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Philippe Cronier and Sylvie Willard
France's Philippe Cronier \& Sylvie Willard wake up today as the new European Open Mixed Pairs Champions. They were always in the top two and a fine last session saw them finish almost two tops clear. It was Philippe's sixth medal and Sylvie's ninth.
A powerful run brought the combination from Monaco \& Norway, Geir Helgemo \& Aase Langeland into second place, giving the Norwegian her second medal.
Third place went to Russia's Andrey Gromov \& Victoria Gromova, their second and third medals respectively.
The EBL Open Pairs Cup went to Marco ter Laare \& Linda Molle of the Netherlands.
A special mention for Norway's Sofie Sjodal \& Suen Hoyland, who scored $75.26 \%$ in the last session of the Mixed Final - and Sofie is just 13 years old - remember her name!

## TODAY'S SCHEDULE

OPEN/WOMEN TEAMS
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

SENIOR TEAMS * 10.00-11.05: Round 1 11.20-12.25: Round 2 12.40-13.45: Round 3 14.45-15.50: Round 4 16.05-17.10: Round 5 17.25-18.30: Round 6 18.45-19.50: Round 7

* Check the calendar for the Seniors event on page 2
(ay)
Tromse kommune


Aase Langeland and Geir Helgemo

## SENIOR TEAMS - CALENDAR

| $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 1 . 0 5}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Table | Team NS |
| 81 | WALGER |
| 82 | TO HEROAR |
| 83 | NOTTEROY |
| 84 | HEMS |
| 85 | BLANDA DROPS |
| 86 | SCOTLAND |
| 87 | MARI |


| 11.20-12.25 | Round 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Table Team NS | Team EW |

81 GERMAN SENIORS TAKE

83 WALGER HONKAVUORI
84 TO HEROAR LIONS ROAR
85 NOTTEROY
86 HEMS SCOTLAND
87 BLANDA DROPS MARI

| $\mathbf{1 2 . 4 0}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 3 . 4 5}$ | Round 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Team NS | Team EW |
| 81 | SAGG | GERMANSENORS |
| 82 | WALGER | TAKE |
| 83 | TO HEROAR | YOUNG BOYS |
| 84 | NOTTEROY | HONKAVUORI |
| 85 | HEMS | LIONS ROAR |

86 BLANDA DROPS SORVOLL
87 MARI SCOTLAND

| $\mathbf{1 4 . 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 5 . 5 0}$ | Round $\mathbf{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Table | Team NS | Team EW |
| 81 | SORVOLL | SCOTLAND |
| 82 | LIONS ROAR | BLANDA DROPS |
| 83 | HONKAVUORI | HEMS |
| 84 | YOUNG BOYS | NOTTEROY |
| 85 | TAKE | TO HEROAR |
| 86 | GERMAN SENIORS WALGER |  |
| 87 | SAGG | MARI |



Linda Molle and Marco ter Laare
16.05-17.10

Table Team NS
81 NOTTEROY
82 HEMS
83 BLANDA DROPS
84 SCOTLAND
85 SORVOLL
86 LIONS ROAR
87 MARI
17.25-18.30

Table Team NS
81 HONKAVUORI
82 YOUNG BOYS
83 TAKE
84 GERMAN SENIORS
85 SAGG
86 WALGER
87 TO HEROAR

Table Team NS
81 HEMS
82 BLANDA DROPS
83 SCOTLAND
84 SORVOLL
85 LIONS ROAR
86 HONKAVUORI
87

### 18.45-19.50

MARI

Round 1
Team EW
SAGG
GERMANSENIORS
TAKE
YOUNG BOYS
HONKAVUORI
LIONS ROAR
SORVOLL

Round 5
Team EW
TO HEROAR
WALGER
SAGG
GERMAN SENIORS
TAKE
YOUNG BOYS
HONKAVUORI

## Round 6

Team EW
LIONS ROAR
SORVOLL
SCOTLAND
BLANDA DROPS
HEMS
NOTTEROY
MARI
Round 7
Team EW
NOTTEROY
TO HEROAR
WALGER
SAGG
GERMAN SENIORS
TAKE
YOUNG BOYS


Yesterday here in Tromsø, the contract between the EBL and the Italian Delegation for the organisation of the 8th European Open Championships in Montecatini, 10-24 June 2017, was signed. The meeting was attended by the EBL President Yves Aubry, the President of the Italian Bridge Federation Gianni Medugno, the FIGB General Secretary Francesco Conforti and FIGB Executive Member Silvia Valentini.


Can you come up with a caption for this photograph?

Bring your suggestions to the Bulletin Room or email them to markhorton007@hotmail.com

Here are the captions received up to now:
Instead of vodka, she got high on a double.

## Will she go down? (Art Desmond)

With such a lovely double, a trial-bid to the trouble?
The eye of the tiger. (Anonymous)
My partner has chained me here until I find a better opening lead. (LB)
"Great! All those pole dancing classes have paid off with an invitation to the Playboy mansion" (EK)
If you pull another of my penalty doubles i jump (Cosmok)

| Gо то 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 |  | $\mathbf{3}$ |

## IT'S BRIDGE JIM, BUT NOT AS WE KNOW IT.

by Mark Horton

Bridge: the final frontier. These are the voyages of the Daily Bulletin Tromsø. Its two week mission: to explore strange new auctions, to seek out new signalling systems and locate missing keycards, to boldly go where no Mixed Pair has gone before.

It's life, Jim, but not as we know it' is derived from the song StarTrekkin which parodies the TV Series Star Trek.
It was never said in the original Star Trek series but it is now commonly misattributed to the show. The closest equivalent in the original is "No life as we know it" in the episode 'The Devil in the Dark'. It might be that the writers took this phrase from an essay written by the famous science fiction author Isaac Asimov, written in 1981, called "Not As We Know It. The Chemistry of Life."
Join me now as I take a look at four deals from Sessions $4 \& 5$ of the Mixed Pairs final.

Dealer South. All Vul
4 K 932
$\checkmark$ AJ 4
$\diamond 965$
\& K 64


| West <br> Cornell | North <br> Zaleski | East <br> Cornell | South <br> Olivieri <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| $2 \Omega^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $3 \mathbf{4}^{*}$ | Pass | $3 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ | All Pass |


| $2 \diamond$ | Multi |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass or correct |

Holding the West hand I would be uncomfortable if my methods did not allow me to find a 5-3 spade fit. If East is declarer then South is virtually
certain to lead a heart which leaves declarer with little chance, but if West is in the chair then North has to find the impossible lead of a low heart (or the jack) to leave the defence on top.

South led the ten of hearts and declarer won with the queen and played the ace and queen of spades, North winning with the king as South pitched the eight of hearts. When North returned the nine of diamonds declarer ducked and finessed the jack on the next round, South winning and continuing with the five of hearts to North's jack.
The ace of hearts came next and when declarer parted with the jack of spades rather than a club, a trick had been squandered. North exited with a diamond and declarer had to lose two club tricks for -300, 50-0 for N/S.

Dealer West. None Vul


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cornell | Zaleski | Cornell | Olivieri |
| Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | $3 \Phi$ | $3 \downarrow$ |
| $4 \Omega$ | $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass |
| $6 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |  |

South cashed the ace of spades and North followed with the four. Where I come from that would a clear suggestion that South should switch to clubs, but if that was the case here, the message was lost in translation as South continued with the queen of spades. Declarer could set up two diamonds in order to get rid of the losing clubs, $0-50$, so just another average round for both pairs.

| 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 |  |

Dealer North. None Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { s } & 8 \\
\diamond & \\
\diamond & \text { K 6 5 4 } 2 \\
\diamond & \text { K } 93 \\
\text { \& } & \text { K Q } 87
\end{array}
$$



| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cornell | Michielsen Cornell | Rosenthal |  |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \propto$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | $3 \leftrightarrow$ | $3 \diamond$ | $3 *$ |
| Pass | $4 \leftrightarrow$ | $4 \diamond$ | $5 \&$ |

All Pass


When East overcalls 14 you either pass or bid $2 \%$ - you pays your money and takes your choice.
West led the nine of spades and declarer won with the queen, played a club to the king and a diamond for the jack, queen and ace.
If that jack was meant to convey something to West the message was not received as West continued with a second spade. Now declarer could pitch a losing heart on the king of diamonds for +400 and 42-8.
I wonder if they have a copy of Better Signalling Now at the bookstall?

