## 7th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS <br> 0

## Daily Bulletin

27th June-11th July
Editor: Mark Horton Co-Editor: Jos Jacobs Lay-out Editor \& Photographer: Francesca Canali Journalists: Snorre Aalberg, David Bird, John Carruthers, Patrick Jourdain, Fernando Lema, Micke Melander, Barry Rigal, Ram Soffer, Ron Tacchi

## TRIUMPH \& DISASTER

## TUESDAY, JULY 72015

Issue No. 10
CONTENTS сиск то navigate

## Women \& Seniors pairs format

 p. 2
## New event in Monaco

 p. 2
## Dobbelskvis fra Nord-Norge

Snorre Aalberg, p. 3
Orange White vs 10 cc
David Bird, p. 5
The compliment with a sting
Patrick Jourdain, p. 8
A Slam Monaco Style
A. Roth \& F. Lema, p. 9

## Vissi D'Arte

Mark Horton, p. 10
The final problem
Micke Melander, p. 11
PDC vs Lazer
Barry Rigal, p. 16
Anatomy of a disaster
John Carruthers, p. 23
The story of team Levy's Stem...
Ram Soffer, p. 17
Credit where credit is due
Barry Rigal, p. 19
Monaco - Noralia, p. 20
David Bird, p. 20
O/W/S teams Butler
p. 23

Open BAM Results p. 29

## Brackets

 winners of the BAM teams
On a day where the players were faced with an extraordinary number of testing deals, there were thrills and spills galore to entertain the thousands following the Championships on BBO. On top of that, there was another dramatic sudden death play off, this time in the Women's teams.
The Senior \& Women's European Open Team Champions will be crowned tonight and tomorrow's Bulletin will tell you how the tiles were won and lost.


The PRIZE GIVING CEREMONY for the European Women and Senior Teams Championship \& the BAM will take place today at 20.00 in the dedicated area at the far end of the cafeteria.
(avis
Tromse kommune

## $\doteqdot$

## WOMEN AND SENIORS PAIRS FORMAT IN TROMSØ

## STARTING TODAY

After the Qualification stage (50 boards on Tuesday) the field will be divided in Semifinals $A$ and $B$ (approximately 50 boards on Wednesday). The pairs coming from the Final of the Teams will drop in to Semifinal A.
There will be a linear carry-over from the Qualification to the Semifinals.
A total of 14 Pairs will qualify to the Final ( 52 boards on Thursday): 12 from Semifinal A and 2 from Semifinal B.
There will be a linear carry-over from the Semifinals to the Final.
Further details depend on the final number of entries and will be published shortly after the start.

All pairs can play the Marit Sveaas Swiss Pairs (Friday and Saturday) free of charge, provided they register online before 22.00 h , on Thursday.

## TIME SCHEDULE OF THE QUALIFICATION

10.00-11.30
16.15-17.45
11.45-13.15
18.00-19.30
14.30-16.00

IN SEMIFINALS AND FINAL THE STARTING TIME WILL ALWAYS BE 10.00 BUT THE EXACT SCHEDULE WILL BE PUBLISHED LATER


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!
 DOBBELSKVIS FRA NORD-NORGE

by Snorre Aalberg

Omtrent på denne tiden av året pleier vi norske å spille vår festival. De siste årene har Fredrikstad vært vertskap, mens Lillehammer har en årelang historie som arrangør av det som etter hvert har blitt en stor suksess, nemlig Norsk Bridgefestival.
I år har NBF tatt på seg en formidabel oppgave med å arrangere EM i Bridge og vi er ubeskjedne nok til å håpe at Tromsø skal fa betegnelsen «Best games ever». Om det målet oppnås er for tidlig å si, men når vi næermer oss to tredjedeler av mesterskapet er det stort sett godord å høre fra alle kanter.


Olav Arne Hoyem, Borre Lund, Ole Berset, Ahsel Hornslien

Det ble tidlig klart at vi ikke hadde ressurser til à avholde både Bridgefestival og EM, så for å stimulere til oppslutning av norske spillere her i Tromsø, bestemte NBF tidlig at i de fire hovedturneringene skulle vårt Norgesmesterskap inkluderes. Reglene var ganske klare og enkle, nemlig i beste par/ lag med kun medlemmer av NBF fikk tittelen "Norgesmester 2015". Tidligere denne uka har vi kåret to gullvinnere, Lillaballuba i Mixlag og Åse Langeland - Geir Helgemo i par.

I går ble kvalifiseringen i lagturneringene avviklet. I åpen klasse var ikke de norske resultatene til å hoppe i taket for når bare et reint norsk lag gikk videre til sluttspillet. Det betyr at to dager før EM-tittelen deles ut, er det norske mesterskapet i åpen klasse avgjort. Gratulerer til «SLUFSA" med spillerne Børre Lund - Ole


Berset og Aksel Hornslien - Olav Arve Høyem.
På tredjeplass i vårt Norgesmesterskap kom «BAANNBRIDGE» fra Troms. En av turneringens beste spilleføringer stod Stian Elvestad for i spill 29 i kamp 6 mot det russiske laget «Matchpoint NYC"

Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { s } & \text { J } 10 \\
\diamond & 9632 \\
\diamond & \text { Q J } 2 \\
\& & \text { A Q J } 10
\end{array}
$$

$\begin{array}{ll}\wedge & 82 \\ \diamond & \text { KQ } 5 \\ \diamond & 108\end{array}$
\& K 98432


