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Bernhard Sträter \& Ulrich Kratz


Sandra Rimstedt \& Emma Sjöberg

After an incredible day where at times you could have thrown a handkerchief over the leading pairs and the lead repeatedly changed hands a strong finish saw Sweden's Emma Sjöberg \& Sandra Rimstedt installed as the European Women's Pairs Champions. Poland's Justyna Zmuda \& Katarzyna Dufrat were second and China's Yan Lu \& Yan Liu third. Germany's Bernhard Sträter \& Ulrich Kratz were convincing winners of the European Open Senior Pairs, finishing ahead of Norway's Roald Maesel \& Helge Maesel and the Netherlands' Jaap Trouwborst \& Nico Doremans.


## TODAY'S SCHEDULE

## OPEN PAIRS FINAL

MARIT SVEAAS SWISS PAIRS
10.00-11.30: Round 1
11.45-13.15: Round 2
14.30-16.00: Round 3
16.15-17.45: Round 4
18.00-19.45: Round 5
10.30-14.00: Session 1
15.30-19.00: Session 2
(4)


Roald \& Helge Maesel


Nico Doremans \& Jaap Trouwborst


Lu Yan \& Liu Yan

## PRESS CONFERENCE TODAY

by European Bridge League
The President of the EBL
will host a press conference Today 10th at 15.00 p.m.
in the Press Room of the Championship's Venue.
Together with Yves Aubry, Jan Kamras, Patrick Jourdain, Jostein Sørvoll, Inger Hjellemarken will jointly chair the conference and answer questions from journalists.


TODAY JULY 10TH, 3.00 P.M. - PRESS CONFERENCE - PRESS ROOM
2

| 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## PRACTICAL INFORMATIONS

1. The cafeteria will close at 19.00 today.
2. There will be no more side events.

## EUROPEAN BRIDGE LEAGUE <br> FÉDÉRATION MONÉGASQUE DE BRIDGE

Monaco, from 8th fo 14th Febrnary, 2016

Monaco is getting ready to host an exciting new event with substantial cash prizes
from 8th to 14th February 2016
Sponsored by Pierre Zimmermann
Stay tuned on: www.eurobridge.org!


## FROM THE ARCHIVES

by Frank van Wezel \& Hans van de Konijnenberg

Dutch players Frank van Wezel and Hans van de Konijnenberg both collect books, magazines and Daily Bulletins about bridge. They especially enjoy reading Daily Bulletins from the pre-internet era because these bulletins are a treasure trove of wonderful photographs, marvellous sketches, splendid deals, and tremendous stories and anecdotes.
Frank and Hans decided that this material should be at the disposal of all bridge players. At the same time, they want to save the history of bridge from oblivion. Therefore they launched a free website www.bridgedailybulletins.nl. On this site you can find thousands of scanned bulletins, both from the digital era and before. They posted WBF, EBL and ACBL championship bulletins, as well as many from miscellaneous tournaments around the world.
And if you have bulletins that they are missing, please contact them. Contact details can be found on the website.

As a taster of what the site has to offer, here is a deal, reported by Barry Rigal, from the 1989 European Championships, held in Turku, Finland.


## Cain and Abel

One of the advantages of playing boards duplicated across the field is that one can find hands where one player has done something good, and then check how the rest of the field compared.

Here Raymond Brock fond the correct technical play, giving the defence in addition a chance to go wrong, which they duly grabbed; the only disappointment was that it robbed us of the choice of a brilliancy, though would it have been for declarer or defence?


Three no-trumps is a fortuitous make, but both tables sailed into four spades after North had overcalled in hearts. Indeed at nearly every table the contract was four spades - Denmark managed to stop in three spades against Norway.

Every table led a top heart, and every declarer except Raymond and the Polish declarer (against Ireland) won the first trick. There were now no squeeze chances in the heart suit; as soon as the defence got in they could play two more rounds of hearts, killing the menace.

The Polish declarer got a heart continuation, and tried drawing trumps (North throwing three hearts), before playing a club to the queen (ducked smoothly of course). Then a losing diamond finesse left him needing the club ace onside or a diamond split. No luck - one down.

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



Raymond Brock also ducked the first trick, and the defence unwisely shifted to diamonds; ten easy tricks now.

Look, however, at what ought to have happened on a heart continuation: (we shall look at a club continuation later). Declarer wins, draws four rounds of trumps, and the last one squeezes North:

|  | A - |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 10 |  |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 1086 |  |  |  |
|  | 8 |  |  |  |
| A 105 N a - |  |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ - |  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E |  | 9 |
| $\diamond$ A J 2 |  | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}}$ | $\diamond$ | K 543 |
| \& 1065 |  |  | 8 | K Q 8 |
|  | 4 9 - |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | - |  |  |
|  |  | 97 |  |  |
|  |  | A J 9 |  |  |

North cannot afford to discard a diamond, as declarer can easily arrange to duck one trick in diamonds. If he pitches a heart, declarer plays a club to the queen (ducked of course, else North is easily strip-squeezed), and a club from dummy.

If South cashes his last club, he squeezes North, so he exits with a diamond. But declarer wins in dummy and plays a heart, pitching his club to endplay North!

So North pitches a club, and declarer plays a club to the queen. The same strip squeeze operates if South wins, so he ducks; now dummy plays the losing heart, as West pitches his club loser, and when North plays his last heart he pitches a diamond from dummy and his last club from hand, to endplay North finally to lead diamonds. (This works even if he has misread the distribution, and North has the bare ace of clubs and queen to three diamonds left).


What about a club at trick two? Declarer wins his queen on table (else we are back to the stripsqueeze), and runs the trumps:


North can now afford a diamond on the spade ten, dummy similarly. Declarer plays a club to dummy, won by South; here he must avoid the fratricide squeeze of cashing his last club.

He exits with a diamond and declarer wins in hand to lead his losing club. Again South wins, and avoids playing a club, instead playing a diamond to break up the squeeze.

One down!


Barry Rigal before (1989) and after (2015) Dorian Grey?

| go to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |

## CAIN AND ABEL REVISITED

by Barry Rigal

## Check the 1989 version of the article at previous page

As Harold Wilson nearly said "A week is a long time in politics but 26 years is an eternity in Bridge."
Revisiting my earlier analysis, this time with the aid of Deep Finesse, I am now a sadder and better informed if not wiser man. I now see that after the initial heart duck even a club shift, ducked will not suffice to defeat the game so long as declarer discards a club from dummy on the fourth spade.


THE NEW APP ON BIDDING

FOR TABLETS AND SMARTPHONES

In the diagrammed seven-card ending North cannot discard a heart or a club followed by a heart on the second club. If he does, declarer has a simple squeeze on North in the red suits if South cashes the second club winner, and a simple endplay on North with a heart if South shifts to a diamond after winning the first club.
Assume North instead pitches a diamond first. Declarer ducks a club and South again cannot cash the second club. But when he gets off play with a diamond West covers the diamond and ducks North's queen. The defenders have no communications in clubs so declarer can take the 13th diamond to pitch his club loser from hand.

7th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS

## POOR MAKEABLE GAMES? ...RICH SWINGS

by Ana Roth \& Fernando Lema

Here are two boards on which game was declared; you can decide if they were good contracts, but both were cold. Those who were lucky found major swings.

Open Teams Round 4. Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.
A A 64
© A 984
$\diamond 8$
\& A9852

| ¢ 10972 |  | A K J 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 3 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc$ K 72 |
| $\diamond$ J 764 | ${ }_{\text {W }} \mathrm{L}$ | $\diamond$ K 1092 |
| \& Q J 6 |  | \& K 104 |
|  | ¢ Q 83 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 1065 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q 53 |  |
|  | \& 73 |  |


| West <br> Hornslien | North <br> Verbeek | East <br> Hoeyem | South <br> Molenoar <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \&$ | Pass | $1 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Pass | $3 \Omega$ | Pass | $4 \Omega$ |

All Pass

## $1 \diamond \quad$ Transfer

On this deal game was reached at only seven of the 51 tables.
With everything friendly it was easy to take ten tricks.


Tim Verbeek


Open Teams. Round 2. Board 11. Dealer South. NoneVul.

- 765
$\bigcirc 105$
$\diamond$ AKJ642
\& A 3

| ¢ Q 932 |  | ¢ K 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ K 73 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\bigcirc$ AJ8642 |
| $\diamond$ Q 105 | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond 9$ |
| \& J 102 |  | \& 8764 |
|  | - A J 84 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 9 |  |
|  | $\diamond 873$ |  |
|  | \& K Q 95 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vinciguerra | Verbeek | Bompis | Molenaar |
|  |  |  | $1 \%$ |
| Pass | 29** | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | Pass | 30** |
| Pass | 48 | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

2* Diamonds, game forcing
34 Spade control
With no heart stopper the partnership landed in $5 \diamond$, a contract that some called poor, but that is always cold. (A slight overstatement. Editor.)
Only 16 of the 52 tables reached this game and only 10 declarers made it.
As a defender, I would rather be at another table...

## TEAM ORANGE WHITE vs BLUND

by John Carruthers

## Open Teams Final, Segment 2 of 4

The future looks bright for Dutch bridge. Team Orange White, three of whose players are not long out of the junior ranks, had thus far produced a dominating performance in the European Open Teams Championship. They had won the Swiss Qualifying by more than a match, never having been worse than in second place, and had not had a really close call in any of their knockout matches to date. Their opponents in the Open Teams final, by contrast, had just squeaked into sixteenth place by less than one Victory Point. They had had a roller-coaster ride in the Swiss, having been as high as second place after three matches and dropping to forty-seventh after another three. Nevertheless, Team Blund, all from Norway, has not had a close knockout match either. Somewhat unusually at these transnational championships, both these teams were purely national teams. These two nations had battled each other in the 1993 Bermuda Bowl final, the Dutch coming out on top in that encounter, although it must be said, not one of these players was on either team. The three junior Dutch players were barely out of diapers in 1993.

Orange White had pretty much had their way with Blund in the first stanza, scoring 49 IMPs and holding their opponents to 11 . Unbiased observers were hoping for a comeback by Blund so that we'd have a more exciting match. However, the trend continued early in the second set of 14 .


The combatants:
My apologies to the players if their compass direction are incorrect-there were technical difficulties with the BBO connection and seating locations were uncertain. The BBO record shows players from other matches in your seats and the EBU record is blank. (they are correct, J.C. Editor)

## Open Room

North: Tim Verbeek (Orange)
West: Ole Berset (Blund)
East: Børre Lund (Blund)
South: Danny Molenaar (Orange)

## Closed Room

North: Olav Arve Høyem (Blund)
West: Bart Nab (Orange)
East: Bob Drijver (Orange)
South: Aksel Hornslien (Blund)
Try this lead problem:
Board 18. Dealer East. N/S Vul.
SOUTH
ค 109872
$\checkmark$ J 9642
$\diamond 10$
\& 93
Open Room

| West <br> Berset | North <br> Verbeek | East <br> Lund | South <br> Molenaar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1\& |  | Pass <br> Pass |  |
| 3NT | Dble | 2NT | Pass |
|  | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room

| West | North <br> Høyem | East <br> Drijver <br> 1NT* | South <br> Hornslien <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
| 1NT | $9-12$ |  |  |

Well, do you like a spade or a heart? The hearts are marginally better, but that spade sequence looks pretty good as well.

Molenaar led a heart, Hornslien a spade. This was what they caught:


Lund was one down, Drijver made three. That was 10 IMPs to Orange when it could just have easily been 10 to Blund. Perhaps the simulation mavens can tell us what's really best.

Just in case we need a reminder that defence is the toughest part of the game...

Board 20. Dealer West. Both Vul.
A K 986
$\checkmark 753$
$\diamond$ AKQ 73
$\% A$


A J 10732

- Q 1094
$\diamond 82$
\& 83
Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar |
| 1NT | Dble** | $3 \& \%$ | Dble* |
| Pass | $4 \& \&^{*}$ | Pass | $40^{*}$ |
| Pass | 44 | All Pass |  |

Dble Penalties
Dble Cards, responsive type
4\% Let's play game
$4 \checkmark$ Still looking for our best fit
I confess that I have had to guess at the Verbeek/ Molenaar defensive methods over the strong notrump after the initial double. I've seen three different convention cards for them, none of
them explaining what the bidding beyond double means. I've tried to make my explanations fit the cards they actually held.