Dealer South
\& A J 7
$\diamond$ AK 97
$\diamond$ A Q 8
\& Q J 2


A K Q 104
$\diamond 4$
$\diamond$ K J 62
\& A 1086

- 65
- Q J 8652
$\diamond 105$
\& K 75

| West <br> Hetz | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bogen | Pachtman Bogen |  |
|  |  |  | $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Dble | 20* | 40 | Pass |
| 4NT* | Pass | 54* | Pass |
| 5NT* | Pass | $6 \diamond *$ | Pass |
| 74 | All Pass |  |  |


| $2 \diamond$ | Multi |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass or correct |
| 4NT | RKCB |
| 5 | $2+$ Q Q |
| 5NT | Any side kings |
| $6 \diamond$ | $\diamond K$ |

Was West, knowing that the club king was missing, hoping that the Great Shuffler had handed it out to North? Three other pairs took a shot at seven so -100 was 47-3.

| Go to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



## MIXED PAIRS FINAL SESSION 2

by Jos Jacobs

Over the first ten boards, Auken-Welland had not done particularly well. Based on past form, one would expect them to rally in session two, which they duly did. Here are a few boards from their second session:

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul.


| West <br> Welland | North <br> Gromov | East <br> Auken | South <br> Gromova <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $4 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ | $5 \diamond$ | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 5 | All Pass |  |

Roy Welland's $4 \diamond$ opening bid, even green v. red but in 2 nd position, would not have been everybody's choice (but there again, you haven't seen Roy's three-level pre-empts at this vulnerability!). However, the aggressive action promptly did its job, as it created some difficult problems for the opponents. Gromov's 4ヵ and Auken's sacrifice in $5 \diamond$ were OK but Gromova now was confronted by a typical pairs problem. Holding two aces, she judged that going on to 54 would probably lead to a better score than defending, as 11 tricks looked likely whereas $5 \diamond$ might well be a cheap sacrifice. Alas for her, Gromov also held two diamonds so the contract had no play. +100 brought Auken-Welland 80\%.


In the next round, EW could make two slams but the first problem was to bid them after a pre-empt and a double raise:

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Welland | Gui | Auken | Wang |
|  | $3 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Dble | $5 \boldsymbol{5}$ |
| 5 | Pass | $6 \boldsymbol{1}$ | All Pass |

Over 3ap, Auken's double was easy enough but over $5 \%$, West's best action was far from obvious. Some Wests doubled to show some strength but must have felt unhappy when partner passed.
Some other Wests bid 54 and were allowed to play there.
Roy Welland was among the 5 -bidders but it was Sabine who had the last word: she boldly raised her partner to six, giving him the problem of finding both the major suit queens to make his contract.

It should be noted that, if you locate the two missing queens correctly, you can even make 7® (but not 74).

We will not bother any further with that pipedream, because Welland's task in his small slam was already far from easy. Welland ruffed the club lead and quickly overcame the first hurdle when he successfully finessed South's $\$ \mathrm{Q}$ in drawing trumps. After that, he played $\diamond A$ and another. South went up with the king and exited in clubs but Welland ruffed with his last trump and went on to cash the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$. When North showed out, it

| Gо 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 |  |

became known that he had started with one spade, two diamonds and in all probability seven clubs, in view of his choice of opening bid. He thus should have room for three hearts, so Welland cashed his $\checkmark \mathrm{K}$ and led a heart to dummy's jack to land his contract for a fine +980 .

Nobody made 13 tricks anywhere and +980 was worth $96 \%$ to Auken-Welland

On the very next board, another slam was available for EW, 12 tricks depending on either black suit finesse working. As it happened, few EW pairs bid it, though I saw a pair being doubled in 40, no doubt for a club lead (to restrict the overtricks).

Welland and Auken also needed some late encouragement to reach slam:

Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Welland | Gui | Auken <br> $1 \uparrow$ | Wang |
| 4थ |  | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | $5 \uparrow$ | $6 \diamond$ |
| 6 | Dble | All Pass |  |

Four Clubs was a fit bid but Auken initially was not really interested. When she was given a second chance when North surprisingly went on to $5 \diamond$, red $v$. green, she immediately took her opportunity, thus giving Welland the chance to finish off the good work by going to slam after all when South bid $6 \diamond$.

With all the finesses working and no club lead, 13 tricks were easy enough and brought AukenWelland yet another $96 \%$ score. They thus reached a point from where they could consider themselves to be in contention.

On board 19, the friendly distribution of the opponents' hands would allow NS to make game in either major but reaching the correct denomination (hearts) was already a problem as after 1\&-1 ; 1NT $-2 \triangle$ there is a clear case for "false preference" by bidding $2 \boldsymbol{\$}$.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.


At one table, I saw a Swedish pair beating all the odds when they ended up in 3NT by North:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M.Cornell | Nilsson | V.Cornell | Oppenstam |
|  |  |  | $1 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Now, what would you lead as East? As your diamond holding is distinctly stronger than your clubs, a diamond lead seems to stand out. . .or does it?

First let's look at what happens if you lead a diamond. North wins partner's queen with his king, crosses in hearts and leads a spade to his queen and your ace. What can you do now?

Had you initially led a club instead, you would now have at least five tricks: three clubs and two aces plus a possible declarer misguess in diamonds if you can give him a chance.

In real life, East was on play now, and he had no way to prevent nine tricks. Declarer even made an overtrick as he had no option but to finesse the aJ on the second round of the suit. His score of +430 was worth $92 \%$ of the matchpoints.

Of course, you can make 10 tricks with spades as trumps as well, but only the very courageous among us would do so. Making 10 tricks in hearts, on the other hand, was not so difficult.

| Gо to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

For the last board of the session, we will return initially to Auken-Welland:

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

|  | 4 | K J 53 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ | 9872 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | Q 3 |  |
|  | 0 | A 32 |  |
|  | - |  | A 10964 |
|  | A J 4 | $\mathrm{W}^{\mathbf{N}} \mathrm{E}$ - | $\bigcirc 3$ |
|  | J 974 | $\omega_{\text {S }}$ E | $\diamond$ AK 1086 |
| of | Q J 10964 |  | \& K 85 |
|  | - | AQ 872 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | K Q 1065 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | 52 |  |
|  | 8 | 7 |  |

Once again, Roy Welland timed a pre-empt to perfection:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Welland | Myers | Auken | Brock |
| 3\& | Pass | $5 \%$ | Dble |

Now what can you do as NS if the bidding gets underway like this? To me, it looks as if North should bid a major. If he would have done so, he might well have been left to play there, doubled, for an average score. Sitting the double was not a success; it brought Auken-Welland another 84\% score.

No, nowhere near the top score. To achieve that, you would have to bid and make a slam as EW and arrange it in such a way that you would get doubled as well.

This is what happened at another table:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gross | Pachtman | Gold | Hetz |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ |
| $5 \uparrow$ | $5 \uparrow$ | $6 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

So far, both EW and NS had complied with all the requirements mentioned above. The only remaining uncertain factor thus was South's opening lead. Would you lead your singleton in the opponents' known side suit first, or would you try your ace to possibly prevent the overtrick? Why did East not raise to $6 \%$ rather than $6 \diamond$, only to find out that $6 \%$, on a different layout, might go down on a singleton diamond lead followed by a ruff in that suit?

When South opted for her A, Gold quickly had his 12 tricks for +1540 and all 50 matchpoints.


## 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 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.


| Gо 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 |  |

## CHAMPIONSHIP DIARY

by Mark Horton

The journalists were having trouble tracking down individual results. One of them saw an organizer and the Director and Reviewer, Eitan Levy. He explained the problem.
The organizer passed responsibility to someone else. The journalist said to Eitan "Don't you think providing us and the players with the frequencies and board analyses is the least we should be doing?" "On the contrary, replied Eitan "You've seen the least we can do!"
Whereupon, it should be said, Eitan contacted the irreplaceable Fotis and in little more than 48 hours, the necessary information was at our disposal. Thanks everyone concerned!
To access detailed information on each board, go to: http://www.eurobridge.org/repository/ competitions/15Tromso/microsite/Results.htm
Then click on the pair's ranking number to see each result, click on the board number to see the statistics for that deal.
We shall not fail or falter; we shall not weaken or tire. Neither the sudden shock of battle, nor the longdrawn trials of vigilance and exertion will wear us down. Give us the tools, and we will finish the job.

If you want to know who is playing on BBO in any given event just go to livebridge.net and click on VuGraph Schedule. Then click on the link to the Championships and you will find who is playing at every table - especially useful if you are following a Pair's event.

On Thursday, the Editor informed the Bulletin Room that having read the programme he had discovered that the Co-Editor was Jos Jacobs. When he announced that if it became necessary for him to leave the office for any length of time, Jos would assume command Herman interjected, 'Don't leave'.

When Brian Senior paid a visit he suggested that one of the writers had maligned him in an article and made his play appear questionable. The Editor immediately turned to Micke and said, 'Make a note to give the writer a pay rise'.

