11 |

7
8

DIKHNOVA T. - MATUSHKO NATHAN M. - OLSEN S. ANDERSSEN R. - MOGSTAD A. GILLIS S. - HARDING M. KAZMUCHA D. - SEREK C. BERTHEAU K. - HOFTANISKA WANG W. - ZHANG B.
GOTARD B. - GOTARD T.
KOWALSKI A. - MISZEWSKA E. SANBORN K. - SANBORN S.
KOVACHEV V. - MARQUARDT AUNE E. - EIDE P.
BESSIS T. - CRONIER B.
ELLINGSEN K. - LYBAEK A.
FLAATT E. - FLAATT P.
BUGGE L. - GUSTAVSEN A. MOLLEL. - TER LAARE M. BAKKE T. - REMEN S. GULEVICH A. - VAINIKONIS V. HAUGSTAD E. - SJODAL S. HOILAND T. - THORESEN S. MAYER F. - TISLEVOLL G. ROREN T. - WENNEVOLD I. LISLAND T. - WELANDER U. ALLERTON J. - LESLIE P. BULL S. - NESSETH B. GUSEV V. - NIKITINA A. GROVEL. - KARLSEN S. DAI J. - SHEN (1) Q. EDLUND L. - LARSSON R. HANSEN L. - KARAIVANOV K. FENTON A. - YUEN M. STABELL T. - VOS V. KOKSOY E. - SEMERCIU. GRAIZER N. - HORVITZ S. ANJER M. - HAGEN E. TESHOME S. - THROWER J. CAPLAN E. - FRISBY W. SKELTON J. - THEELKE M.

3,927.81 58.91 3,868.28 58.02 3,862.56 57.94 3,846.64 57.70 3,827.70 57.41 3,813.79 57.20 3,775.62 56.63 3,774.68 56.62 3,753.13 56.29 3,746.53 56.20 3,703.71 55.55 3,701.45 55.52 3,696.44 55.44 3,682.02 55.23 3,677.37 55.16 3,675.77 55.13 3,665.34 54.98 3,650.40 54.75 3,644.92 54.67 3,636.85 54.55 3,635.70 54.53 3,604.79 54.07 3,595.58 53.93 3,590.80 53.86 3,589.96 53.85 3,579.94 53.70 3,577.23 53.66 3,567.30 53.51 3,559.82 53.39 3,558.55 53.38 3,555.25 53.33 3,543.19 53.15 3,541.47 53.12 3,534.47 53.01 3,533.09 52.99 3,516.28 52.74 3,503.69 52.55 3,479.15 52.18 3,475.74 52.13

46

ELIASSEN E. - SUNDLAND H. 3,467.74 52.01 ROSSLEE D. - STEPHENS R. $3,465.7151 .98$ ENGEBRETSEN G. - OWER A. $3,464.9651 .97$ ANDERSEN W. - FAGERDAL R. $3,442.5251 .64$ FABER H. - NICOLAYSEN F. $3,442.1551 .63$ MALUISH A. - MILL A. $3,438.0151 .57$ LUND H. - VIGANDER K. $3,436.9151 .55$ FJAELBERG A. - LERBREKK R. $3,424.7351 .37$ JONES B. - LOURIE O. 3,422.48 51.33 3,420.44 51.30 3,420.25 51.30 3,415.93 51.24 3,415.14 51.22 3,413.15 51.19
3,375.75 50.63
3,369.31 50.54
3,348.51 50.23
3,332.94 49.99
3,329.54 49.94
3,325.97 49.89
3,295.13 49.42
3,291.34 49.37
3,285.31 49.28
3,270.60 49.06
3,267.46 49.01
3,265.73 48.98
3,260.60 48.91
3,252.92 48.79
3,252.37 48.78
3,251.93 48.78
3,251.55 48.77
3,243.02 48.64
3,237.33 48.56
3,230.60 48.46
3,226.59 48.40
3,226.08 48.39
3,225.15 48.37
3,215.47 48.23
3,213.06 48.19
3,211.66 48.17
3,211.63 48.17
3,191.07 47.86
3,187.87 47.82
3,187.32 47.81
3,181.62 47.72
3,178.37 47.67