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Høyem | Drijver | Hornslien |
| 1NT | $2 \boldsymbol{\$}^{*}$ | 2 NT* $^{*}$ | $3 \boldsymbol{\$}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | All Pass |  |

24 Spades and a minor
2NT Forces 3\%
Holding little in the way of high cards but knowing their partners held lots, both Easts made intelligent leads. Lund led the two of hearts, lowest from an odd number. This gave West a problem: on the auction and lead, North could have held one heart or three, but not five. If it had been one, that one could have been the singleton king. If it were, Berset could not allow it to score a trick; if it weren't, all was not lost. Accordingly, he won with his ace. Then he returned a heart, hoping that it had been one, declarer would have to ruff the second round. When the king and another heart to the queen passed off safely, declarer was able to pick up the trumps with one loser (ruffing the third round of diamonds as a second entry to the dummy). That was a fantastic +620 for Verbeek and Molenaar.

Drijver led the eight of hearts, playing secondand fourth-best. When that went to the nine and jack, it looked like the Norwegians were booked for one off. Nab shifted to the king of clubs, however, won by the ace, East playing the jack (should he discourage with the nine, holding the king of hearts?). Declarer played the ace of diamonds, king of diamonds, and a diamond ruff to get to the dummy. When the jack of spades held the next trick, declarer was in position to pick up the spades. A second spade went to the ace and West played... a club. Declarer ruffed, drew the last trump and discarded two hearts from the dummy on diamonds. He surrendered a heart and claimed.

That was an extremely odd push.
Other than Board 18, the first 11 boards were pretty flat. With the score 65-16 to Team Orange and three boards to go in the set...

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



Although there was no alert entered in BBO, it appeared that, after the cue bid, two hearts showed spades and that two spades was a minimum. Someone may need to rethink that approach since four spades was a decent vulnerable game. East led a trump to the nine, ten and king. The queen of diamonds brought out the king and the ace of spades play next resulted in +170 . Should we chalk that one up to Lund getting in the first punch, or to the methods? Or was it judgment?

| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Nab | Høyem | Drijver | Hornslien |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1 ヵ$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Here, the club seven went to the ace and ten, and a club was returned to the queen. Thereafter, declarer also lost a spade trick, but his only other loser was the ace of hearts for +620 and 10 IMPs.

That made it 65-26 for Orange.

After a 2-IMP gain on Board 27 too make it 65-28...

Board 28. Dealer West. NS Vul.

|  | a 76 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark 85$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 932 |  |  |
|  | \& K 10876 |  |  |
| a Q 42 <br> $\checkmark$ AJ 943 | $\cdots$ - |  | A J 10985 |
|  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\checkmark$ | K 62 |
| $\diamond$ K 108 | ${ }^{\text {W }}$ | E |  |
| * Q 2 |  | 8 | A J 94 |
|  | A K 3 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 107 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AQ 7654 |  |  |
|  | - 53 |  |  |
| Open Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar |
| 18 | Pass | 10 | $2 \diamond$ |
| Dble* | $3 \diamond$ | 64 | All Pass |

Dble Three-card support
Lund took a reasonable shot when the opponents revealed themselves to have length and strength in diamonds. While it looks like the slam is on two of three finesses (about $50 \%)$ plus breaks, it became much better on the ace of diamonds lead. Declarer ruffed and immediately led a heart to the jack. When that held, he rejected the spade finesse and played the ace and another. South won with his king and tried a club, to no avail. Plus 980 to East/ West.

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Høyem | Drijver | Hornslien |
| 1NT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass |
| $4 \wedge$ | All Pass |  |  |
| $4 \diamond$ | Splinter |  |  |

Here, Nab was not tempted and Drijver let it go. North led a low diamond and Nab played safely, discarding a heart from dummy. He lost just the ace of diamonds and the king of spades for +450 . That resulted in an 11 -IMP gain for Blund, narrowing the gap to a more-manageable level, 26 IMPs. It was Orange 65 - Blund 39 with 28 boards to play.


100 teams $\infty 270$ pairs $\infty 50$ years tradition $\infty$ over $\mathbf{4 0}$ countries luxury venue Hotel Park Plaza Histria $\infty$ direct flights from most European cities fancy surroundings $\infty$ monuments from Roman times great summer weather at Adriatic coast accommodation from 10 euro/day $\infty$ daily bulletins international TD crew $\infty$ live broadcast on BBO entries: 10-20 Euro/day $\infty$ prizes 50.000 Euro $\infty$ special prizes open team winners 4.000 Euro $\infty$ open pairs winners 3.000 Euro www.pulabridgefestival.com

| Fri, Sept $4^{\text {th }}$ | $9 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. | Welcome Pairs | single session |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sat, Sept $5^{\text {th }}$ | $9 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. | IMP Pairs | single session |
| Sun, Sept 6 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 3 p.m. \& 9 p.m. | Mixed \& Open Teams | 2 sessions |
| Mon, Sept $7^{\text {th }}$ | 3 p.m. \& 9 p.m. | Mini-Teams BAM | 2 sessions |
| Tue, Sept $8^{\text {th }}$ | $9 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. | Lara Mixed \& Open Pairs | single session |
| Wed, Sept $9^{\text {th }}$ | 3 p.m. \& 9 p.m. | Open Teams | $1^{\text {st }} \& 2^{\text {nd }}$ session |
| Thu, Sept 10 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 3 p.m. \& 9 p.m. | Open Teams | $3^{\text {rd }} \& 4^{\text {th }}$ session |
| Fri, Sept 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 3 p.m. | Open Teams | final $A$ |
| Fri, Sept 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | $9 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. | Brk Open Pairs | $1^{\text {st }}$ session |
| Sat, Sept 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 1 p.m. | Brk Open Pairs | $2^{\text {nd }}$ session |
| Sept, $13{ }^{\text {th }} \mathbf{1 6}^{\text {th }}$ | $9 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. | Daily Additonal Pairs | single sessions |

## TEAM ORANGE WHITE vs BLUND

by David Bird

## Open Teams Final, segment 3

The third quarter began with Team Orange White leading by 65-39. We did not have long to wait for the first big swing.

Board 1. Dealer North. Neither Vul.

|  | a 65 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 6 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 72 |  |
|  | \& AJ9854 |  |
| ヘ 872 |  | - KQ94 |
| $\bigcirc$ J 10 |  | $\checkmark$ K Q 2 |
| $\diamond$ KJ8643 | $3{ }_{\text {w }}$ E | $\diamond$ Q 105 |
| \& 63 |  | \& K Q 2 |
|  | ¢ A J 103 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 987543$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 9$ |  |
|  | \& 107 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nab | Hoeyem | Drijuer | Hornslien |
|  | $1 \%$ | 1NT | 29* |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | 20 |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT | Dble |

South's 2\& showed a moderate hand with both major suits. There is a well-known maxim that 3NT can be difficult to make when three aces are missing. This deal illustrates an extension to that guideline. East could not hope for $\diamond \mathrm{A}-\mathrm{K}$ -$x-x-x-x$ opposite, since West would not then have bid only $2 \diamond$. West's bidding suggested long and weak diamonds and it would take time to generate extra tricks from the three K-Q combinations.
South led the $\triangle 8$, ducked by North. When declarer played diamonds, North held up the ace for two rounds and the eventual penalty was 500.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar |
|  | $1 \boldsymbol{N}$ | $1 \mathrm{NT}^{*}$ | $2 \triangleq$ |
| 2NT* | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{\boldsymbol { \phi } ^ { * }}$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Nab used a Lebensohl relay to sign off in $3 \diamond$. The defence of ace and another heart allowed this to make, for the loss of four aces. After a spade lead, or a spade switch at Trick two, South can beat the contract by holding up the A on the first round. 2 IMPs to White.

Board 3. Dealer South. E-W Vul.
A K J 10
© J 10543
$\diamond 73$
\& 642


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar |
|  |  |  | $2 \diamond *$ |
| 4*** | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 44** | All Pass |  |  |

West's 4\% was Leaping Michaels, showing clubs and a major. East could expect the major to be hearts and had a good diamond suit to mention anyway. I cannot tell you what 4^ was intended to mean. East read it as West's major suit and passed. It seems that it cannot have been intended as a cue-bid, since West also held a heart control. Perhaps he took $4 \diamond$ as RKCB for clubs and was showing four key cards. It was a sad bidding mishap from a team who had performed so splendidly to reach the final. Berset went two down for 200 away.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Hoeyem <br> Drijuer | Hornslien <br> $2 \diamond *$ |  |
| $4 \% \%^{*}$ | Pass | $5 \%$ | All Pass |

Nab scored all 13 tricks and the Blund team lost 13 IMPs, where they might have gained the same amount.

Board 4. Dealer West. Both Vul.
A 10832
$\checkmark 52$
$\diamond$ K J 4
\& K 943


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar |
| $1 \Phi$ | Pass | $3 \triangle$ | Pass |
| 68 | All Pass |  |  |

Hoping to retrieve some IMPs from the wreckage of the previous board, Berset raised the weakjump response to the six-level. His spirits must have dropped when South led the $\& A$. Could some miracle rescue them? Yes, it could! Lund ruffed the second club, drew two rounds of trumps and established the spade suit for 1430 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Hoeyem | Drijver | Hornslien |
| $1 \$$ | Pass | $2 \Phi$ | $3 \boldsymbol{6}$ |
| $3 \Omega$ | Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |

I assume $3 \triangle$ was forcing, since West was seemingly worth $4 \checkmark$ otherwise. East did not rate his weak hand as worth a 4\& cue-bid and Blund gained 13 much-needed IMPs.



Board 9. Dealer North. E-W Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\Delta & \mathrm{Q} \\
\diamond & 108653 \\
\diamond & \text { A } 7 \\
\text { \& } & \text { J } 10953
\end{array}
$$

A 8753
$\checkmark$ AK 2
$\diamond$ J 9864
d K


- 2
$\checkmark$ Q J 74
$\diamond 10432$
\& A 874
- AKJ10 964
$\bigcirc 9$
$\diamond K$ Q
\& Q 62

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar |
|  | $2 \Phi$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ |

All Pass
North's $2 \triangle$ showed hearts and a minor. Expecting a singleton spade in dummy, South bid a conservative $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ and this ended the auction.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Hoeyem | Drijver | Horslien |
|  | Pass | Pass | 4 $\boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ |

Horslien was more adventurous, facing an unknown passed hand. He bid a spade game that had three top losers and was at risk to a defensive club ruff. If those sturdy performers, GIB and Deep Finesse, had been in the E-W seats they would have taken their club ruff without pausing for breath. Nab reckoned that a lead of the $\triangle A$ had potential and the game was made. 6 IMPs to Blund.

Board 12. Dealer East. Both Vul.
A J 1062
$\diamond$ K 9742
$\diamond$ K 97
\& 7

| A 54 |  | ヘ Q 873 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 8653 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\bigcirc 10$ |
| $\diamond 82$ | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ Q 1063 |
| \& K Q 96 | S | \& A 543 |
|  | © AK 9 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A J |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AJ 54 |  |
|  | ¢ J 1082 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Berset | Verbeek | Lund | Molenaar |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1} \boldsymbol{6}$ |
| $1 \varnothing$ | Dble* | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

North's double showed spades. South would have opened 1 NT with 15-17 balanced and would now rebid 14 (partner's suit) on 12-14 balanced. It was an economical part of this method that the lowly rebid of 1 NT showed 18-19 points.
The defenders played four rounds of clubs, setting up a club trick for South. Molenaar continued with ace king and another spade, East exiting safely in spades. A heart to the 10 and ace was followed by the $\bigcirc \mathrm{J}$, successfully run. Declarer then had $3+3+2+1$ and made the game without needing the diamond finesse. +600 .