Time for some light relief, so I turn to the world's leading bridge playing detective.
Sherlock Holmes and Dr Watson went on a camping trip. After a good meal and a bottle of
red, they lay down for the night and went to sleep.
Some hours later Holmes woke up, nudged his faithful friend and said, "Watson, I want you to look up at the sky and tell me what you see." Watson said, "I see millions and millions of stars."
Holmes enquired, "And what does that tell you?"
After a minute or so of pondering Watson said, "Astronomically, it tells me that there are millions of galaxies and potentially billions of planets. Astrologically, I observe that Saturn is in Leo. Horologically, I deduce that the time is approximately a quarter past three in the morning. Theologically, I can see that God is all powerful and that we are small and insignificant. Metereologically, I suspect that we will have a beautiful day today. What does it tell you?"
Holmes was silent for about 30 seconds and said, "Watson, you idiot! Someone has stolen our tent!"


The mayor of Tromsø Jens Johan Hjort makes a spectacular opening bid for Philippe Cronier, the new European Open Mixed Pairs Champion during the Final.

| Gо то 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 |  |

## THE RABBIT PLAY

When every matchpoint counts, and the Open Mixed Pairs tournament is reaching its climax, the competitors seem to step up the pace. They are even more into trying to take advantage of every chance they are given.

At this point if the distributions become a little bit wild we know to expect a fireworks show are! In the Mixed Teams earlier on we saw Full House winning bronze medals, and at the start of the sixth session of the Mixed Pair final the previous team mates met!

The first board between the two gave Tuncok/ McCallum 30 of the 50 MPs available when they bid their cold heart game and made their eleven tricks. Far more action happened on board two and a very interesting board it was too.

Board 2. Dealer West. NS Vul.
A AJ10964
$\bigcirc 3$
$\diamond$ A J
\& Q J 97

## ↔ Q 8753 <br> $\checkmark$ K 10962 <br> $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ <br> \& 4



A -
$\checkmark$ AQ 875
$\diamond 65432$

- 1083

A K 2
$\checkmark$ J 4
$\diamond$ K 10987
\& K K 652

| West | North <br> Upmark | McCallum | East <br> Rimstedt |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Tuncok |

Rimstedt balanced the American pair into Four Diamonds and just doubled what they bid after that, knowing that no suit was behaving.

A heart was led to the ace and a second round of hearts followed, which declarer ruffed in dummy to continue with the queen of clubs. Upmark won with the ace and returned the queen of diamonds. Declarer won with the ace and played back the jack, setting up his diamonds in hand. Another diamond followed, which Upmark ruffed and then exited with his last club. So far so good for the defense, who had got three tricks and the remaining cards were:


If Upmark had simply refused to ruff, declarer would have stood no chance to pick up the queen of spades. Now declarer played the ten of diamonds and when Upmark ruffed, dummy could overruff, but trumps, and claim the contract when the clubs were good.

790 was of course a clear top!, giving the American pair all the points against their previous teammates. But it was actually N-S who was sacrificing against E-W since the only contract (besides part scores) that could be made in theory was Four Hearts.

Just looking at the hand one might think that if a trump was led against Four Hearts, and if South jumps up with the king of diamonds when the suit is played, to lead a second trump in an attempt to make sure that declarer couldn't cross-ruff himself to ten tricks, the contract would go down. That isn't the case, since a cross-ruff thereafter by declarer in spades and diamonds would give the following endplay with four cards left to play.

| Gо 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 |  |



Declarer now cashes the ace of clubs and the defense can't do anything about it. Either North will be put on lead to lead into the spade tenace, or South would be endplayed to give away the last tricks to what we might suspect be the eight of clubs* since declarer wouldn't miss the opportunity of winning with that particular card.

Unfortunately to somehow kill what could have been a really great story, none of the four declarers who made Four Hearts received a trump as the opening lead.

The eight of clubs in Sweden is what the seven of diamonds is for our Danish friends.

Board 3. Dealer South. EW Vul.

|  | A Q983 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\diamond$ K J 87 |  |  |
|  | \& K8632 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { s } 754 \\ & \diamond \text { Q } 654 \\ & \diamond \text { A1032 } \\ & \text { \& } 109 \end{aligned}$ |  | 4 | K J 10 |
|  | ${ }^{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\checkmark$ | J |
|  | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ |  | Q 9654 |
|  | S | of | A Q 54 |
|  | A A62 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 1098732 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ - |  |  |
|  | \& J 7 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Multon | T. Helness | Ward-PlattG.Helness |  |
|  |  |  | 15 |
| Pass | 14 | $2 \diamond$ | 30 |
| $4 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass | 40 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Multon led the ten of clubs, and declarer followed low from dummy. Now Ward-Platt as East made a real Rueful Rabbit play when she went up with the ace of clubs to return the jack of hearts at trick two.

Declarer won with the ace of hearts and continued with the king and ten discarding a spade and a diamond from dummy. West won with the queen of hearts and I have to say it would have been priceless to see what South would have done if West now would have led the nine of clubs at this stage...

However that wasn't the case and West continued with a spade through dummy, declarer tried the queen but East covered with the king. Declarer allowed it to win by ducking from hand. East then continued with the jack of spades and suddenly declarer was very close to making her contract, since the tempo was there to try executing a double squeeze.

If declarer had held West's seven of spades instead of the six she would have made the contract by squeezing East on the remaining rounds of trumps. This would become the three card ending:


When the last trump was played West only had to discard a club, since East had to hold on to her clubs. Ironically East actually got her second club trick in the end with the queen, defeating the contract by a trick! Since most pairs had set it with two tricks it was a fine result to the Norwegian pair, who scored 43.72 for that.

Not believing what had happened in clubs at the first trick I went to chat with Ward-Platt to check what had happened when she replied.

- They were furious at the table, shouting and screaming at each other and being affected by that I simply pulled out the wrong card...

Multon as West did well by holding on to his seven of spades as one might think it doesn't matter much if you play the four, five or the seven when the suit is being played and dummy arrives with Q983...
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# BRIDGE RASTIGNANO 2015 VIII EDITION 5/6 SEPTEMBER 

## OPEN TEAMS

Saturday, September $5^{\text {th }}-2.00 \mathrm{pm}$ $1^{\text {st }}$ prize $€ 2,500=$
Guaranteed prize fund $€ 8,740=$

## MIXED PAIRS

Sunday, September $6^{\text {th }}-2.00 \mathrm{pm}$ $1^{\text {st }}$ prize € $1,000=$ Guaranteed prize fund $€ 3,420=$


TEAMS PROGRAMME
From 12.30 pm to 13.45 pm : teams' registration 2.00 pm : QUALIFICATION
n. 4 rounds of Swiss 8 boards each, single section following wich the teams will be divided into sections of 20-25 teams with full carry over. 7.00 pm : FINALS
n .3 rounds of Swiss 8 boards each.
7.00 pm : 1st round; 8.00 pm : dinner break; $9.30 \mathrm{pm}:$ 2nd and 3 rd round. Prize giving to follow. ENTRY FEES
Open team $€ 140,00$ (max 6 players)
Open team $€ 120,00$ (without 1st category players)
Open team $€ 80,00$ (studentss, CAS, Juniors, Cadets)
MAXIMUM TEAMS ACCEPTED: 120
U ROLL OF HONOUR $\Psi$ 2008 (56 T.):TAMBURI - Andreoli-Basile-Facchini 2009 (56 T.): TREOSSI - Bianchi-Mieti-Zannoni 2010 (66 T.): MONTANELLI - Andreoli-Bonvicini-Golfarelli 2011 (70 T.): FRANCHI - Giubilo-Montanari-Versace 2012 (73 T.): MEDUGNO - Rinaldi-Tanini-Venier 2013 (82 T.): LUPPI - Botti-Giachetti-Pattacini 2014 (96 T.): CAMBIAGHI - Franco-Matteucci-Minaldo

## venue CENTRO CONGRESSI UNAWAY HOTELS Via Palazzetti $1 / \mathrm{N}$ San Lazzaro di Savena (Bologna) Italy UNAWAY HOTEL CONVENTION HOTEL SERVICES (rates "per room", per day, BB) CLASSIC SINGLE: $€ 48.00$ <br> CLASSIC DUS (single use) : € 54.00

CLASSIC DOUBLE: $€ 60.00$
JUNIOR SUITE: € 86.00
Direct booking: phone +39.0514997411
e-mail:una.bolognasanlazzaro@unawayhotels.it
$15 \%$ discounted rate avaiable by booking online or directly with the hotel up to 3 days before the arrival.
Prepaid rate: non-refundable, no changes possible.
CATERING SERVICES
Saturday night dinner pre-booked: $€ \mathbf{2 0 , 0 0}$
Lunch on saturday pre-booked: $€ 15,00$