| 92 | VERHEES Jr L. - VIDIGAL A. | $3,168.74$ | 47.53 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 93 | KVIKSTAD J. - KVIKSTAD Y. | $3,156.89$ | 47.35 |
| 94 | LARSEN H. - OVSTEDAL F. | $3,149.63$ | 47.24 |
| 95 | GOUVERITH M. - DE MULLER | $3,146.94$ | 47.20 |
| 96 | BOGEN H. - LINDAHL S. | $3,137.15$ | 47.05 |
| 97 | BANKOGLU E. - BANKOGLU L. | $3,129.76$ | 46.94 |
| 98 | SAYER N. - ZAHARIEV Z. | $3,124.71$ | 46.87 |
| 99 | BARONI. - TOKAY M. | $3,112.69$ | 46.69 |
| 100 FURUNES J. - SIVERTSVIK R. | $3,110.30$ | 46.65 |  |
| 101 JOHANSEN L. - KLINGEN M. | $3,107.27$ | 46.61 |  |
| 102 FEOFANOV M. - KHONICHEVA E | $3,101.07$ | 46.51 |  |
| 103 GLAERUM L. - UELAND D. | $3,093.79$ | 46.40 |  |
| 104 CAMP O. - SHAMI A. | $3,085.65$ | 46.28 |  |
| 105 DUBLAND K. - SOOILAND T. | $3,075.40$ | 46.13 |  |
| 106 OSACKI M. - SAADA P. | $3,070.32$ | 46.05 |  |
| 107 HARDING G. - STANGHELLE H. | $3,068.75$ | 46.03 |  |
| 108 | SALONEN I. - STRETZ F. | $3,066.93$ | 46.00 |
| 109 GREEN M. - ROSENTHAL L. | $3,060.00$ | 45.90 |  |
| 110 | BRAGADIR S. - DE MENDEZ T. | $3,059.04$ | 45.88 |
| 111 | SOLUM B. - SOLUM S. | $3,056.18$ | 45.84 |
| 112 CLAIR P. - PAGNINI-ARSLAN C. | $3,039.51$ | 45.59 |  |
| 113 DUC L. - MAGNUSSON S. | $3,038.27$ | 45.57 |  |

114 DIX M. - PARNIS-ENGLAND M. 3,028.34 45.42 115 SKJETNE E. - STOEN T. 116 RIESE S. - RIESE T. 117 HAVERKATE J. - PELLE I. 118 JENSSEN I. - RUBACH B. 119 SOLVANG B. - KANDAHL E. 120 KJONSVIK O. - SPILLUM B. 121 WEIMAN M. - WEIMAN M. 122 RANCESCONI A. - MANZANO A. 123 MARK M. - MARK S. 124 SOERENSEN L. - STOKKELAND 125 RYNNING E. - THOREN V. 126 BRIGHTLING R. - MOFFAT L. 127 HERLAND J. - LARSSEN I. 128 BRINCHMANN K. - DAHLV. 129 FRENKEL R. - SAWICKI H. 130 SJODAL E. - SJODAL R. 131 REITAN E. - SKRE I. 132 LARSEN G. - NILSEN H. 133 GARVIK O. - SOLUM R. 134 LARSEN H. - LARSEN L.

2,983.25 44.75 2,965.07 44.47 2,958.69 44.38 2,942.00 44.13 2,926.76 43.90 2,921.86 43.83 2,918.90 43.78
2,911.42 43.67
2,901.56 43.52
2,889.08 43.33
2,836.51 42.55
2,822.70 42.34
2,818.34 42.27
2,808.45 42.12
2,790.30 41.85
2,714.41 40.71
2,714.14 40.71
2,685.66 40.28
2,541.27 38.12
2,507.43 37.61


| 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 |

# EBU SUMMER MEETING Brighton, 14th - 23rd August 2015 

## AT BRIGHTON FOR THE FINAL TIME SEE OUR SPECIAL OFFER FOR EASTBOURNE 2016

Join us for our flagship event at the Hilton Metropole on Brighton seafront The programme is packed with events, but gives you the flexibility to play as much or as little as you choose as we have both Weekend Challenge Events and One Day Events.

## 

For those looking for an intensive long weekend of bridge
First weekend (Fri 14th - Sun 16th) Second weekend (Fri 21st - Sun 23rd) The Four Stars Swiss Teams
50\% enhanced Green Points are awarded.
50\% enhanced Green Points awarded.

## Both events count towards the Player of the Year Competition

For more information visit www.ebu.co.uk/competitions/summer-meeting-wce

## ONSDAYGVENNS

Ideal for those who prefer shorter events or who are visiting Brighton for less time Just come for an evening, a day or a weekend; or come for the whole congress, but spend more time enjoying Brighton - the choice is yours

Most midweek evening events have an 'early bird start' option

First weekend
Saturday - Bracketed Pairs
Sunday - Bracketed Teams

Second weekend
Saturday \& Sunday
Stratified Swiss Pairs

Midweek (single session) Mixed Pivot Teams Mixed Pairs Championship Point-a-Board Teams...
...and many more... see www.ebu.co.uk/competitions/summer-meeting-ode

## THIJFULHCONCREBS

Join us for the full congress and play in all the Weekend Challenge and One Day Events the best value option for those looking for a full ten days of bridge.

Join us for the full congress at Brighton 2015 and get $£ 50$ off the full congress at Eastbourne 2016.

## Other events include:

The Really Easy Congress for less experienced players
The Under 25 Championship Pairs
The Mercian Travel Seniors Congress TD Training Seminars

For full congress information visit www.ebu.co.uk/competitions/summer-meeting

Please enter via 01296317 203/219 or comps@ebu.co.uk, or EBU members can enter online at: https://www.ebu.co.uk/members
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