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $N a b$ | Hoeyem | Drijver | Horslien |
| $2 \Phi^{*}$ | Pass | $2 N T *$ | Dble |
| $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

West's $2 \circlearrowleft$ showed hearts and a minor (how frequently these opening bids arose in this match!) and East's 2NT asked for the minor. Hoeyem arrived in $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ on a $4-3$ fit and played it well.
The $\vee 10$ lead drew the jack, queen and king. Declarer finessed the 9 successfully and continued with the $\boldsymbol{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{\$ K}$, leaving East with the master Q . When East declined to ruff the $\checkmark \mathrm{A}$, Hoeyem crossed to his $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ and led the $\bigcirc 9$. East discarded once more and declarer took a winning finesse of the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$. He was then able to cash the $\diamond A$ and score his J by ruffing a fourth diamond while East had to follow suit. That was +620 and 1 IMP to Blund.
Team Orange White took the set 29-21, giving them a 34 IMP lead with one set still to be played.


Madeira offers a unique opportunity to enjoy a natural environment bathed by a mild climate all year round, with extraordinary landscapes such as tropical gardens, a deep blue Ocean, and the natural hospitality of its people which makes Madeira a high-quality
destination ideal for holidays and events. MADEIRA BRIDGE ASSOCIATION, the VIDAMAR RESORTS MADEIRA and INTERTOURS TRAVEL AGENCY are organizing the 18 th MADEIRA INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE OPEN.
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$\underset{\substack{\text { RESORAK } \\ * \\ \text { VA }}}{ }$
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Estrada Monumental 175-177
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Tel: ( +351 ) 291768447 | Fax: ( +351 ) 291768449 E-mail: sales@madeira.vidamarresorts.com Website: www.vidamarresorts.com

The VIDAMAR RESORTS MADEIRA has ocean-view rooms and natural daylight in all public areas including the bridge tournament room. This room is situated on the 4th floor the same floor as the reception and has air-conditioning and access to an outside terrace with sea
reception and has air-conditioning and access to an outside terrace with sea view. The Resort offers different highlyenjoyable leisure and sport facilities, such as several restaurants and bars, indoor and outdoor swimming pools and the sensational Mar Spa.

## VOYAGE OF DISCOVERY



It would be remiss of me to edit a Bulletin in Norway and fail to mention one of its most famous sons.
The Vikings are known for their reputation as plunderers and warriors, but they were also businessmen and skilled sailors. Eirik the Red is one of the big Viking heroes. After his father was exiled from Norway, his family moved to the Norwegian Viking colony at Iceland. Later Eirik was exiled from Iceland, and sailed west and become the first permanent settler on Greenland.
Eirik's son, Leif Erikson, became the first European to set foot in America when he sailed to Newfoundland. Archaeologists have found the remains of the Viking settlement in Canada. However the colonies in America did not survive. We are not sure why there was no further Viking settlements in America, but it is reasonable to think that the distance between Norway, Iceland, Greenland and America was too large.
With 14 deals to go in the final of the Open Teams Orange White led 94-60, so you could expect Blund to be hyperactive in the bidding whenever an opportunity presented itself. Would the gap be too difficult to traverse?

On the opening deal of the set West held:
↔ 8 ○J105 $\diamond$ AKQJ 1094 \& 84 and at both tables took a unilateral decision to save in $5 \diamond$ over $4 \diamond$. Partner's only asset was the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$, enough to allow declarer to get out for -500 against the vulnerable game.

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
A K 2
$\checkmark$ Q J 1076
$\diamond \mathrm{J} 6$
\& Q 864


ค 1096
$\checkmark 2$
$\diamond$ KQ 87542
\& 103
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hornslien | Drijver | Hoeyem | Nab |
|  | $2 \Omega^{*}$ | $2 N T$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

$2 \bigcirc$ Hearts and a minor
South led the ten of clubs, covered in turn by the jack, queen and king. Taking no chances declarer cashed the ace of spades and played a spade to the jack and king. When North returned the four of clubs declarer's five took the trick and he played a heart to the nine and ten. That was the last trick for the defence, +660 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Molenaar | Lund | Verbeek | Berset |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{\&}^{*}$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

```
1% 2+
```

West led the five of spades and East won with the queen and returned his diamond. West took the ace and returned a diamond and declarer was booked for four down, -800 and 4 IMPs to Orange White.

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

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.
A 864
$\checkmark 1065$
$\diamond-$
\& QJ98752


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hornslien | Drijver | Hoeyem | Nab |
|  | Pass | 1NT | Dble* |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{*}$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |

All Pass
Dble $4 \bigcirc / \uparrow$ and $5+\infty / \diamond$
2\& Pass or correct
I can understand why North, with a void and support for both majors did not open 3\%. Had he done so East would doubtless have overcalled $3 \circlearrowleft$ and when South bid $5 \%$ West would probably have essayed $5 \circlearrowleft$, losing 800 .

West led the six of clubs and when East took the ace South unblocked the king. East returned the four of clubs and declarer won in dummy and played a spade to the king. He could draw trumps and with spades 3-3 he finished with ten tricks, +130 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Molenaar | Lund | Verbeek | Berset |
|  | $4 \propto \%$ | $4 \diamond$ | $6 \diamond$ |
| $6 \odot$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |

All Pass
South's initial thought was to bid 4NT and he had the card on the bidding tray, but then changed his mind and substituted $6 \diamond$. (Personally I would have bid 6\&.)

If West thought 6® would be cheap he was quickly disavowed.
South cashed three diamonds allowing North to dispose of his spades. A low spade now would have resulted in five down, but South erred and led the queen of spades, which cost the defenders a trick. -800 and 12 IMPs to Blund.


Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.
a K 9865
© J 6
$\diamond$ K J 103
\& 86


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hornslien | Drijver | Hoeyem | Nab |
| 1\& | $1 \uparrow$ | $1 N T$ | $2 \varnothing$ |
| 3NT | Pass | Pass | $4 \Omega$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | Pass |
| 5\& | All Pass |  |  |

it looks odd to remove partner's double of $4 \checkmark$, but in a sense West did well, as it is a makeable contract, but $5 \%$ needed the K to be onside and it was not, -100 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Molenaar | Lund | Verbeek | Berset |
| $1 \mathbf{1 4}$ | $1 \uparrow$ | 1NT | $2 \Omega$ |
| $3 \boldsymbol{3 \&}$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

South led the king of hearts and North elected to follow with the jack. When South continued with the queen, declarer could win and claim nine tricks.
I don't know what carding agreements NS have in this situation, but many pairs play that the lead of the king asks North to unblock an honour (so they lead the queen from a king-queen combination).
What I can say is that South needed to switch at trick two, but if it is to a spade then after winning with the king North would have to play a diamond. +600 gave Orange White 12 IMPs.

Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- Q J 74
© 652
$\diamond K$
of KQ942


A K652
$\checkmark$ K Q 10
$\diamond$ AJ 9
\& 653
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hornslien | Drijuer | Hoeyem | Nab |
|  | Pass | Pass | 14\%* |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 20* |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 34 |

All Pass
1\& 2+
2ヘ Balanced minimum
East led his club, and when West ducked declarer won with the king and played the jack of spades. West took the ace and, a trick too late, cashed the ace of clubs. East could score a club ruff, but the defenders had only four tricks, +140 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Molenaar | Lund | Verbeek | Berset |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \uparrow \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \uparrow$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Once again East led the jack of clubs and incredibly West ducked here too.
Declarer won with the king, unblocked the king of clubs and played a spade to the king and ace. East was now in a position to ruff with a spade that dummy could not beat, so when West continued with the ace of clubs the contract was two down, -500 and 12 IMPs to Orange White.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.
A 65
$\checkmark$ Q 84
$\diamond$ K 963
\& K Q 107


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hornslien | Drijver | Hoeyem | Nab |
| $4 \odot$ | All Pass |  | Pass |
| $4 \Omega$ |  |  |  |

North led the king of clubs and when declarer ducked he switched to the five of spades. Declarer took dummy's ace, unblocked the ace of hearts, ruffed a spade, cashed the king of hearts and exited with a heart. North won and tried the king of diamonds but declarer won and returned the suit, +620 .

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South <br> Molenaar <br> Lund |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $3 \diamond$ | Verbeek |  |  |
| Berset |  |  |  |
| Pass |  |  |  |

Once again North led the king of clubs but here declarer elected to win with dummy's ace. He cashed the ace of spades, ruffed a spade and played a club. North took the queen and returned the four of hearts to dummy's ace. When declarer tried to cash the jack of clubs South ruffed and now declarer was a trick short, -100 and 12 IMPs to Blund.

One way for declarer to get home is to ruff a club back to hand and play two rounds of hearts. North wins, but with only minor suit cards left is endplayed.


## I LET MY CHANCES PASS ME BY

by Barry Rigal

## Stanza nine Open Pairs Qualifier

I sat down to watch Bobby Levin and Shane Blanchard play NS in what was effectively their first ever outing together. Bobby told me he had not managed to sleep past 4AM yet, and was feeling extremely tired, but it did not seem to affect his bridge dramatically. However the cards were running his opponents' way, and it seemed like every decision the partnership took worked out badly, with the EW pairs doing the right thing on almost every deal.
Still the first board of the set was their best, when Levin took a favourable-vulnerability save against $4 \bigcirc$ bid by Overbeek/Polak. Credit Blanchard for raising his partner's 1 to $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ in a competitive auction on $\uparrow$ J94 $998 \diamond$ Q73 \& J10753.
Overbeek bid on to the five-level and that left Polak to bring home 4 AK 8 facing 4 Q 962 to make his game - with a highly remote squeeze chance thrown in. That did not come in and Levin/Blanchard had an $83 \%$ result. Even had Levin misguessed everything in his game, he would have scored above average.
On the next deal Polak as declarer in 1 NT swung half a top by guessing which diamond to play from dummy when Levin shifted to the suit in mid-hand after cashing $\uparrow A K Q$.

| - 964 | - 1085 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 942$ | ¢ KQ5 3 |
| $\diamond 1085$ | $\diamond$ K Q 2 |
| -10954 | * AQ 2 |

He put up the ten, partly because entries to dummy were non-existent. When it held he escaped for two down and a $60 \%$ board instead of going four down had he played the eight.
Svindahl/Hansen came to the table next, Svindahl judging accurately to play the major after 2NT-3仓-3@-3NT with ¢AKQ5 ©1092 $\diamond$ A75 \&AK7. The editors differ on whether it is right to convert to 40 here. The Senior Editor passes when balanced, the Junior Editor believes that if responder doesn't want to play a $5-3$ fit he uses Stayman instead. As so often is the case, the Junior Editor turned out to be emphatically correct, dummy's diamonds being a small singleton. That
was a $60 \%$ result for the Norwegians, and they continued their accurate play here.

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- KQJ
© J 10943
$\diamond$ J 8

4. A 87


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hansen | Blanchard <br> Suindahl <br> Levin |  |  |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 1ヵ | All Pass |  |  |

Bobby Levin is as competitive if not more so than the next guy, but he knew he was outgunned here, and even though he had a singleton in the opponents' suit, he sold out at the one-level. Blanchard accurately led a top heart. Jonny Hansen won it and led a club to the upsidedown ten, queen and ace. Blanchard cashes his trumps and shifted to the 9 J to the queen king and ace. Back came a heart, and declarer won and judged nicely to unblock $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, then cash his clubs discarding his diamond. Now since North as a passed hand had shown 11 HCP already, Hansen tried $\diamond Q$ from dummy, more in hope than expectation, and was equally surprised and delighted to pin the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ and collect an important second overtrick. That overtrick was worth more than a quarter of a top though again only a 60\% result since many NS pairs had gone overboard after a 10 opener by North. North had to duck the first club to disrupt the timing.
The Stabell brothers were next up, Leif-Erik's four-card major $1 \bigcirc$ opening earning him a $60 \%$ result when he reached 3NT, and Levin led the unbid major instead of the bid suit.
The next deal saw a really difficult defensive problem. Would YOU have done any better?