## VISIT BOLOGNA

ASD RASTIGNANO will organise two guided tours of the city of Bologna for visitors and players.
1 - Saturday afternoon from 3 pm to 7 pm :
BOLOGNA BETWEEN SACRED AND SECULAR. The main church, medieval street, the two towers, the Isolani court, the Mercanzia palace, the former Sala Borsa, the house of Lucio Dalla.
2 - Sunday morning from 9.30 to 12.30 pm : CAFFE' IN PIAZZA MAGGIORE.
Visit to main square of Bologna with illustration of the main monuments and access to the Basilica of San Petronio.
Transfer by public transports from the hotel
accompanied by guide.
partecipants) $€ 12$ per person per tour. ( min . 10


## PAIRS PROGRAMME

From 12.30 to 1.45 pm : pairs entry
$2.00 \mathrm{pm}: \mathrm{n} .3$ rounds $10-12$ pre-dealt hands. Mitchell movement. 7.15 pm : prize giving
ENTRY FEE
$€ 40,00$ per pair
€ 30,00 students, CAS, Juniors, Cadets
MAXIMUM PAIRS ACCEPTED: 240

## (1) ROLL OF HONOUR <br> 2014 (120 pairs) : BASSI - ULIVAGNOLI

TD: M. Eminenti - C. Cenni - N. Fedele - V. Boldrini Technical direction: M. Mazzurega - S. Valentini. The teams tournament will be broadcast live on Bbo. Bridgmate will be used.

Partecipation reserved to member of FIGB or other National Bridge Federation. Admitted students' teams limited to students
enrolled at least in their 2nd years. The management reserves the right to make any modifications considered necessary to facilitate the movement and/or schedule.

prizes guaranteed indipendently of the n .
prizes added with 100 teams (29 prizes)
prizes added with 100 teams ( 29 prizes)
prizes added with 110 teams $(32$ prizes)
prizes added with 120 teams ( 35 prizes)
${ }^{( }$) credit note c/o Mercatone Germanvox Toscanella di Dozza

## FURTHER PRIZES BY RANDOM SELECTION

open teams: 4 software offered by "Bridge Base Italia" assigned by random selection among all the players open teams: 4 software offered by "Progetto Bridge" assigned by random selection among under 30 players mixed pairs: 2 software offered by "Bridge Base Italia" assigned by random selection among all the players mixed pairs: 2 software offered by "Progetto Bridge"assigned by random selection among under 30 players

| PRIZES <br> MIXED PAIRS |  | SPECIAL PRIZES (min 3 pairs) Prizes are not cumulative. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1000 | $1 \mathrm{NC} / 2^{\wedge} / 3^{\wedge} / 4^{\wedge}$ cat | 50 |
| 2 | 500 | $2 \mathrm{NC} / 2^{\wedge} / 3^{\wedge} / 4^{\wedge}$ cat | 40 |
| 3 | 300 | 1 outside region | 50 |
| 4 | 200 | 2 outside region | 40 |
| 5 | 150 | 1 outside province | 50 |
| 6 | 100 | 1 students | 40 |
| 7 | 90 | 2 students | 40 (*) |
| 8 | 80 | 1 juniors | 40 |
| 9 | 70 | 2 juniors | 40 (*) |
| 10 | 60 | 1 ASDBB Rastignano | 50 |
| 11-17 | 50 | 2 ASDBB Rastignano | 40 (*) |
| 18-20 | 50 | Best last round | 50 |
| 21-22 | 50 | 30 prizes guaranteed |  |
| 23-25 | 50 | 3 prizes added with 130 p <br> 2 prizes added with 140 p <br> 3 prizes added with 150 |  |

## ORGANIZATION AND RESERVATION <br> Asd Bridge Bologna Rastignano

phone: +39.320.0183214 (a.dalpozzo) - +39.051.742329 (office Asd) mail: eventi@rastignanobrigde.it - facebook: rastignanobridge
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| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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## FIRST AMONG EQUALS

## by Mark Horton

In the final of a major pairs event where the field is of exceptional quality, it is about as rare as a hen's tooth for only one pair to reach the top spot on a deal. Consider this one from the fifth session of the Mixed Pairs final:

| Dealer North. All Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ Q J 107 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 973$ |  |  |
| $\diamond$ A 2 |  |  |
|  | \& Q973 |  |
| ¢ A942 N |  | A K 86 |
| $\bigcirc$ A J 6 N |  | $\bigcirc$ K 102 |
| $\diamond 3 \mathrm{~W}$ S |  | $\diamond$ KQJ10976 |
| * AK 864 |  | \& - |
|  | A 53 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 854 |  |
|  | $\diamond 854$ |  |
|  | \& J 1052 |  |

As some of you may know I spend a certain amount of time each year writing commentaries for simultaneous pairs events.
Sometimes it can be quite difficult to predict the outcome of a deal even when you can see all four hands.
Looking at this deal it is clear that EW belong in $6 \diamond$ (or even better, 6 NT ) but how to reach a slam?
If for example the bidding starts $1 \diamond-2 \leftrightarrow-2 \diamond-$
2-2NT-3 ${ }^{*}$ * is it so clear that East should do any more than bid 3NT? (I would be tempted to bid $4 \diamond$, but I am having difficulty convincing myself that it is not just because I can see all the cards.)
In search of information I investigated what had happened at the BBO tables.

This was the auction at table 26, where Vadim Kholomeev \& Diana Rakhmani occupied the EW seats against Elly SchippersBosklopper \& Rene Stienen:

| West | North <br> 20 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | East |
| :--- |
| South |

However, the other results were uniform, +690 for $3 N T+3$.

I printed out the detailed results for this board and discovered that 6 pairs had bid a slam. Four were in $6 \diamond$, one in an unfortunate 6 (just a single bid away from glory).

Here is what happened at table 23:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fredin | Cilleborg | Blaagestad Bilde |  |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 ヵ$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 6NT | All Pass |  |  |

Superb.
Why didn't I think of that?



## MIXED PAIRS SESSION 6, TABLE 19

by John Carruthers

One always hopes for exciting swing deals, especially at pairs, where unusual views are sometimes the norm.

As some of the names may be unfamiliar, I've used given and family names in this report.

Board 1. Dealer North. Neither Vul.
A A985

- A 87
$\diamond$ KQJ842
\& -

- 10742
$\checkmark 5$
$\diamond 963$
\& K Q 963
A K
$\diamond$ K J 9432
$\diamond 105$
\& J 1087

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subhash | Haavard | Noriko | Oddrun |
| Gupta | Moe | Domichi | Godejord |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \circlearrowleft$ |
| Pass | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | Pass | $4 \circlearrowleft$ |

All Pass
Subhash Chandra Gupta led the queen of spades, which ran to Oddrun Godejord's king. Godejord led the ten of diamonds, ducked all around and followed that with a heart to dummy's ace. Declarer was able to resist the pairs temptation of discarding her remaining diamond on the ace of spades and ruffing a diamond-if trumps had been 2-2 and the diamond ace had been ruffing down, that would have meant three overtricks. Godejord is made of sterner stuff that that, however, and she carefully played a high diamond from dummy to Gupta's ace.

West shifted to a low club, ruffed in the dummy. Dummy was about to die an early death, so declarer led a good diamond and discarded a losing club on it as West ruffed. Counter-intuitively, declarer needed to ruff that with the king to allow her to ruff another club, discard a club on the ace
of spades, then discard her remaining club on a good diamond as West ruffs in. Even better would have been to discard a club on the ace of spades, ruff a spade, ruff a club, and only then discard her fourth club on a good diamond. That line reults in eleven tricks.

In actual play, West lost the plot a little as, upon ruffing the diamond, the queen of hearts exit, would have left declarer with two losing clubs and no way to get to the dummy. As East had bid one spade voluntarily, this play should not have been beyond West to find.

Nevertheless, another low club was led and ruffed in the dummy, leaving declarer with one club remaining. In her turn, also losing the plot a little, Godejord threw that club on a diamond, allowing West to score his queen of hearts. Still, that was good for ten tricks and +420 North/ South. We'd gone from eleven tricks to nine, then back to ten.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
A AJ 10964
$\bigcirc 3$
$\diamond$ A J
\& Q J 97


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Subhash | Haavard | Noriko | Oddrun |
| Gupta | Moe | Domichi | Godejord |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | $1 N T$ | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 30 | All Pass |

When dummy arrived after the queen of clubs lead, Gupta thought they might have missed a game. He ducked the first club, won the second and led the queen of diamonds. North won that
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with the ace and tried to cash a club. Declarer ruffed the club, ruffed a spade, ruffed a diamond and ruffed a spade, felling the king. When he ruffed a diamond with the nine of hearts and North could not overruff, discarding a club, it looked like South was either $2=2=5=4$ or $3=1=5=4$ with the jack of hearts and maybe the ace of spades. Taking no chances, Gupta ruffed two more spades in dummy, both with high trumps, and lost a trick at the end. Plus 170 -they'd missed a game after all. However, had North led or shifted to a trump and allowed South to win the diamond queen to lead a second trump, declarer would have had to play well enough to earn the IBPA Best Played Deal of the Year to make ten tricks.

Let's say North leads a trump. Declarer wins in hand, ruffs a spade and leads a diamond. South rises with the king (well, we are playing double dummy, yes?) and leads a second trump. North can afford a spade discard. Declarer wins the second heart in dummy and ruffs a diamond, ruffs a spade and ruffs another diamond. North must discard a club as a spade allows declarer to set up a long card. So declarer ruffs another spade and leads another diamond from dummy...


When declarer, in the dummy, ruffs a diamond, again North must discard a club as a spade allows declarer to duck a spade and again make a long card in the suit. Now look at those club spots. Declarer plays the ace and another club and it matters not which defender wins the second club. Either (if South wins the club) dummy will make a club trick or (if North wins it) declarer makes a spade trick.

Thank you, Deep Finesse.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

|  | Q 983 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\diamond$ | - |
| $\diamond$ | K J 87 |
| $\&$ | K 8632 |



| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bin | Chris | Wei | Dana <br> Shi |
|  | Willenken | Tian | Berkowitz <br> 10 |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | $4 \Omega$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

With no favourable breaks for declarer, this one looks to be two off. But watch.

Shi Bin led the ace of diamonds, ruffed by Dana Berkowitz. Declarer led the ace, king and seven of hearts to West's queen. West shifted to the ten of clubs, two, five!, jack. Having won a surprise club trick, declarer was now in a position to make four hearts. All she had to do was guess the location of the king of spades. She drew the remaining trump and led a club to the nine, king and ace. East was endplayed if only declarer knew it. East exited with the queen of clubs. If East had the king of spades, declarer could make four hearts by discarding a spade on the club. East would have had to lead into dummy for ten tricks. However, declarer had a hard time believing that East would have ducked the club holding that card, so she ruffed the club and led a spade to the queen.
One off, -50.
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Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
A AJ943
$\checkmark$ Q 85
$\diamond 108$
\& 653
$\Delta-$
$\diamond 964$
$\diamond$ K 7432
$\&$ A 10874


A Q 875
๑ K J 1073
$\diamond$ Q J
\& J 2

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Romain | Knut | Gabriella | AnneMarie |
| Zaleski | Pettersen | Olivieri 1NT | Pettersen $20^{*}$ |
| 2 | 34 | Pass | Pass |
| 45 | Pass | 50 | Pass |
| 6.4 | 69 | Dble | All Pass |

* Both majors

With six clubs and seven diamonds makeable, this deal was all about the the sixth undertrick. Five down would mean -1100 , six down, -1400 , more than the value of the East/West slam. Only at pairs!

The defence took their four minor-suit winners, then led the ace and another heart. To hold his losses to 1100 , declarer needed to neutralise East's ten of spades. When he led the ace of spades and another, East was able to win with his king and tap dummy with a club. Declarer could take the queen of spades, but then had to surrender a heart ruff to East for -1400 . North's attempt to "walk the dog" had cost his side a bottom board, unless anyone could get to seven diamonds.


Board 10. Dealer East. Both Vul.
© K J 93
$\checkmark 954$
$\diamond$ AK 964
\& 7

| ¢ 42 N |  |  | A 1087 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 10872$ |  | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ | Q 53 |
| \& K 93 |  |  | \& | A Q 4 |
|  | 9 | A Q 65 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | J 10 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | J |  |  |
|  | 8 | J 1086 |  |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Elly | Christian | Rene | Liv Marit |
| S.-BosklopperBakke | Stienen | Grude |  |
|  |  | 1NT | 2 $\boldsymbol{\Lambda l}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{a}$ | All Pass |  |

No one could ever accuse Liv Marit Grude of being reticent in the bidding. Elly SchippersBosklopper led a third-best three of hearts and Rene Stienen played three rounds of the suit. Declarer ruffed and led three rounds of diamonds, ruffing the third with the queen. When she next led a club, it was the last chance for the defence to play trumps. When West won the club with the nine and led another club, declarer was in with a chance. She led a diamond from the dummy in this position:


Had East discarded the ace of clubs, he'd have been in an overruff position. Instead, he discarded his heart and declarer still had a chance to make. She needed to ruff the diamond low, ruff a club low and crossruff the remainder high. Instead she ruffed the diamond with the ace of spades and tried to draw trumps, hoping the ten was doubleton. When it was not, she was down one for -100 .
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## A SPECTACULAR BOARD

## by Jos Jacobs

Sweden's Peter Fredin lived up to his reputation of a specialist in spectacular results when he had to tackle this board:

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.
A K 2

- A J 1082
$\diamond$ AK 94
\& $A 7$

| A Q 965 |  | ヘ J 873 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Q 93 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\bigcirc$ - |
| $\diamond$ Q 7 | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond 1086$ |
| \& Q 1084 |  | \& KJ9532 |
|  | - A 104 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 7654 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 532 |  |
|  | \& 6 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| McAllister | Fredin | ZCampanile Blaagestad |  |
| Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Pass |  |
| Pass | $6 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

The par contract reached in really no time at all. East led a club to declarer's ace and next, with nothing to guide him, Fredin elected to cash the $\checkmark A$. West now had a trump trick but with the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ coming down doubleton, the contract still seemed
to be in no danger until Fredin, having a complete black-out, after eliminating both black suits went on to play a low diamond away from his AK, hoping for a defensive idiosyncrasy from East. When West could do little else than take dummy's $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ with his queen, the contract drifted one down. So much for the curious people who might want to find out where those -100's on the frequency sheet came from!


## PLAY BRIDGE TONIGHT! SOCIAL EVENING TOURNAMENT

## AT HOTEL THE EDGE

START 21:30

15 BOARDS // 150 NOK PER PAIR
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7th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS MIXED PAIRS FINAL STANZA FIVE
by Barry Rigal

In the Mixed Pairs Final the last ten deals of the first day gave me the opportunity to watch the two leading pairs at that time (Butryn-Sakowska and Cronier-Willard) while Thomas Bessis was feeding me the results from the Auken-Welland table. All three pairs were separated by about a top in matchpoint terms.
The first deal demonstrates what Tony Forrester so aptly described as the power of the Closed Hand. The advantage of relay systems that let declarer's hand remain completely unknown is hard to estimate; but I'd take a wild guess at half a trick a hand? The following deal exemplifies the sort of problem I am describing. To match wits with declarer, look just at the South hand, with which you are defending 4a


Open Room

| West <br> Welland | North <br> Willenken | East <br> Auken | South <br> D.Berkowitz |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \wedge^{*}$ | Pass |
| $4 \boldsymbol{Q}^{*}$ | Pass | $4 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \wedge^{*}$ | All Pass |

1NT Relay
20 Transfer
2 ${ }^{4}$ Relay
4\% 4-2-7-0 minimum
$4 \diamond \quad$ End-signal
After a very slow auction from both East and West, East signs off in 4 $\mathbf{\$}$ after finding partner's precise range and pattern. Do you lead a heart or

club? Let's say you lead a heart, and dummy comes down as advertised. Partner wins the ace and returns the two. Declarer, who has taken a minute or two before playing from dummy to trick one, wins the king, leads a spade to the king, partner following with the eight - which might have suit preference overtones or be generally obstructive. Declarer now leads the $\diamond$ J from dummy, partner plays the upside-down three, declarer pitches a heart, and you are in with the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$. Your move!
I've no idea what you should do, but Dana Berkowitz tried a club, and that was not a success, as the full hand reveals. Auken now had two clubs, one diamond and seven trump winners. On a trump back I think Auken would win the queen, and either try to ruff out the diamonds or advance the $\diamond 10$. But even nine tricks would prove a struggle. Since Auken could of course have crossruffed for nine tricks at trick two (for a 31MP/50 or $62 \%$ board) it is interesting to speculate on whether her approach was the correct MP one in theory - but in practice it certainly was. +420 was a cool 0-50.
Welland-Auken also scored extremely well on the next deal when a non-vulnerable pre-empt from Welland pushed his opponents into an awkward spot.
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| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Welland | Willenken | Auken | D.Berkowitz |
| $2 \Omega$ | Pass | Pass | 2NT |

All Pass
Welland's winning options on lead were to start with a top heart or to lead a diamond. Naturally, however, he led a low heart. Declarer's easiest route to success would have been to win the jack or ten and finesse in clubs. One can sympathize with the decision to run the lead to her hand - which would certainly have been sensible had East started life with a bare heart honour. Nonetheless the critical entry issue to dummy does suggest playing an honour to me. When declarer misguessed the club jack at trick two the diamond shift finished her off, and an error in the endgame led to down two and 47/50MP for her opponents. Had South played the roJ to be in East she could still have recovered from trick one. Lead a club to the queen and ace, and East can do no better than return a low diamond. You win the queen, finesse in clubs and cash your $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ to reach this ending:

|  | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathbf{n} & \mathrm{J} 92 \\ \boldsymbol{D} & \mathrm{~J} 10 \\ \diamond & 2 \\ \dot{\phi} & 10 \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E |  |
|  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{S}}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | A AQ4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 32 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 6 |  |
|  | 8 - |  |

Declarer must now find the elegant move of advancing $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$. East must duck, and now a heart
lead lets West win and exit in diamonds. East takes the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and gets off-play with a diamond, but now the defenders' communications are cut and South sets up a second heart in peace and quiet (taking two tricks in each suit). If East ducks the first diamond, South wins the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and exits in diamonds to force East to lead spades at the death and concede the eighth trick in a different way.