GO TO PAGE:
$\begin{array}{llllllllll}1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\ 20 & 21 & 22 & 23 & 24 & 25 & 26 & 27 & 28\end{array}$
11
12
13
$\begin{array}{llll}14 & 15 & 16 & 17\end{array}$
18
19


Tolle Stabell opened a $20+-22$ 2NT and played there. Blanchard led the $\diamond A$ and received a discouraging eight. His low spade went to Levin's ace. Back came the $\diamond J$, covered all round. Now what was Blanchard to do? Assuming declarer could not run the clubs - and why would he be able to - it was right to play $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ to set up spades while he still had an entry. That was what he did, and declarer cashed out for 150 - but below average. Less than a quarter of the field managed to get the defence right, and many were defending 3NT.
If North had bid spades a top diamond lead and spade shift might have seen South play back spades, of course.
On the next deal, not warned by the previous one, Levin raised 2NT to 3NT with jack-sixth of clubs and $\diamond$ QJ. He caught his partner with a 2-4-5-2 19-count (and yes you may well ask why). The diamond honours were gold-dust but the game was still down one when spades were $5-3$. A $30 \%$ result for NS, but they got it all back on the next hand, where Blanchard received a favourable lead against his major-suit game and though he could have made 12 tricks he settled for 11 and a $70 \%$ result.
The penultimate deal of the set was the most interesting, and an indication that all too often players at the table give away information they do not have to by gratuitous misuse of tempo. One should not mislead opponents by deliberately

varying in tempo, but equally one should try to play all cards in consistent tempo.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roren | Blanchard | E. Eide | Levin |
|  |  |  | 140 |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 4* | All Pass |  |

Tormod Roren did well to lead the 3rd/5th $\checkmark 2$, to Eide's king. Back came the $\diamond 10$ to the jack queen and king. Perhaps Levin might have unblocked the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ now, but that is maybe being wise after the event. He actually led a spade and East's tempo as he played the ace, even behind the screen, strongly suggested he had a singleton. When a diamond came back Levin won in hand and had a terrible dilemma.
If the A was singleton, the only winning line was to lead a low trump from hand right now (you can arrange to unblock clubs, ruff a diamond high and finesse in trumps later). But this would be catastrophic if trumps were $3-2$ with the doubleton AAQ. Levin combined his chances by cashing $\triangle$ A and leading a spade towards his hand. When East discarded Levin was not out of chances. He unblocked clubs, cashed dummy's third heart, and tried to ruff a diamond. But West could overruff and still had $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ to come for down one.
I'm sure Levin felt that this was an opportunity missed, but remarkably, it was still a $65 \%$ board. 4 had more often gone down two than one, and only one declarer had made 49 as South after a heart lead.
Eide-Roren completed their good performance by bidding to a cold 7 NT for $75 \%$ of the matchpoints, and I decided I would find another pair to watch thereafter, since I certainly hadn't brought this one any luck!

## THE EUROVISION BRIDGE CONTEST

by Micke Melander

The Eurovision Song Contest is one of the longest running television shows in the world. It was on the 24th of May, 1956, that Europe saw the first ever Eurovision Song Contest. After all those years, the contest is one of the most typical European traditions and without doubt, Europe's favourite TV show!

Some twenty years later in 1976 we saw the first edition of the European Open Pairs in Bridge being arranged in Cannes, France. Now in 2015 we are all following the progress of the Championships in Tromsø, Norway and are as eager to see who is winning here as who won the Eurovision Song Contest earlier this spring.

## Heroes

The 2015 winners in the Eurovision was Sweden with the song Heroes where one of the first parts of the lyrics is:

> What if I'm the only hero left?
> You better fire off your gun
> Once and forever

On the deal below Vlad Isporski, being on the opening lead against Six Clubs, understood from the bidding that declarer most probably was 6-6 in hearts and clubs giving the way the bidding had gone. He also knew that since he lacked a lot of the top spot cards in his hand it might be urgent to kick off with the right suit, either spades or diamonds. Further on, his thoughts were that since South had confidently bid 3NT, after they had bid spades against them, dummy was likely to hold the ace of spades. Hence he came to the conclusion that diamonds should be the solution of his opening lead problem and the diamond four hit the table.

Said and done, Isporski fired off his gun with the four of

situation:

|  | $\hat{0} \overline{\mathrm{~K}} 6$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\stackrel{-}{\text { A }} 9$ |  |
| a A 109 | 0 A Q 9 | A Q J |
| $\bigcirc$ - | ${ }^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\bigcirc$ - |
| $\diamond-$ | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ K |
| -4 4 |  | \& K 10 |
|  | - K 6 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ - |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 9 |  |
|  | 9 - |  |

The ace of clubs and a second round followed, bringing declarer home with twelve tricks when the suit broke as it did.
"We are the heroes of our time - But we're dancing with the demons in our minds..."
This line introduces the chorus of the Heroes song and I bet Isporski was dancing with the demons the next night in his bed, contemplating what opening lead he should have made, while Kovachev was wondering if he should have risen with the ace of hearts or not at the third trick.

It didn't matter when declarer started cross-ruffing if East had ruffed high to return a trump, since declarer would still be able to ruff the hearts good at next occasion.

These are the votes from the Swedish jury, Norway 12 and Bulgaria 0.

More heroes appeared on this hand from the first session of the Open Pairs Semifinal:

You hold:

Partner opens in first seat, none vulnerable if that matters, with One Diamond, you reply One Spade and partner raises to Two Spades. You are now by your system able to relay, and ask for more information about your partners hand with 2 NT , whereupon he rebids Three Diamonds showing a three card raise in spades, probably five cards in diamonds and any 3-2 in clubs and hearts somehow with no extras, ie 11-14. What to bid?

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.
A J 864
$\bigcirc$ Q J 63
$\diamond 9$
\& AJ 82


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gierulski | Kovachev | SkrzypczakIsporski |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \star$ | Pass | 2 NT $^{*}$ | Pass |
| $3 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

Skrzypczak found a real hero's bid when he passed the board out in $3 \diamond$, after being in the tank for almost four minutes evaluating the situation. More demons flying in the Bulgarians' minds who probably thought they had the whole world against them, since the opponents couldn't make any game on best defence. They probably wished that their spades were $3-3$, so that game would have been cold, if the defense didn't cash out immediately.
These are the votes from the Swedish jury, Poland 12 and Bulgaria 0.
"We are the heroes of our time - But we're dancing with the demons in our minds..."

7th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS

## SET UP LOSERS NOT WINNERS

## by Barry Rigal

Many years ago Patrick Jourdain wrote a couple of tongue-in-cheek articles for Bridge World arguing that on defence one should keep losers not winners. On today's hand Geir Helgemo went one step further by setting up not one but two suits for the opponents at no-trump.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

| - A53 |  | ¢ Q J 96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ J 986 | N | $\bigcirc$ A |
| $\diamond$ Q 8 | W E | $\diamond$ K J 6 |
| \& AK 84 | S | \& J 7532 |

Helgemo opened 1\% as West and after a 10 overcall heard his partner double. He bid 1NT and was raised to three. The sight of the 9 K as the opening lead cheered him up. He won, perforce, and his first move was to lead a low diamond to an upside-down seven, queen and ace. The spade eight return from North allowed him to win dummy's jack.
When the king and ace of clubs drew a discard
from South, Helgemo set up diamonds for his opponents by cashing the king and jack, then spades, by taking the ace. He got off play with a club to North, who was down to four cards, all hearts. He could take his heart queen now (dummy pitching a spade) or he could exit with a low heart to let his partner collect a spade at trick 13, but either way, Helgemo had 10 tricks and a $90 \%$ score.

The full hand:
A 82
$\checkmark$ KQ 1075
$\diamond$ A 95

* Q 96

A A 53
© J 986
$\diamond$ Q 8
\& AK 84


A Q J 96
$\checkmark$ A
$\diamond$ K J 6
\& J 7 5 32
A K 1074
© 432
$\diamond 107432$
\& 10

## 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 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 |

## FROM THE DIRECTOR'S CHAIR

by Herman De Wael

Some rulings are of interest not just to the players involved, they are educational to many other people as well.

The following happened last Tuesday, in the Pairs' qualifiers.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
A K 43
$\checkmark$ AKJ 2
$\diamond A$
\& K J 865

| 76 |  |  | A A Q J 985 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3 | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ | $\bigcirc 1094$ |
|  | KQ106532 | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond 97$ |
| ¢ | 1074 | S | \& A 3 |
|  | 4 | 102 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | Q 8765 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | J 84 |  |
|  | 8 | Q 92 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $10 \boldsymbol{0}$ | $2 \Omega$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Dble |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

$1 \%$ was strong, and East knew this. East's 20 showed either spades or the minors, and East alerted this, or so he said, by pointing downwards a few times at it. North did not notice this alert, and the rules state that a player must make certain that his screen-mate notices his alert. According to the regulations, the $2 \triangle$ is deemed not to be alerted to North. But that would cause trouble only when North was next to call.
First the tray passed to the South/West side of the screen. There, South alerted the $1 \&$ opening, by waving a redouble card. There has been an infestation of Arctic Alerteating Aphids during the past week, and several objects, including redouble cards (they are blue, after all) have been used instead of the missing regular blue alert cards. Such an alert is of course valid, except that - you guessed it - at this table, West never noticed it. As Director, there is no reason to disbelieve either player's statements, and of course it meant that legally, West had not been alerted to the fact that $1 \%$ was strong.

So West interpreted $2 \triangle$ as natural, and did not alert it. South had nothing to say over a natural call in his five-card holding, and passed. So did West.
Now we come back to North, who, remember, had not been told that 20 showed anything but hearts. He decided to double. East was relieved to be allowed to escape, and he bid his spade suit. After pushing the tray, North asked about the 24 bid and now learnt about the "missing" alert. He called the Director, but there was nothing the TD could do at this time.
Over to the other side of the screen, again. South decided he would show his penalty pass over the hearts, by doubling the spades. West still had nothing to contribute.
And now North was faced with a small problem. He now had the correct explanation, and he knew that he could ask the Director for a contract of $2 \Omega$, undoubled. But that would never outscore the game contract he thought he could make. He had of course no knowledge of the fact that South too had been misinformed. So he imagined South would be stopping the spades, and he elected to bid 3NT. That contract was of course doomed and went two light.

Over now to the Director. If North/South had not been misinformed, the bidding might easily have gone like this:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 104 | $2 \Omega$ | Pass |
| 24 | 304 | Pass | $3 \odot$ |
| Pass | $4 \Omega$ | All Pass |  |

But one of the misinformations (the one to South) was caused by South himself. So maybe North/South did not deserve any redress either.
It might be argumented that West failed to protect himself. Had West paid a little more attention to the game, perhaps by looking at his opponent's System Card at the start of the round, then the missing alert would not have been enough to cause the problems. In fact, the Directors have ruled that way against a pair who had a different meaning of $2 \boldsymbol{\%}$ over 1\%, depending on whether the $1 \&$ showed two clubs

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
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or three. There, the Directors did not exonerate the second misexplainer because of a missing alert over $1 \mathbf{1}$. If the meaning of your bids differs to a large degree over similar meanings of your opponent's call, then you should make very sure that you have all the information you need, and not simply rely on a possibly erroneous non-alert. But here, the meanings of $1 \%$ (natural or strong) differ to such a degree that the Directors decided to excuse this West player for his misexplanation.

After long deliberations, the Directors decided to award average minus (40\%) to both pairs.

One more point: North pushed the tray to the other side after the bid of $2 \boldsymbol{A}$. At the same time, he asked about the strange-looking bidding, and received the news that $2 \triangle$ had not been natural, and that he had not noticed that it had been alerted. If, at this point, North would have called the Director before pushing the tray to the other side, he would
have been allowed to change his call of double. The original call (the double) would then have been Unauthorized Information to East, but one ruling of misinformation would have been avoided. Which would not have been enough, as it happens!