On the next deal I watched Cronier-Willard be the beneficiaries of a very tired play from an opponent who conceded an extra trick when she had the rest on top (miscounting her winners by no fewer than two tricks). This was worth 46/50, while Butryn-Sakowska were conceding 690. Welland-Auken had a relay accident and played a broken 4-3 fit in slam with 12 top tricks in notrump or diamonds, for a complete zero.
On the next deal, the same defender against Cronier-Willard heard her partner open a weak multi, and a 2NT overcall. With a 3-2-3-5 16-count she meekly passed it out, and then cashed out for down one in the middle game with two down still a distinct possibility. This was not especially expensive (one down was 30 MP for the French, two down would have been 23). And since $3 \bigcirc$ was making for their opponents, with 3 on the cards their way, and plus score either way would have been respectable enough.
The next round saw a triumph for light openers one in each direction. In first seat at unfavourable vulnerability Welland opened KJ/QJ1042/ J754/K6, seduced no doubt by his quick tricks? His LHO tried to put on the pressure with a 49 call, where God had created only a 3 pre-empt. Auken briskly informed him of his error and defended accurately to collect 500. That was only worth 35/50 since 3NT was making for her side. But at many tables the initial pass allowed the 39 pre-empt to buy the contract, as happened where Voldoire-Avon were playing against CronierWillard. That earned the leaders 19MP/50.
This score was reversed with interest on the next deal where Voldoire did not open what in many respects was a far better opener than the one on the previous round (Q10/98/A10652/AJ105). That meant his partner with a 5-2-4-2 12-count played a spade partscore for +170 rather than their excellent spade game or makeable diamond game. Malinowski-De Botton did reach game against Welland-Auken and made +650 , which was a result worth $47 / 50$. Butryn-Sakowska duplicated the French results and remained in second place behind them.

| GO TO PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

At this stage the leading two pairs met, and the French did themselves no favours. Cronier was faced with the third successive light-opener conundrum.

Board 17 Dealer North. None Vul.

- 8

৩ K6542
$\diamond$ K 93
\& KQ 87


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Butryn | Cronier | Sakowska Willard |  |
|  | $1 \Omega$ | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ |

All Pass
Willard and Cronier were on completely different pages here. (Put me in Philippe's book though Shock! Horror! He had opened a hand I would have passed, I admit). 24 went down three on repeated heart leads - a fine shot by Butryn to lead $\searrow \mathrm{Q}$ since on a club lead Willard would have won the $\& \mathrm{~K}$, finessed in spades and cashed $\boldsymbol{A}$ to come to at least seven tricks, for what would have been close to an average. As it was, -150 meant 49/50 for the Poles.



Board 18. Dealer East. NS Vul.
A AJ64
$\checkmark$ KQ1053
$\diamond 105$
106


Natalia Sakowska, East, declared 4^ after Cronier had doubled hearts and Willard had raised to $3 \checkmark$. If declarer is going to misguess spades, the contract can be defeated. After Willard's $\bigcirc 7$ lead Cronier decided to put in the $৩ \mathrm{~K}$. Declarer won and advanced $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$, ducked all round, then led a second spade. Cronier won and returned a low heart. Declarer had no guess: she went up with $\bigcirc \mathrm{J}$ and drove out the trump honour, and ran the diamonds for 10 tricks and a slightly above average score. Of course the defenders could have prevailed - though it is not easy. If Cronier shifts to a club after winning $\$ \mathrm{~J}$ how is Willard to know what to do? If partner has a singleton club you must give him a ruff (and no, partner couldn't cash © A to remove a losing option as he might have a singleton club and you might have $\diamond$ A not $\& \mathrm{~A}$. In that case, cashing the A loses the ruff). Of course today the winning defence is to win $\% \mathrm{~A}$ and play hearts to force dummy - but that was never going to happen after the false-card to trick one.
On the next deal Cronier-Willard coped extremely well with a Multi $2 \diamond$ opener to reach 6NT, with the grand slam on a losing finesse. That was worth $31 / 50$, while Butryn-Sakowska escaped for 800 in 29 x , for a $76 \%$ result. The last three deals of the set saw something very close to average results for the French. They broke with a narrow lead over Welland-Auken, who had closed the gap to 2MP. It would be all to play for tomorrow!

| Go to Page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
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## MIXED PAIRS FINAL, SESSIONS 6-7

## by David Bird

The second day of the final dawned and I was following the play at Table 25.

Board 3. Dealer South. N/S Vul.
か Q 983
$\diamond$ K
$\diamond$ K 87
\& K 8632

$\left.\begin{array}{lll}\text { West } & \text { North } & \text { East }\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { South } \\ \text { Helgemo }\end{array}\right)$

It might not be to everyone's taste to open at the four-level with a side ace and void. Anyway, North ended as declarer in $4 \diamond$ and the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ was led. It looked like two down but it didn't turn out that way. McCallum won and drew a second trump, East discarding a diamond. A trump to West's queen was followed by the $\$ 10$ to the queen.
East held nine cards remaining at this stage and the return of only one of them would allow the contract to make. Sadly she found it, leading the $\boldsymbol{\omega} \mathrm{K}$. McCallum won, drew the last trump and cleared a club trick. The Q allowed her to reach dummy for a spade discard and $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{S}$ scored 48.92-1.08.



Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| McAllister | T.Helness | Migri | G.Helness |
|  |  | 1NT | $2 \boldsymbol{q}^{*}$ |
| 3:* | 4a | Dble | All Pass |

South showed the major suits and West indicated the minors with spade shortage. Tor Helness was doubled in 4 4 and the defenders had to seek an 800 penalty (four down) to improve on the +640 available in a minor-suit game.
Migri led the $\% \mathrm{~K}$ and $\% \mathrm{Q}$. She switched to the $\checkmark A$, drawing a reverse-attitude $\triangle 9$, and then played the $\diamond A$, receiving an encouraging $\diamond 2$. To ensure +800 East must play her remaining heart now, aiming to use partner's $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ as the entry for a heart ruff. When she played a diamond to the king instead, declarer had a chance to reduce the penalty to a matchpoint-rich 500. He won West's heart return with the queen and then needed to lead low to the 8 to achieve his goal. He chose to play the A instead and we were back in 800 territory. The 4 went to the 7 . East could then win the Q with the S K and play a third club, forcing dummy's last trump. Locked in the South hand, declarer had to promote East's 10 with a heart play. -800 was worth $13.56-36.44$ for N/S.
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| :--- | ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Board 8. Dealer West. Neither Vul.

|  | A 54 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 864 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 75 |  |  |
|  | \& KQ 3 |  |  |
| A KQJ 2 | N | 4 10986 |  |
| $\bigcirc 1053$ | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ |  |  |
| $\diamond 1084$ |  |  | A Q 3 |
| \& A 64 |  | 8 | 109872 |
|  | A A 73 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ QJ 92 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 962 |  |  |
|  | \& J 5 |  |  |
| West | North E | East | South |
| Blaagestad | Michielsen | Fredin | Rosenthal |
| Pass | 18 | Pass | $3 \diamond *$ |
| Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |

South's $3 \diamond$ was a Bergen raise, showing 9-11 points and North's advance to game seems ambitious to me. The 10 was led and Michielsen reached an elimination position with three diamonds and a trump in each hand. She led a low diamond from North and only a spot-card appeared from East. If East had started with $\diamond A-x$ and mistakenly failed to rise on the first round, declarer could make the contract by winning with the king and exiting to the bare ace. This was scarcely possible, so Michielsen covered with the $\diamond 9$ to guarantee only one down. Attempting the close game and failing by a trick was worth 13.56 36.44 for $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$.