There are a number of lessons to be drawn:
Aspiring directors will have noted the difficulty involved in ruling behind screens. Even if there is only one incidence of misinformation, the bidding can easily spiral out of control, and it is sometimes not easy to reconstruct how the bidding would develop with correct information.
Players of all levels will have noted something they should have registered a long time already. When alerting, you need to make certain that your opponent has noticed the alert. If he's stirring his coffee, hold the alert card until he acknowledges having noticed it.
And finally, directing can be a lot of fun too!


"Master Solver Problem"

"Flying Dutchmen"

New videos are coming soon!
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## SENIORS PAIRS FINAL - SESSION 1

by Jos Jacobs

On Thursday, the Open Pairs were still involved in their semi-finals but both the women and the seniors would be playing their final and the winners were to receive their prizes at the end of the day's play. So, rather than having a look at the Open Pairs, I decided to have an extended look at the Seniors Pairs. For a number of reasons, I chose the overnight leaders as my anchor pair for the first session but I will report about what happened at some other tables as well.

In the first round, the overnight leaders, Doremans-Trouwborst from the Netherlands, would meet the overnight runners-up, Britain's Jourdain and Kendrick. Yes I know: it should be Wales and England...

On the very first board, Patrick Jourdain did me a favour, he told me afterwards with his usual sense of humour, enabling me to start this report with a spectacular non-auction, so to speak.

This was the board:
Board 1. Dealer North. None Vul.


| West | North East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kendrick | TrouwborstJourdain | Doremans |
|  | $1 \uparrow \quad$ Pass | Pass |

$2 \uparrow$ All Pass
2 was explained, on both sides of the screen, as hearts and a minor. East now has a problem as partner may as well hold the red suits. Even more so because 19 could theoretically be opened on
four cards only, Jourdain elected to pass, knowing he would certainly be in a playable contract but also that the board was sure to get into the Bulletin for a good story.

In both respects, Patrick was absolutely right. North led the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$, won by declarer's ace. $\checkmark \mathrm{A}$, $\bigcirc 10$ came next, North covering and dummy ruffing. $\& Q$ overtaken by the king and a top heart for a diamond discard, followed by the © 7 to the king and ace. South returned a club for North to ruff and on the diamond return, dummy's trumps were fatally shortened, so the contract made without any overtricks. Making +110 was still worth $33.3 \%$ of the matchpoints.

On the next board, the British EW simply bid: Pass-1NT (shaded); 3NT which was a little too high.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- AKJ 9
$\checkmark 10987$
$\diamond 1054$
\& K 6


Even if the club finesse is right, you may well lose four spade tricks and the $\checkmark \mathrm{A}$ from the top.

The Dutch defence was impeccable: $\boldsymbol{\$} \mathrm{K}$ lead, heart to the ace and a spade. After that, declarer still had to take the club finesse so he went down two. As only 3 pairs were in 3NT, of which one pair only went down one, +100 was worth 91.7 \%.

On the next board, in an all-German encounter Kratz and Sträter were the only pair to reach game:
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Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.
A J 102
$\checkmark$ K 43
$\diamond$ AJ5 2
\& Q J 5

| $\wedge$ | 985 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\diamond$ | 107 |
| $\diamond$ | 8643 |
| $\&$ | A 764 |


© AK
$\checkmark$ J 5
$\diamond$ K Q 107
\& K 10832
A Q 7643
$\checkmark$ AQ9862
$\diamond 9$
\& 9
Sträter as South simply opened $2 \diamond$ showing at least 5-4 in the majors and Kratz bid $3 \Omega$, showing tolerance for both majors. Looking at a nice 6-5 distribution, Sträter then took the reasonable shot at game in hearts. As North was the declarer, East could have defeated it by cashing both spades followed by a club to obtain a spade ruff but when he led the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ instead, a more logical alternative, Kratz quickly had his 10 tricks. Please note that with the hearts 2-2, 4ヵ is unbeatable. Making $4 \bigcirc$ was (of course) worth all the matchpoints.

On the next board, Trouwborst-Doremans, who had been among the many pairs in $2 \Omega$ on board 3 , bid a grand slam after a remarkable auction:

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

- J 9
© AK 974
$\diamond$ Q 8
\& K 984


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Svensson | Trouwborst | AndreassonDoremans |  |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | $6 \diamond$ |
| $6 \uparrow$ | $7 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

When the Swedes did not take the sacrifice for an average score, all the matchpoints went to the Dutch. Three pairs were not even in slam.

At the table, the auction caused at lot of laughter
at both sides of the screen. First, South and West started giggling about their bids and then, when the screen reached the other two pairs, they burst out in even more serious laughter.

On board 6, five out of seven most pairs were in slam but one wonders why only two declarers made 13 tricks in their slam.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- A 4
© J 873
$\diamond \mathrm{A}$
\& A Q J 653
$\uparrow \quad 92$
$\diamond 542$
$\diamond 109643$
$\diamond$ K 92

$\diamond$ K Q J 875
\& 1084
- K Q J 10873
- A Q 96
$\diamond 2$
\& 7

The Dutch had an easy auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Danylyuk | Trouwborst | MsDanylyukDoremans |  |

Not very scientific but more than adequate. Declarer easily made 13 tricks when he led hearts twice from dummy. This was worth $91.7 \%$.


Boards 9 and 10 saw the confrontation between the two pairs who were leading the field after eight boards:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.


| West | North | East | South <br> Lindquist |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Trouwborst | HolmbakkenDoremans |  |

When North had no good bid available below the $6 \circlearrowleft$ level, the grand was missed, as happened at many tables. In fact, once again the Germans Kratz-Sträter were the only pair to get to the grand. After the same start of their auction, South (Sträter) could bid 5 to ask for any specific king. Now, 5NT would deny any king and 60 would therefore show the $\boldsymbol{\Phi} \mathrm{K}$. That's all Kratz needed to announce the grand with confidence as he already knew about the four-card trump support once his $2 \circlearrowleft$ was raised to four. Scoring +2210 was worth all the matchpoints, not surprisingly, even with 7NT a spread.
But as an aside: IF $4 \bigcirc$ shows a minimum then North should show the AK over 5NT shouldn't he...how bad could 6NT be with of QJ to fill those gaps? And as one further aside; Spiral Scan, which focuses on 'important' kings would ask with 54 over $5 \bigcirc$ for specific kings starting with $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathrm{K}$. Step one denies that card, step two promises it and denies the $\& \mathrm{~K}$, step three shows the black kings and no $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ etc etc.
On the second board of the round, there was another grand slam on the cards, but a rather less comfortable one to bid or make.


Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul.


20 was either GF with hearts or a transfer raise in spades.

NS at this table reached the popular contract, as no NS pair got to slam. Declarer missed out, however, on a positional squeeze that would have brought in all the tricks. East will be squeezed out of his top spade and heart honours on the run of the trumps after declarer ruffed all his losing clubs in dummy. No need for a Vienna Coup or whatever. Making 13 tricks represented an average score, but making only 12 tricks scored just 8.3 \%.

At the end of the session, Norway's Holmbakken and Lindquist, after their last round, had become the new leaders.
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## ALL BRIDGE PLAYERS ARE EQUAL, BUT SOME ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS? <br> by Snorre Aalberg

Is women's or senior's bridge less attractive than the open category?
When I came to the bulletin room today, my plan was to watch the women and the seniors final here in Tromsø. I write a daily "blog" on the Norwegian Bridge Federations website, but so far I haven't used much space on the women's and the seniors championship. Shame on me!
Yesterday the pairs final in both these classes were played and it was a big surprise when I realized that there was no broadcast at all. Both the women and the seniors have been playing several days to qualify for the last fifty crucial boards, but no one outside Mackhallen was able to see a single deal bid and played.
My first thought was that this had to be some kind of mistake or misunderstanding. I am always heading for a Pulitzer Prize, so I made contact with the chief of the organizing committee, Maurizio Di Sacco, to ask where the dog is buried.
"Yes, it is correct that I have decided that there will be no broadcast from the women's and the seniors final. Our experience from the last championships is that there will be a low number of spectators watching women's and seniors, especially when they are playing pairs. The spectators want to see famous names like Zia and Helgemo."

In the Norwegian Bridge Federation more than fifty percent of the members are sixty years old or more, and a large number of members are women. In recent years the number of females playing bridge is increasing (and it was only 15 years or so ago that the Norwegian ladies reached the semi-finals of the world championships, after not having entered a team for many years. Editor). Don't you think that they deserve to be able to watch the finals in their own classes?
"The number of seniors and women are expanding in all countries, but this a reality. If you could choose between watching Meckstroth - Rodwell and an unknown female pair in Tromsø, what would be your choice?

There is also a general problem broadcasting pair tournament, independent of whether it is open, women or seniors. BBO has no link to the results and it is not possible to see if the actual board is a good or a bad one. The spectators are competitive and when the competitive dimension is gone, the broadcast is less attractive"

I hear what you say, Mr. Di Sacco, but I could not disagree with you more. If bridge is going to survive as a hobby, we have to take care of every possibility to promote the game. Personally I prefer to watch men's soccer than women's, but I have no problem realizing that other people take the opposite approach. I don't want to use the words "sexist" or "ageist" in this article, but I understand if someone else can read those words between my lines.

If media is only going to broadcast event that has the largest number of spectator, many sports will have great problems. Close to nobody watches cricket in Norway (Shame! Editors). I hope you Maurizo Di Sacco, don't mean that this will tell us cricket is a boring game?

On behalf of the bridge-playing women and seniors in the world, I am sorry for EBL's decision of not broadcasting from yesterday's finals here in Tromsø. I am sure that a large number of spectators would have found it interesting to watch bridge played by accomplished players.
(Both the Senior and Women's finals teams were given extensive coverage on BBO and in the Daily Bulletin. There is also coverage of the Pairs finals in the Daily Bulletin. Editor).
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## OVERALL MASTERPOINT RACE

| 1 DRIJVER Bob | 125 | GRAVRAAK Olve | 30 | CLEMETSEN Tormod | 15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOLENAAR Danny | 125 | HANSEN Jonny | 30 | KJERNSROD Knut | 15 |
| NAB Bart | 125 | LIU Jing | 30 | KOCH Sverre | 15 |
| VERBEEK Tim | 125 | RIMSTEDT Cecilia | 30 | LINDAAS Pernille | 15 |
| WORTEL Meike | 110 | SHAN Xingxing | 30 | LORENTZEN Arvid | 15 |
| BERSET Ole | 100 | TORNBERG S. B. s. | 30 | PAGNINI-ARSLAN C. | 15 |
| HOEYEM Olav Arve | 100 | VIST Gunn Tove | 30 | PASMAN Jet | 15 |
| HORNSLIEN Aksel | 100 | WANG Nan | 30 | SIMONS Anneke | 15 |
| LUND Boerre | 100 | WANG Wei | 30 | SORVOLL Jostein | 15 |
| CRONIER Philippe | 94 | ZHAO Bing | 30 | SUNDSETH P. Bryde | 15 |
| WILLARD Sylvie | 94 | ZIMMERMANN Pierre | 29 | VAN ZWOL Wietske | 15 |
| HELGEMO Geir | 75 | KIZILOK Omer | 27 | VOS Vanessa | 15 |
| MATUSHKO Georgi | 71 | KUTUK Basak | 27 | WALLE Tor | 15 |
| McCALLUM Karen | 71 | HESKJE Torild | 24 | DE BOTTON Janet | 14 |
| KHOLOMEEV Vadim | 65 | BILDE Dennis | 22 | KOWALSKI Apolinary | 14 |
| LANGELAND Aase | 65 | HAYMAN PIAFSKY J | 22 | MALINOWSKI Artur | 14 |
| DE WIJS Simon | 63 | KALITA Jacek | 22 | MISZEWSKA Ewa | 14 |
| DYKE Kieran | 63 | ROSENTHAL Andrew | 22 | BERTHEAU Kathrine | 13 |
| HOWARD Justin | 63 | VAINIKONIS Vytautas | 22 | LARSSON Jessica | 13 |
| KHIUPPENEN Yury | 63 | VAN PROOIJEN Ricco | 22 | SANBORN Kerri | 13 |
| MULLER Bauke | 63 | TUNCOK Cenk | 21 | SANBORN Steve | 13 |
| STERKIN Alexei | 63 | BAKHSHI David | 20 | SCHIPPERS-B. Elly | 13 |
| SVEINDAL Jon | 63 | BRINK Sjoert | 20 | STIENEN Rene | 13 |
| BAKKEREN Ton | 60 | DRIJVER Bas | 20 | WENNING Ulrich | 13 |
| HOP Jacco | 60 | EKEBLAD Russ | 20 | COPE Simon | 12 |
| MADSEN Christina L | 60 | FISHER Lotan | 20 | GOLD David | 12 |
| GROMOV Andrey | 57 | FREDIN Peter | 20 | HELNESS Tor | 12 |
| GROMOVA Victoria | 57 | GIERULSKI Boguslaw | 20 | LEV Sam | 12 |
| BALDYSZ Cathy | 54 | LEVINE Mike | 20 | MCALLISTER John | 12 |
| MICHIELSEN Marion | 52 | MCGARRY Dennis | 20 | OZGUNES Ayse | 12 |
| ALDEBORG Kalle | 50 | MOLLE Linda | 20 | UZUM Dogan | 12 |
| BAKER Lynn | 50 | NYSTROM Fredrik | 20 | ZUR-CAMPANILE M. | 12 |
| BUTRYN Piotr | 50 | OLANSKI Wojtek | 20 | BAREL Michael | 10 |
| ELMROTH Gunnar | 50 | SCHWARTZ Ron | 20 | BERKOWITZ David | 10 |
| KARLSSON Kent | 50 | SILVERSTEIN Aaron | 20 | BERKOWITZ Lisa | 10 |
| SAKOWSKA Natalia | 50 | SKRZYPCZAK Jerzy | 20 | BOGEN Anne Irene | 10 |
| TRAPP Leif | 50 | TER LAARE Marco | 20 | BOGEN Frank | 10 |
| UPMARK Johan | 50 | VENTIN CAMPRUBI J | 20 | BOMPIS Marc | 10 |
| JASZCZAK Andrzej | 49 | VERHEES Jr Louk | 20 | BOWLEY Richard | 10 |
| SARNIAK Anna | 47 | WRANG Frederic | 20 | BRAITHWAITE A. | 10 |
| AVON Danielle | 45 | D'OVIDIO Catherine | 19 | BROGELAND Boye | 10 |
| VOLDOIRE J.-Michel | 45 | WERNLE Alexander | 19 | CASTNER Kevin | 10 |
| AUKEN Sabine | 40 | ZOCHOWSKA Joanna | 19 | DOMBI Gergely | 10 |
| HARASIMOWICZ Ewa | 40 | CHARLSEN Thomas | 18 | FANTONI Fulvio | 10 |
| JANISZEWSKI P. | 40 | HOFTANISKA T. Erik | 18 | GAWRYS Piotr | 10 |
| WELLAND Roy | 40 | CAMERON Gail | 17 | GULEVICH Anna | 10 |
| WOJCIESZEK Jakub | 40 | SEALE Catherine | 17 | GUMBY Pauline | 10 |
| WILLENKEN Chris | 36 | BERKOWITZ Dana | 16 | HOMONNAY Geza | 10 |
| BREKKA Geir | 35 | ARNOLDS Carla | 15 | KLUKOWSKI Michal | 10 |
| FUGLESTAD A.Karin | 35 | BASA Marusa | 15 | LAKATOS Peter | 10 |
| MULTON Franck | 31 | BJERTNES Sten | 15 | LAZER Warren | 10 |
| ARONSEN Per | 30 | BLAAGESTAD Lise | 15 | LINDQVIST Espen | 10 |
| CHEN Yiyi | 30 | BOLVIKEN Erik | 15 | LORENZINI Cedric | 10 |
| GOLDENHEIM Petter | 30 | CLAIR Paolo | 15 | MAHAFFEY Jim | 10 |


| MANNO Andrea | 10 | GLAERUM Lisbeth | 5 | LEVITINA Irina | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUNES Claudio | 10 | KAZMUCHA Danuta | 5 | LYBAEK Astrid Steen | 2 |
| PISCITELLI Francesca | 10 | MARRO Christophe | 5 | MAESEL Helge | 2 |
| QUANTIN J.-C. | 10 | MIRKOVIC Ann-Mari | 5 | MAESEL Roald | 2 |
| RINGSETH Jorn Arild | 10 | SIVERTSVIK Ranja | 5 | MALAKOVA Desislava | 2 |
| RITMEIJER Richard | 10 | THORESEN Siv | 5 | MARKUSSEN Svein | 2 |
| ROBINSON Ian | 10 | WENNEVOLD Ida | 5 | MARQUARDT Diana | 2 |
| SANDQVIST Nicklas | 10 | WENNING Karin | 5 | McINTOSH Andrew | 2 |
| SHAH Shivam | 10 | ZMUDA Justyna | 5 | MOE Haavard | 2 |
| TICHA Magdalena | 10 | AARDAL Jorund | 4 | MORTENSEN M. Dam | 2 |
| TOWNSEND Tom | 10 | BROCK Sally | 4 | NIKOLOVA MARTA | 2 |
| VAN DEN BOS B. | 10 | GRAIZER Nurit | 4 | PACHTMAN Ron | 2 |
| VAN LANKVELD J. | 10 | HOLMBAKKEN J. | 4 | PENFOLD Sandra | 2 |
| VINCIGUERRA Herve | 10 | HORVITZ Shimshon | 4 | PETTERSEN A. Marie | 2 |
| WINKLER Gabor | 10 | LINDQVIST Petter H. | 4 | PONOMAREVA T. | 2 |
| ZACK Yaniv | 10 | MARK Micha | 4 | PUNCH Sam | 2 |
| ZALESKI Romain | 10 | MARK Sonia | 4 | RAKHMANI Diana | 2 |
| HELNESS Gunn | 9 | MERMELSTEIN Gabi | 4 | REES Tim | 2 |
| HUANG Yan | 9 | MORAWSKI Dariusz | 4 | ROBERTSON Marion | 2 |
| LI Xiaoyi | 9 | MYERS Barry | 4 | SAELENSMINDE Erik | 2 |
| LU Dong | 9 | NAVEH Nurit | 4 | SALONEN Irmeli | 2 |
| SUN Shaolin | 9 | VINJEVOLL Oddbjorn | 4 | SAUR Oyvind | 2 |
| WANG Yanhong | 9 | BAKKE Christian | 3 | SENIOR Brian | 2 |
| WU Shaohong | 9 | GRUDE Liv Marit | 3 | SENIOR Nevena | 2 |
| BOGEN Haakon | 8 | AABYE Jon | 2 | SHI Bin | 2 |
| FRERICHS Hans | 8 | ASLA Ronnaug | 2 | SIELICKI Tomasz | 2 |
| GOLIN Cristina | 8 | BAKKE Tor | 2 | SKORCHEV Stefan | 2 |
| HARDING Gerd Marit | 8 | BANASZKIEWICZ E. | 2 | STABELL Leif-Erik | 2 |
| KLUMPP Herbert | 8 | BLOOM Valerie | 2 | STERN Levy | 2 |
| KRATZ Ulrich | 8 | BOHNSACK Henning | 2 | TIAN Wei | 2 |
| LANZAROTTI M. | 8 | BOHNSACK Susanne | 2 | TRENDAFILOV R. | 2 |
| MARSAL Reiner | 8 | BREDE Lukasz | 2 | URMAN Lior | 2 |
| STANGHELLE Helge | 8 | CARROLL John | 2 | WANG Liping | 2 |
| STRATER Bernhard | 8 | CAYNE Patricia | 2 | WARD-PLATT Kiki | 2 |
| BERGHEIM Geir Egil | 7 | CILLEBORG Dorte | 2 | WILSON Alison | 2 |
| BONES Turid | 7 | CORNELL Michael | 2 | YADLIN Doron | 2 |
| BREKKE Vegard | 7 | CORNELL Vivien | 2 | YADLIN Israel | 2 |
| FABER Hege Charlotte | 7 | DE FALCO Dano | 2 | ANFINSEN Ivar M. | 1 |
| HELMERSEN K. Ove | 7 | DOMICHI Noriko | 2 | SOLHEIM Eli | 1 |
| KJAER Ellen | 7 | DUBININ Alexander | 2 |  |  |
| NICOLAYSEN F. R. | 7 | EBER Neville | 2 |  |  |
| NILSSON Hakan | 7 | ELLINGSEN Kristian | 2 |  |  |
| NORENG Hans | 7 | FARSTAD Arve | 2 | - |  |
| OPPENSTAM Agneta | 7 | GARVEY Tommy | 2 |  |  |
| RONNING Ola | 7 | GODEJORD Oddrun | 2 |  |  |
| SNEVE Sissel | 7 | GROETHEIM Glenn | 2 | d |  |
| CABAJ Stephan | 6 | GROSS Susanna | 2 | bridgebase.com |  |
| FRIEDLANDER Ehud | 6 | GUI Shengyue | 2 | 1 |  |
| GRUDE Tor Eivind | 6 | GUPTA Subhash | 2 |  |  |
| ILNICKI Wlodzimierz | 6 | HEGGE Kristoffer | 2 |  |  |
| JOHANSEN Lars Arthur | 6 | HELLEMANN A.-Lill | 2 | PLAY UNLM |  |
| KOPSTAD Ole K. | 6 | HELNESS Fredrik | 2 | aso zree :nd |  |
| LIRAN Inon | 6 | HELNESS Tor | 2 |  |  |
| MARI Christian | 6 | HETZ Clara | 2 | ROBOTSTNALL |  |
| REKSTAD Gjermund | 6 | ISPORSKI V. Nikolov | 2 | SORTS OF GANTES |  |
| WALTER Stanley | 6 | KEDZIERSKA Urszula | 2 |  |  |
| ANJER Maja Rom | 5 | KHANDELWAL H. | 2 | COMPETE WITH A FAVO PARTNER OR FIND |  |
| BREWIAK Grazyna | 5 | KHANDELWAL R. | 2 | a |  |
| DUFRAT Katarzyna | 5 | KING Philip (Phil) | 2 |  |  |
| GAVIARD Daniele | 5 | KOVACHEV Valentin | 2 |  |  |

## SPECIAL EVENTS MASTERPOINT RACE

| MOLLE Linda | 20 | WANG Yanhong | 9 | GRAIZER Nurit | 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| TER LAARE Marco | 20 | WU Shaohong | 9 | HORVITZ Shimshon | 4 |
| CLAIR Paolo | 15 | MATUSHKO Georgi | 8 | MARK Micha | 4 |
| PAGNINI-ARSLAN Carla | 15 | GULEVICH Anna | 8 | MARK Sonia | 4 |
| SANBORN Kerri | 13 | BERGHEIM Geir Egil | 7 | MERMELSTEIN Gabi | 4 |
| SANBORN Steve | 13 | BONES Turid | 7 | NAVEH Nurit | 4 |
| KOWALSKI Apolinary | 12 | BREKKE Vegard | 7 | KIZILOK Omer | 2 |
| MISZEWSKA Ewa | 12 | FABER Hege Charlotte | 7 | KUTUK Basak | 2 |
| OZGUNES Ayse | 12 | HELMERSEN Kjell Ove | 7 | AABYE Jon | 2 |
| UZUM Dogan | 12 | KJAER Ellen | 7 | CARROLL John | 2 |
| LEV Sam | 10 | NICOLAYSEN Finn Robert 7 | GARVEY Tommy | 2 |  |
| BERKOWITZ David | 10 | NORENG Hans | 7 | GROETHEIM Glenn | 2 |
| BERKOWITZ Lisa | 10 | RONNING Ola | 7 | KING Philip (Phil) | 2 |
| BROGELAND Boye | 10 | SNEVE Sissel | 7 | McINTOSH Andrew | 2 |
| GAWRYS Piotr | 10 | FRIEDLANDER Ehud | 6 | SAELENSMINDE Erik | 2 |
| KLUKOWSKI Michal | 10 | GRUDE Tor Eivind | 6 | SAUR Oyvind | 2 |
| LINDQVIST Espen | 10 | JOHANSEN Lars Arthur | 6 | STERN Levy | 2 |
| MAHAFFEY Jim | 10 | KOPSTAD Ole K. | 6 | URMAN Lior | 2 |
| HUANG Yan | 9 | LIRAN Inon | 6 | YADLIN Doron | 2 |
| LI Xiaoyi | 9 | REKSTAD Gjermund | 6 | YADLIN Israel | 2 |
| LU Dong | GAVIARD Daniele | 5 | ANFINSEN lvar M. | 1 |  |
| SUN Shaolin | 9 | MARRO Christophe | 5 | SOLHEIM Eli | 1 |