Michielsen and Rosenthal returned to the same table in the next session:

Board 14. Dealer East. Neither Vul.
A A 10653
© Q 983
$\diamond-$
Q Q J 85

| ¢ J 97 | N | 4 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ A J 10 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc$ K 72 |
| $\diamond$ J 1093 | ${ }^{\text {W }}$ | $\diamond$ AK 8752 |
| \& A 64 |  | \& K 93 |
|  | * KQ42 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 654$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 64 |  |
|  | \& 1072 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rosenthal | Moe | MichielsenGodejord |  |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Playing inverted minors, responding with a forcing $2 \diamond$ and showing stoppers, would had revealed the lack of a spade stopper. 2NT was a reasonable effort at matchpoints, I suppose, but it went unrewarded. North led a spade and the defenders quickly stacked five tricks in the suit. They had to score a diamond too, so that was two down, giving N-S 35.83/14.17.
The E-W pairs who played in $5 \diamond$ were defeated by the 3-0 trump break. They could at least guarantee ten tricks with an elimination ending. A club lead must be won with the king. You then play one top trump, followed by a spade. They win and play a club to the ace. When you ruff a spade and return a club, they have to play a third spade. This completes the elimination. You cash the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and exit in trumps, forcing South to save you the heart guess.
Well, let's end with this one:
Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- 954
- 1085
$\diamond 10842$
\& $\mathrm{A} \mathrm{J}^{2}$


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A.Bogen | Berkowitz | F.Bogen | Willenken |
| 104 | Pass | $1 \Omega$ | Pass |
| $1 \mathbf{1}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

Willenken led a club to the ace, Berkowitz returning the $\& 4$ to the $\& \mathrm{~K}$. South crossed to partner's $\% \mathrm{~J}$ by leading the $\$ 8$ - a suit-preference card for a spade return. Back came a spade and the defenders had the first six tricks, 44.22-5.78 for $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$.
If clubs are not led, perhaps because West is declarer, there are eight tricks available in the red suits (following Restricted Choice in diamonds). Because the clubs are blocked, declarer can in fact establish a ninth trick in spades and make the game.
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## MIXED PAIRS - FINAL A

FINAL RESULTS

| 1 | CRONIER P. - WILLARD S. | $2,940.46$ | 56.66 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | HELGEMO G. - LANGELAND A. | $2,849.24$ | 54.90 |
| 3 | GROMOV A. - GROMOVA V. | $2,822.90$ | 54.39 |
| 4 | BUTRYN P. - SAKOWSKA N. | $2,820.25$ | 54.34 |
| 5 | AVON D. - VOLDOIRE J. | $2,811.26$ | 54.17 |
| 6 | AUKEN S. - WELLAND R. | $2,774.62$ | 53.46 |
| 7 | BREKKA G. - FUGLESTAD A. | $2,757.43$ | 53.13 |
| 8 | HANSEN J. - VIST G. | $2,752.35$ | 53.03 |
| 9 | KIZILOK O. - KUTUK B. | $2,747.62$ | 52.94 |
| 10 | HAYMAN PIAFSKY J. - KALITA | $2,732.49$ | 52.65 |
| 11 | HESKJE T. - OVESEN J. | $2,726.53$ | 52.53 |
| 12 | BERKOWITZ D. - WILLENKEN | $2,715.16$ | 52.32 |
| 13 | SCHIPPERS-B. E. - STIENEN R. | $2,712.01$ | 52.25 |
| 14 | RIMSTEDT C. - UPMARK J. | $2,708.69$ | 52.19 |
| 15 | BALDYSZ C. - JASZCZAK A. | $2,706.95$ | 52.16 |
| 16 | NILSSON H. - OPPENSTAM A. | $2,706.94$ | 52.16 |
| 17 | WENNING K. - WENNING U. | $2,698.17$ | 51.99 |
| 18 | BAKKE C. - GRUDE L. | $2,694.74$ | 51.92 |
| 19 | HELNESS G. - HELNESS T. | $2,684.84$ | 51.73 |
| 20 | MICHIELSEN M. - ROSENTHAL | $2,672.45$ | 51.49 |
| 21 | PUNCH S. - REES T. | $2,663.88$ | 51.33 |
| 22 | KHANDELWAL - KHANDELWAL | $2,661.80$ | 51.29 |
| 23 | GUI S. - WANG L. | $2,655.64$ | 51.17 |
| 24 | BLOOM V. - EBER N. | $2,637.40$ | 50.82 |
| 25 | PASKE T. - SEALE C. | $2,634.68$ | 50.76 |
| 26 | McCALLUM K. - TUNCOK C. | $2,631.54$ | 50.70 |


| 27 | DE BOTTON J. - MALINOWSKI | $2,624.04$ | 50.56 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | VAN PROOIJEN R. - WILSON A. | $2,621.60$ | 50.51 |
| 29 | KHOLOMEEV V. - RAKHMANI | $2,620.21$ | 50.49 |
| 30 | MCALLISTER - ZUR-CAMPANILE $2,598.62$ | 50.07 |  |
| 31 | BROCK S. - MYERS B. | $2,592.89$ | 49.96 |
| 32 | GOLD D. - GROSS S. | $2,566.89$ | 49.46 |
| 33 | SARNIAK A. - SIELICKI T. | $2,524.93$ | 48.65 |
| 34 | CAYNE P. - DE FALCO D. | $2,521.78$ | 48.59 |
| 35 | BLAAGESTAD L. - FREDIN P. | $2,510.46$ | 48.37 |
| 36 | CAMERON G. - STABELL L. | $2,507.79$ | 48.32 |
| 37 | GODEJORD O. - MOE H. | $2,495.70$ | 48.09 |
| 38 | LEV S. - LEVITINA I. | $2,473.42$ | 47.66 |
| 39 | MANNO A. - PISCITELLI F. | $2,472.25$ | 47.63 |
| 40 | DOMICHI N. - GUPTA S. | $2,467.18$ | 47.54 |
| 41 | BILDE D. - CILLEBORG D. | $2,457.18$ | 47.34 |
| 42 | LINDAAS P. - RINGSETH J. | $2,451.88$ | 47.24 |
| 43 | BOHNSACK H. - BOHNSACK | $2,432.37$ | 46.87 |
| 44 | MULTON F. - WARD-PLATT K. | $2,423.48$ | 46.70 |
| 45 | PETTERSEN A. - PETTERSEN | $2,422.27$ | 46.67 |
| 46 | SHI B. - TIAN W. | $2,421.91$ | 46.66 |
| 47 | BOGEN A. - BOGEN F. | $2,398.80$ | 46.22 |
| 48 | KEDZIERSKA U. - MORAWSKI | $2,307.10$ | 44.45 |
| 49 | ASLA R. - MARKUSSEN S. | $2,304.36$ | 44.40 |
| 50 | OLIVIERI G. - ZALESKI R. | $2,298.10$ | 44.28 |
| 51 | HETZ C. - PACHTMAN R. | $2,259.77$ | 43.54 |
| 52 | CORNELL M. - CORNELLV. | $2,125.00$ | 40.94 |

Results are subject to confirmation
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The Vienna Coup by Kitty Cooper