## OPEN PAIRS

SEMIIFINAL A

| 1 | BESSIS T. - VOLCKER F. | 3,131.03 | 61.39 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | COLDEA I. - ROTARU I. | 3,102.29 | 60.83 |
| 3 | SMIRNOV A. - PIEKAREK J. | 3,035.23 | 59.51 |
| 4 | YADLIN D. - YADLIN I. | 3,007.81 | 58.98 |
| 5 | GAWRYS P. - KLUKOWSKI M. | 2,999.62 | 58.82 |
| 6 | HANLON T. - CARROLL J. | 2,995.75 | 58.74 |
| 7 | MORATH A. - EFRAIMSSON B. | 2,941.63 | 57.68 |
| 8 | STABELL L. - STABELL T. | 2,907.46 | 57.01 |
| 9 | LANZAROTTI M. - MANNO A. | 2,905.86 | 56.98 |
| 10 | WILLENKEN C. - BILDE D. | 2,852.14 | 55.92 |
| 11 | GINOSSAR E. - RESHEF O. | 2,841.10 | 55.71 |
| 12 | MARTENS K. - FILIPOWICZ D. | 2,839.70 | 55.68 |
| 13 | BERSET O. - STOKKVIK D. | 2,838.10 | 55.65 |
| 14 | KOLESNIK A. - ROEDER R. | 2,833.67 | 55.56 |
| 15 | SIMONSEN S. - BERG E. | 2,830.82 | 55.51 |
| 16 | YILMAZ M. - GUR O. | 2,814.64 | 55.19 |
| 17 | KING P. - McINTOSH A. | 2,812.13 | 55.14 |
| 18 | KOPSTAD O. - GRUDE T. | 2,788.41 | 54.67 |
| 19 | VAN LANKVELD J. - BOS B. | 2,783.69 | 54.58 |
| 20 | HELGEMO G. - HOFTANISKA T. | 2,775.54 | 54.42 |
| 21 | BOMPIS M. - VINCIGUERRA H. | 2,770.71 | 54.33 |
| 22 | KOLATA S. - KANDEMIR I. | 2,767.21 | 54.26 |
| 23 | GIERULSKI B. - SKRZYPCZAK J. | 2,764.92 | 54.21 |
| 24 | JOERSTAD K. - JOERSTAD R. | 2,760.76 | 54.13 |
| 25 | MATUSHKO G. - STERKIN A. | 2,753.10 | 53.98 |
| 26 | SANBORN K. - SANBORN S. | 2,735.78 | 53.64 |
| 27 | OHREN J. - BRENTEBRAATEN F. | 2,720.32 | 53.34 |
| 28 | ISPORSKI V. - KOVACHEV V. | 2,719.26 | 53.32 |
| 29 | LINDQVIST E. - BROGELAND B. | 2,697.45 | 52.89 |
| 30 | ROMANSKI J. - GRZELAK R. | 2,681.22 | 52.57 |
| 31 | DRIJVER B. - NAB B. | 2,672.10 | 52.39 |
| 32 | NANEV I. - GUNEV R. | 2,649.00 | 51.94 |
| 33 | GUMBY P. - LAZER W. | 2,645.74 | 51.88 |
| 34 | DE WIJS S. - VAN PROOIJEN R. | 2,629.10 | 51.55 |
| 35 | BAUMANN K. - EILERAAS S. | 2,619.35 | 51.36 |
| 36 | HEGGE K. - SVEINDAL J. | 2,616.10 | 51.30 |
| 37 | GIARD O. - BENOIT A. | 2,611.08 | 51.20 |
| 38 | BERTHEAU P. - WHITTAKER W. | 2,600.47 | 50.99 |
| 39 | HOMONNAY G. - WINKLER G. | 2,596.05 | 50.90 |
| 40 | JOHNSEN S. - STOKKELAND L. | 2,577.91 | 50.55 |
| 41 | VOLL R. - KINDSBEKKEN A. | 2,575.27 | 50.50 |
| 42 | LEVIN R. - BLANCHARD S. | 2,572.88 | 50.45 |
| 43 | HANTVEIT T. - HOYLAND S. | 2,572.42 | 50.44 |
| 44 | KVANGRAVEN N. - LIE T. | 2,564.52 | 50.28 |
| 45 | RIMSTEDT P. - JONSSON S. | 2,556.00 | 50.12 |
| 46 | HELNESS T. - HELNESS F. | 2,553.34 | 50.07 |
| 47 | AYDIN A. - SUZER U. | 2,550.07 | 50.00 |
| 48 | RUBINS K. - LORENC S M. | 2,548.68 | 49.97 |
| 49 | AUSTBERG P. - BERG J. | 2,546.96 | 49.94 |
| 50 | LUND B. - MOLBERG J. | 2,546.10 | 49.92 |
| 51 | CHUMAK Y. - ROVYSHYN O. | 2,540.59 | 49.82 |
| 52 | SVINDAHL F. - HANSEN J. | 2,538.43 | 49.77 |
| 53 | SAETHER J. - SCHEIE M. | 2,538.31 | 49.77 |
| 54 | OZDIL M. - OZBALCI E. | 2,536.84 | 49.74 |


| 55 | BIGDELI F. - POLET G. | 2,528.15 | 49.57 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 56 | HOYLAND J. - HOYLAND S. | 2,525.44 | 49.52 |
| 57 | HOFF G. - HJELMELAND G. | 2,514.16 | 49.30 |
| 58 | ROMANOVSKA M. - GOLDBERG C. | 2,510.24 | 49.22 |
| 59 | JOHANSEN L. - REKSTAD G. | 2,509.33 | 49.20 |
| 60 | REINHOLDTSEN J. - LUOSTARINEN J. | 2,508.58 | 49.19 |
| 61 | SEN T. - KAYA E. | 2,501.90 | 49.06 |
| 62 | FODSTAD A. - AAREBROT A. | 2,496.95 | 48.96 |
| 63 | HELMICH A. - HOP G. | 2,489.66 | 48.82 |
| 64 | SMITH V. - EVJEN S. | 2,484.01 | 48.71 |
| 65 | DYKE K. - JOHANSEN J. | 2,483.10 | 48.69 |
| 66 | TOWNSEND T. - SANDQVIST -. | 2,478.04 | 48.59 |
| 67 | NITTER T. - LUTRO J. | 2,466.97 | 48.37 |
| 68 | KWIECIEN M. - JANISZEWSKI P. | 2,451.80 | 48.07 |
| 69 | RITMEIJER R. - TICHA M. | 2,446.89 | 47.98 |
| 70 | HALLBERG G. - BLACK A. | 2,430.79 | 47.66 |
| 71 | SMILGAJS A. - BENDIKS J. | 2,420.98 | 47.47 |
| 72 | VAINIKONIS V. - OLANSKI W. | 2,403.48 | 47.13 |
| 73 | FJAELBERG J. - OLSEN J. | 2,401.85 | 47.10 |
| 74 | AYAZ I. - PEYRET H. | 2,401.11 | 47.08 |
| 75 | KREUNING H. - OUDA S. | 2,400.93 | 47.08 |
| 76 | SKJETNE E. - LUNNA K. | 2,361.60 | 46.31 |
| 77 | JACOB T. - MACE B. | 2,349.53 | 46.07 |
| 78 | AA T. - LIVGARD A. | 2,341.12 | 45.90 |
| 79 | O'CONNOR S. - BELL M. | 2,330.51 | 45.70 |
| 80 | SKIMMELAND T. - LARSEN G. | 2,329.09 | 45.67 |
| 81 | LINDER P. - SWENSSON P. | 2,317.49 | 45.44 |
| 82 | RAJADHYAKSHA P. - GORDON M. | 2,315.30 | 45.40 |
| 83 | CORNELL M. - BACH A. | 2,294.02 | 44.98 |
| 84 | MOLENAAR D. - VERBEEK T. | 2,269.10 | 44.49 |
| 85 | BAREKET I. - LENGY A. | 2,268.18 | 44.47 |
| 86 | HERLAND J. - FROEYLAND S. | 2,251.73 | 44.15 |
| 87 | HOILAND T. - OVESEN J. | 2,238.20 | 43.89 |
| 88 | WEINSTEIN S. - HUMPHREYS G. | 2,235.57 | 43.83 |
| 89 | LYNGEN I. - LARSEN H. | 2,225.25 | 43.63 |
| 90 | MICHAUD-LARIVIERE X. - DE MENDEZ T. | 2,214.36 | 43.42 |
| 91 | EBER N. - BOSENBERG C. | 2,209.55 | 43.32 |
| 92 | ENGEBRETSEN G. - LOEN L. | 2,208.56 | 43.31 |
| 93 | MIHAI G. - MIHAI R. | 2,203.19 | 43.20 |
| 94 | QUANTIN J. - LORENZINI C. | 2,200.87 | 43.15 |
| 95 | DAVIDSEN R. - SAUR J. | 2,192.38 | 42.99 |
| 96 | TATLICIOGLU S. - KAYTAZ B. | 2,169.37 | 42.54 |
| 97 | ERBIL E. - ZOBU A. | 2,155.65 | 42.27 |
| 98 | EIDE L. - ELLINGSEN K. | 2,094.99 | 41.08 |
| 99 | LARSEN E. - EVENSTAD S. | 1,991.40 | 39.05 |
| 100 | OTVOSI E. - CHRISTIANSEN K. | 1,973.77 | 38.70 |



## OPEN PAIRS

SEMIIFINAL B

| 1 | KOLUDA P. - DARKIEWICZ-MONIUSZKO G. | 3,193.71 | 60.26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | JANSONS U. - GERMANIS A. | 3,179.51 | 59.99 |
| 3 | MARSTRANDER P. - ANDERSSEN R. | 2,982.57 | 58.57 |
| 4 | JASSEM K. - MAZURKIEWICZ M. | 2,965.47 | 58.24 |
| 5 | HOFSETH J. - KRISTENSEN A. | 2,956.70 | 58.07 |
| 6 | ERNSTSEN S. - HAETTA L. | 3,055.56 | 57.65 |
| 7 | KOWALSKI D. - BLACH M. | 3,029.49 | 57.16 |
| 8 | BJERKSET S. - LANGEN A. | 2,905.80 | 57.07 |
| 9 | DALECKI M. - MODRZEJEWSKI M. | 3,013.19 | 56.85 |
| 10 | FAILLA G. - DE MICHELIS L. | 3,003.52 | 56.67 |
| 11 | SILVERSTEIN A. - ROSENTHAL A. | 2,965.34 | 55.95 |
| 12 | RYNNING E. - BREKKA G. | 2,957.24 | 55.80 |
| 13 | BILDE M. - FARHOLT S. | 2,840.12 | 55.78 |
| 14 | COUNIL J. - ROUSSEL N. | 2,950.90 | 55.68 |
| 15 | SERPOI G. - TEODORESCU C. | 2,937.32 | 55.42 |
| 16 | ROLL Y. - LEVIN A. | 2,930.50 | 55.29 |
| 17 | THOMASSEN K. - Hinge S. | 2,916.81 | 55.03 |
| 18 | DESSAIN T. - KABAN T. | 2,780.73 | 54.61 |
| 19 | TER LAARE M. - MOLLE L. | 2,891.27 | 54.55 |
| 20 | MUSAOGLU A. - MINASYAN A. | 2,885.40 | 54.44 |
| 21 | EIDE H. - BAKKE C. | 2,885.07 | 54.44 |
| 22 | COPE S. - PASKE T. | 2,867.07 | 54.10 |
| 23 | OLSEN R. - OLSEN S. | 2,863.22 | 54.02 |
| 24 | GOLD D. - CASTNER K. | 2,853.47 | 53.84 |
| 25 | SHI B. - TIAN W. | 2,737.00 | 53.75 |
| 26 | OLSEN R. - BJORKAN I. | 2,848.18 | 53.74 |
| 27 | SCHIPPERS-BOSKLOPPER E. - STIENEN R. | 2,838.91 | 53.56 |
| 28 | THOMASSEN P. - ANDERSEN S. | 2,826.92 | 53.34 |
| 29 | GOLEBIOWSKI S. - JASZCZAK A. | 2,818.33 | 53.18 |
| 30 | JOHANSEN J. - JOHANSEN A. | 2,805.52 | 52.93 |
| 31 | FRANCHI A. - ZALESKI R. | 2,785.60 | 52.56 |
| 32 | GUSTAVSSON T. - CLARIN P. | 2,781.86 | 52.49 |
| 33 | DINKIN S. - TUNCOK C. | 2,776.55 | 52.39 |
| 34 | MALINOWSKI A. - PADON D. | 2,667.53 | 52.39 |
| 35 | GIUBILO V. - MEDUGNO G. | 2,769.54 | 52.26 |
| 36 | ZACK Y. - COHEN I. | 2,658.24 | 52.20 |
| 37 | GOWER C. - APTEKER A. | 2,761.62 | 52.11 |
| 38 | LAKATOS P. - DOMBI G. | 2,759.86 | 52.07 |
| 39 | CARCASSONNE-LABAERE V. - LABAERE A. | 2,753.41 | 51.95 |
| 40 | VAN DER TOORN C. - KAPTEIN M. | 2,744.64 | 51.79 |
| 41 | KRISTIANSEN T. - FAGERDAL R. | 2,628.95 | 51.63 |
| 42 | POLAK T. - VAN OVERBEEKE T. | 2,736.05 | 51.62 |
| 43 | KVAMSDAL L. - HOFF A. | 2,735.31 | 51.61 |
| 44 | HAUGE B. - HAUGE T. | 2,624.62 | 51.54 |
| 45 | LASSERRE D. - BRUNET K. | 2,621.54 | 51.48 |
| 46 | GILL P. - DAWSON J. | 2,720.26 | 51.33 |
| 47 | GROSSACK A. - GROSSACK 2. | 2,717.05 | 51.27 |
| 48 | STRAND K. - HELMERSEN K. | 2,716.26 | 51.25 |
| 49 | GARSEG T. - STATLE S. | 2,604.03 | 51.14 |
| 50 | HELGESEN L. - GJOES T. | 2,710.33 | 51.14 |

Results are subject to confirmation

| 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| 51 | HELGESEN K. - ANFINSEN E. | 2,704.89 | 51.04 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52 | JENSAAS J. - INGEBRIGTSEN T. | 2,700.15 | 50.95 |
| 53 | AUKEN S. - WELLAND R. | 2,698.48 | 50.91 |
| 54 | LINDESTEG O. - UELAND D. | 2,688.81 | 50.73 |
| 55 | ELIASSEN E. - SOOILAND T. | 2,685.30 | 50.67 |
| 56 | SAELENSMINDE E. - HAUGE R. | 2,671.64 | 50.41 |
| 57 | MIDJO R. - UKKELBERG O. | 2,555.79 | 50.19 |
| 58 | JENSEN R. - ALMLI S. | 2,655.96 | 50.11 |
| 59 | BULL S. - BULL I. | 2,654.13 | 50.08 |
| 60 | ARONOV V. - DAMIANOVA D. | 2,537.50 | 49.83 |
| 61 | VALLESTAD A. - PEDERSEN B. | 2,629.49 | 49.61 |
| 62 | KALTENBORN J. - BRUUSGAARD R. | 2,624.23 | 49.51 |
| 63 | ROMANOWSKI J. - ROZWADOWSKI W. | 2,614.07 | 49.32 |
| 64 | OLSEN M. - LYNGBOE T. | 2,612.97 | 49.30 |
| 65 | SAYILKAN T. - KIZILOK O. | 2,587.86 | 48.83 |
| 66 | KARLSEN L. - JAKOBSEN G. | 2,475.99 | 48.63 |
| 67 | SVARE A. - DYRKORN O. | 2,576.71 | 48.62 |
| 68 | BEYER M. - BAARDSEN T. | 2,574.77 | 48.58 |
| 69 | BOGACH A. - RAPOPORT V. | 2,473.34 | 48.57 |
| 70 | MAGRI F. - BARTOLOTTI P. | 2,572.86 | 48.54 |
| 71 | EIDE M. - LOMSDALEN O. | 2,566.23 | 48.42 |
| 72 | MARTINUSSEN S. - PAULSEN D. | 2,564.02 | 48.38 |
| 73 | OVESEN V. - HATTEN O. | 2,554.95 | 48.21 |
| 74 | SIELICKI T. - TUCZYNSKI P. | 2,553.09 | 48.17 |
| 75 | CHMURSKI B. - CHALUPEC I. | 2,544.49 | 48.01 |
| 76 | LEHN R. - ELDE T. | 2,533.06 | 47.79 |
| 77 | DOBROWOLSKI M. - MADUZIA A. | 2,415.20 | 47.43 |
| 78 | EIDE E. - ROREN T. | 2,512.46 | 47.40 |
| 79 | SAETRE J. - OVESEN S. | 2,392.16 | 46.98 |
| 80 | SKALMERAAS T. - SKALMERAS P. | 2,488.27 | 46.95 |
| 81 | HORNISCHER G. - WEINBERGER S. | 2,467.89 | 46.56 |
| 82 | PARVULESCU M. - BUJENITA D. | 2,467.05 | 46.55 |
| 83 | STERN L. - URMAN L. | 2,453.16 | 46.29 |
| 84 | EIDE L. - ANDREASEN A. | 2,444.40 | 46.12 |
| 85 | NYMOEN A. - DALING T. | 2,443.82 | 46.11 |
| 86 | HAGA O. - BAARDSEN T. | 2,437.41 | 45.99 |
| 87 | LARSEN H. - JOHANSSON S. | 2,337.76 | 45.91 |
| 88 | RYDLAND B. - BOGEN J. | 2,431.10 | 45.87 |
| 89 | TISLEVOLL G. - BREKKE V. | 2,428.16 | 45.81 |
| 90 | SIVERTSEN A. - KARLSEN S. | 2,382.81 | 44.96 |
| 91 | ELIASSEN R. - ELIASSEN S. | 2,382.44 | 44.95 |
| 92 | SANDVIK C. - BREMNES H. | 2,343.70 | 44.22 |
| 93 | DAHL S. - FUGLEM G. | 2,248.24 | 44.15 |
| 94 | NOKLEBY J. - HEGBOM E. | 2,248.16 | 44.15 |
| 95 | SANDSMARK T. - ROGNSAA B. | 2,240.35 | 44.00 |
| 96 | BUIJS P. - DE HULLU H. | 2,326.04 | 43.89 |
| 97 | OLSEN M. - OEDEGAARDEN H. | 2,299.02 | 43.38 |
| 98 | VARDAR R. - KAYA M. | 2,219.22 | 41.87 |
| 99 | JENSEN B. - JOHANSEN R. | 2,211.36 | 41.72 |
| 100 | ELIASSEN N. - CHRISTENSEN P. | 2,211.26 | 41.72 |
| 101 | WEIE D. - OLSEN S. | 2,208.63 | 41.67 |
| 102 | MARRO C. - MARRO V. | 2,194.94 | 41.41 |
| 103 | ZUBOV V. - FILIPPOV V. | 2,189.92 | 41.32 |
| 104 | NORDVIK V. - IVERSEN T. | 2,135.54 | 40.29 |
| 105 | ARNTSEN R. - SOTTAR R. | 2,104.16 | 39.70 |
| 106 | JENSEN P. - STRAUMSNES T. | 2,011.40 | 39.50 |
| 107 | NORUM J. - SIVERTSEN S. | 1,857.12 | 36.47 |

Results are subject to confirmation

## WOMEN PAIRS

## FINAL

| SJOBERG E. - RIMSTEDT S. | 389.20 | 60.06 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ZMUDA J. - DUFRAT K. | 377.80 | 58.30 |
| LU Y. - LIU Y. | 377.00 | 58.18 |
| SARNIAK A. - BALDYSZ C. | 352.40 | 54.38 |
| GLADIATOR A. - WEBER E. | 350.60 | 54.10 |
| PILIPOVIC M. - SVER N. | 349.00 | 53.86 |
| CHEN Y. - ZHAO B. | 337.20 | 52.04 |
| WANG H. - ZHANG Y. | 324.60 | 50.09 |
| YAN R. - LI Y. | 315.00 | 48.61 |
| CAMERON G. - VOS V. | 308.20 | 47.56 |
| BARENDREGT R. - CHEDIAK V. | 288.40 | 44.51 |
| LIU J. - WANG W. | 262.80 | 40.56 |
| RASMUSSEN S. . ARALT L. | 259.00 | 39.97 |
| BROGELAND T. - SVENDSEN T. | 218.40 | 33.70 |

Results are subject to confirmation

## SENIOR PAIRS

## FINAL

| STRATER B. - KRATZ U. | 394.09 | 60.82 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MAESEL H. - MAESEL R. | 369.64 | 57.04 |
| TROUWBORST J. DOREMANS N. | 340.00 | 52.47 |
| BAKKE T. - FARSTAD A. | 339.55 | 51.22 |
| HOLMBAKKEN J. - LINDQVIST P. | 331.91 | 49.45 |
| SCHROEDER K. - HARSANYI J. | 320.45 | 48.89 |
| JOURDAIN P. - KENDRICK D. | 316.82 | 48.11 |
| SVENSSON T. - ANDREASSON L. | 311.73 | 47.40 |
| SKOPINSKA E. - WITKOWSKI P. | 307.18 | 47.11 |
| BOLVIKEN E. - SORVOLL J. | 305.27 | 46.97 |
| DANYLYUK T. - DANYLYUK V. | 304.36 | 45.22 |
| CHODOROWSKA I. - CHODOROWSKI J. | 293.00 | 44.91 |
| WENNING U. - FRERICHS H. | 291.00 | 44.37 |
| McGOWAN E. - LIGGAT D. | 287.55 |  |

Results are subject to confirmation
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## TOURNAMENTS

Traditionally the tournaments of the festival are the Open Pairs, the Swiss Teams and the Mixed Pairs. This year is no exception and the week starts with the Open Pairs, the event that attracts the highest participation. It is a 3 -session pairs' event with match points scoring across the field and it will take place from Friday $4^{\text {th }}$ to Sunday $6^{\text {n }}$ of September 2015, with one session every day.
The second event is the Mixed Pairs which is also a match points event. This one takes place over two sessions from Monday $7^{n \prime}$ to Tuesday $8^{n}$ of September 2015.
Last but not least, the Teams event is played in a Swiss format (and appropriately selected Danish rounds) in 2 sessions on Wednesday $9^{\text {n }} \&$ Thursday $10^{\prime \prime \prime}$ of September 2015 and its completion marks the end of the festival.
Random generated computer hands will be used throughout the festival and top pairs will be seeded. Hand records will be provided at the completion of each session and top tables play in the teams event will be broadcasted on the Internet.
This year there will be barometer scoring with live broadcasting of results.

- Open Pairs $100 €$ per person
- Mixed Pairs $60 €$ per person
- Swiss Teams $300 €$ per team


TOTAL PRIZES
$35.000 €$


## PRIZES

## PROGRAM

## REGISTRATIONS
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