| оо to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
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| $1$ | TER LAARE M. - MOLLE L. | 6,197.31 58.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | CLAIR P. - PAGNINI-ARSLAN C. | 6,266.64 57.49 |
| 3 | KOWALSKI A. - MISZEWSKA E. | 6,246.02 57.30 |
| 4 | UZUM D. - OZGUNES A. | 6,072.60 56.88 |
| 5 | MATUSHKO G. - GULEVICH A. | 6,026.61 56.45 |
| 6 | GAVIARD D. - MARRO C. | 6,143.40 56.36 |
| 7 | SANBORN K. - SANBORN S. | 6,067.35 55.66 |
| 8 | ANFINSEN I. - SOLHEIM E. | 6,049.92 55.50 |
| 9 | BUGGE L. - GUSTAVSEN A. | 6,046.98 55.48 |
| 10 | AYDIN A. - SUZER U. | 6,036.63 55.38 |
| 11 | HOLMOY S. - BOGEN H. | 5,716.82 54.72 |
| 12 | MIYAKUNI A. - MIYAKUNI K. | 5,962.81 54.70 |
| 13 | NIKITINA A. - GUSEV V. | 5,958.94 54.67 |
| 14 | THOMASSEN K. - HINGE S. | 5,949.74 54.58 |
| 15 | BAREKET I. - SAADA N. | 5,939.46 54.49 |
| 16 | HINDEN F. - OSBORNE G. | 5,937.32 54.47 |
| 17 | GOUVERITH M. - DE MULLER | 5,908.34 54.20 |
| 18 | CURTIS C. - FEGARTY P. | 5,901.14 54.14 |
| 19 | ZOBU A. - ARONOV V. | 5,880.43 53.95 |
| 20 | SENIOR B. - PENFOLD S. | 5,862.77 53.79 |
| 21 | McLEISH P. - McLEISH D. | 5,845.25 53.63 |
| 22 | LESLIE P. - ALLERTON J. | 5,838.05 53.56 |
| 23 | GOWER C. - BATEMAN N. | 5,714.61 53.49 |
| 24 | HAGEN E. - ANJER M. | 5,809.79 53.30 |
| 25 | SHAMI A. - CAMP O. | 5,683.67 53.20 |
| 26 | ROREN T. - WENNEVOLD I. | 5,677.27 53.18 |
| 27 | LYBAEK A. - ELLINGSEN K. | 5,790.11 53.12 |
| 28 | HOYLAND S. - SJODAL S. | 5,661.31 52.99 |
| 29 | BREKKE V. - HELNESS F. | 5,652.24 52.94 |
| 30 | McGOWAN E. - LIGGAT D. | 5,646.39 52.89 |
| 31 | KERN S. - ILLNER A. | 5,760.75 52.85 |
| 32 | FJAELBERG J. - BIRKELAND B. | 5,502.46 52.65 |
| 33 | KARLSEN S. - JESUS F Q M | 5,735.16 52.62 |
| 34 | GLAERUM L. - HERMANSEN V. | 5,729.03 52.56 |
| 35 | KOVACHEV V. - MARQUARDT | 5,599.65 52.45 |
| 36 | MITCHELL J. - CAYNE J. | 5,680.39 52.11 |
| 37 | SUNDLAND H. - HAUGSTAD | 5,657.74 51.91 |
| 38 | HOMME M. - HOMME E. | 5,415.17 51.81 |
| 39 | NILSEN H. - PETTERSEN V. | 5,406.01 51.74 |
| 40 | SVENDSEN O. - GILLIS S. | 5,630.67 51.66 |
| 41 | ISPORSKI V. - NIKOLOVA M. | 5,593.59 51.32 |
| 42 | FURUNES J. - STORNES H. | 5,561.91 51.03 |
| 43 | JAKOBSEN A. - DANIELSEN A. | 5,445.68 51.01 |
| 44 | NOSACKI M. - SAADA P. | 5,558.08 50.99 |
| 45 | SAYER N. - ZAHARIEV Z. | 5,552.48 50.94 |
| 46 | TESHOME S. - THROWER J. | 5,432.74 50.89 |
| 47 | FENESS J. - KOPSTAD K. | 5,542.25 50.85 |
| 48 | EGGELING M. - GOTARD T. | 5,424.53 50.81 |
| 49 | ROSENTHAL L. - GREEN L. | 5,525.85 50.70 |
| 50 | BRAGADIR S. - DE MENDEZ T. | 5,505.99 50.51 |
| 51 | KJONSVIK O. - SPILLUM B. | 5,490.89 50.38 |
| 52 | STANGHELLE H. - HARDING | 5,435.40 49.87 |
| 53 | STEPHENS R. - ROSSLEE D. | 5,433.32 49.85 |
| 54 | SOOILAND T. - DUBLAND K. | 5,422.27 49.75 |
| 55 | OZTURK E. - CAKICI F. | 5,310.72 49.71 |
| 56 | MARK M. - MARK S. | 5,194.72 49.70 |
| 57 | HANSSEN - KOFOED HANSEN | 5,285.54 49.51 |


| 58 | PICUS S. - HOFFMAN D. | 5,277.84 49.44 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 59 | ELIASSEN N. - EIDE L. | 5,371.60 49.28 |
| 60 | SNEVE S. - HELMERSEN K. | 5,351.66 49.10 |
| 61 | DOBROWOLSKI M. - MADUZIA | 5,351.65 49.10 |
| 62 | EDLUND L. - LARSSON R. | 5,347.17 49.06 |
| 63 | LOSSIUS T. - THEODORSEN L. | 5,110.89 48.92 |
| 64 | HERLAND J. - LARSSEN I. | 5,317.94 48.79 |
| 65 | KVERNSTROM K. - BERG B. | 5,179.33 48.51 |
| 66 | ELLINGSEN S. - NICOLAISEN S. | 5,168.43 48.38 |
| 67 | STRETZ F. - SALONEN I. | 5,242.23 48.09 |
| 68 | KREUNING H. - OUDA S. | 5,240.15 48.07 |
| 69 | NAVEH N. - MERMELSTEIN G. | 5,115.69 47.88 |
| 70 | GRAIZER N. - HORVITZ S. | 5,215.40 47.85 |
| 71 | KOLESNIK A. - CAPRERA D. | 5,214.93 47.84 |
| 72 | CAPLAN E. - FRISBY W. | 5,209.66 47.80 |
| 73 | YUEN M. - FENTON A. | 5,207.49 47.78 |
| 74 | KHONICHEVA E. - FEOFANOV | 5,097.53 47.71 |
| 75 | BRENNE E. - MOEN V. | 5,196.55 47.67 |
| 76 | DAHLV. - BRINCHMANN K. | 5,190.15 47.62 |
| 77 | HETZ N. - SVENDSEN T. | 5,156.57 47.31 |
| 78 | OVSTEDAL F. - LARSEN H. | 5,048.31 47.29 |
| 79 | TISLEVOLL G. - MAYER F. | 5,043.75 47.24 |
| 80 | BULL S. - NESSETH B. | 5,039.77 47.21 |
| 81 | RIESE S. - RIESE T. | 5,128.94 47.05 |
| 82 | ENGEBRETSEN G. - OWER A. | 5,021.57 47.04 |
| 83 | GRUDE M. - SIVERTSVIK R. | 4,900.45 46.90 |
| 84 | BANKOGLU E. - BANKOGLU L. | 5,108.81 46.87 |
| 85 | VOS V. - BASA M. | 5,093.39 46.73 |
| 86 | KARAIVANOV K. - HANSEN L. | 4,959.07 46.45 |
| 87 | FJAELBERG A. - LERBREKK R. | 4,852.85 46.43 |
| 88 | FRANCESCONI A. - MANZANO | 5,038.62 46.23 |
| 89 | KVIKSTAD J. - KVIKSTAD Y. | 5,023.99 46.09 |
| 90 | GOTARD B. - GOTARD T. | 5,022.40 46.08 |
| 91 | FAGERDAL R. - ANDERSEN W. | 5,009.41 45.96 |
| 92 | PEREZ N. - PEREZ H. | 4,996.79 45.84 |
| 93 | JOYCE E. - FITZGERALD J. | 4,971.68 45.61 |
| 94 | ERNSTSEN S. - JAKOBSEN K. | 4,964.82 45.55 |
| 95 | ROSSARD M. - ROMANOWSKI | 4,950.70 45.42 |
| 96 | PHELAN L. - MITCHELL L. | 4,925.82 45.19 |
| 97 | ROBERTSEN G. - ROSLAND S. | 4,825.59 45.17 |
| 98 | SIVERTSEN A. - SOLLIE F. | 4,754.88 44.54 |
| 99 | SOLVANG B. - KANDAHL E. | 4,799.62 44.03 |
| 100 | HALFON N. - HALFON T. | 4,595.80 43.99 |
| 101 | SJODAL E. - SJODAL R. | 4,648.19 43.54 |
| 102 | LUND H. - VIGANDER K. | 4,624.74 42.43 |
| 103 | PELLE I. - HAVERKATE J. | 4,611.18 42.30 |
| 104 | PARNIS-ENGLAND M. - DIX M. | 4,569.61 41.92 |
| 105 | CRICHTON R. - CRICHTON P. | 4,475.35 41.06 |
| 106 | MALUISH A. - MILL A. | 4,426.75 40.61 |

## Results are subject

 to confirmation
## MONTE-CARLO 16-17-18 Octobre 2015

O
Espace Léo Ferré

# XXVII TOURNOI INTERNATIONAL DE BRIDGE 

 PRIX / PREMI / PRIZES 20,000
## Droits d'inscription: 250 €

 Equipes $2^{\text {ème }}$ séries ou Dames: $100 €$ FREE/GRATUITpour les équipes $3^{\text {ème }}$ et $4^{\text {ème }}$ séries ou Juniors

III Tournoi de Burraco Samedi 17 Octobre 21 h 00

## Informations / Inscriptions

email: contact@federation-bridge.mc tel: + 33 (0)6.80.86.91.03 www.festivalsdusoleil.com
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