A KQ97543
๑ J 1087
$\diamond 6$
\& 6
4. A 6
$\checkmark$ A 4
$\diamond$ AK 97543
of 75

| Vest | Nord | Øst | Syd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A.Dubinin | E.Larsen | A.Gromov | S.Elvestad |
|  | $1 \%$ | 24 | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | 4 |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | 5NT* |
| Pass | 64\%** | Pass | $7 \diamond$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
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Vest spilte ut spar åtte som gikk til spilleførers ess. Syd kunne telle tolv stikk forutsatt at kløverkappen gikk, men enda mangla det et stikk. Stian Evenstad er en dyktig spillefører som kan sin ABC .
Ruter til damen og ruter til esset fulgt av kløverfinessen. Så hjem i trumf før han spilte alle trumfen unntatt den siste. Da er stillingen slik:

Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.

|  | 4 | 10 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ | 9 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | --- |  |  |
|  | 0 | A Q J |  |  |
| A --- |  |  | 4 | K Q |
| $\checkmark$ K Q |  | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\checkmark$ | J 108 |
| $\diamond---$ |  | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ | --- |
| \& K 98 |  |  | of | --- |
|  | 4 | 6 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | A 4 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | 3 |  |  |
|  | 0 | 5 |  |  |

På den siste trumfen må vest kaste seg ned til singel hjerterkonge for å holde kløveren. I bordet forsvinner et svart kort og øst har ingen problemer enda og kaster f.eks en hjerter. Så følger kløver til damen og kløver ess. På den første har øst et ledig kort, men så er det slutt. Enten må han gi opp hjerteren og la spillefører få de to siste for E 4 i fargen ellers må han la spar seks bli en vinner.
En klassisk forsinket tosidig skvis fra NordNorge.

Du ser sikkert at de som bruker svenske utspill med den minste fra dobbelton i utspill, vil beite 7 sp . Da starter vest med spar to og kan holde tre kløver og spar åtte i firekort posisjonen. Øst kan kun konsentrere seg om å holde hjerteren.


## TEAM ORANGE WHITE VS 10CC

by David Bird

## Open Teams Swiss round six

The overnight leader-board in the Open Teams Swiss qualifier showed Team Orange White (Netherlands) with a lead of 11 VPs or so over 10cc (England/USA). These teams met at Table 1 in round 6.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

|  | $\begin{array}{ll}  & 1075 \\ \diamond & K 1076 \\ \diamond & 9753 \\ \& & 32 \end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { A } & \text { A J } 4 \\ \diamond & \text { Q J } 9 \\ \diamond & \text { A Q } 2 \\ \text { \& } & 9876 \end{array}$ | N | 4 | Q 832 |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | A 42 |
|  | S | $\diamond$ | K 10 |
|  |  | 4 | Q J 54 |
|  | ¢ K 96 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 853$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 86 |  |  |
|  | \& AK 10 |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Castner | Verbeek | Gold | Molenaar |
|  |  | $1 \%$ | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

What would you lead against 3NT from the North hand?
60\% of the field chose a heart, and this was the only lead to allow the contract to make, against best defence.
Taf Anthias and I spent two years running computer simulations on opening leads, writing the book 'Winning Notrump Leads'. Of course, one deal proves nothing but I'm sure that our simulations would have disliked a heart lead. Firstly, leading from an honour costs around half a trick on average, and this is not a good bargain when you have only a four-card suit to establish. Secondly, North is weak with no side entry and is better advised to seek tricks in partner's hand.
The auction suggests a major suit lead, it is true, because West has denied a 4-card major. As I see it, the choice is between a diamond and (because it is a major suit) a spade. At all tables where a diamond was led, 3NT was defeated. After a heart
lead, Castner was able to build a club trick, scoring one club, two spades (on a finesse), three hearts (after the lead) and three diamonds. He actually emerged with an overtrick for a 1IMP gain.

Board 23. Dealer South. Both Vul.


| West <br> Castner | North <br> Verbeek | East <br> Gold | South <br> Molenaar <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | $2 \Omega$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\$}$ | All Pass |  |

Gold led the ace and queen of hearts, continuing with the $\triangle 5$ and Castner duly uppercut with the © 10. If declarer overruffs, a trump trick will be promoted for East. Quite rightly, Verbeek preferred to discard his club loser. The contract then went one down when a diamond trick had to be lost.
As you see, the best defence as the cards lie is for Gold to cash the A before delivering the uppercut. Declarer can then escape for one down only by double-dummy play (overruffing and leading low to the 8 , establishing an entry for a lead of the $\diamond J!$ )

This was the bidding in the Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nab | Cope | Drijuer | Bowley |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | 29 | Pass |
| 3\% | 44 | 5\% | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |
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The 3\% and 5\% bids look close decisions to me and the result was a phantom sacrifice of 500 for a loss of 12 IMPs.

Both sides arrived in the wrong game here:

Board 24. Dealer West. Neither Vul.

- K 86
$\bigcirc 92$
$\diamond$ AJ 32
\& 10986

A Q 73
$\checkmark$ AQ 84
$\diamond$ K 85
\& QJ5


| West | North <br> Castner | Eerbeek | South <br> Gold <br> Molenaar |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Cope | Drijver | Bowley |
| 1\& | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

At both tables, $2 \diamond$ showed at least a limit raise of clubs. In the Open Room Verbeek led the $\diamond 2$ from a four-card suit, which again proved to be the only lead to give the contract (except the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ ). Nine tricks were then cold and an overtrick was made when South discarded hearts on the clubs.
Cope chose the $\$ 6$ lead, which looked likely to break the contract. South wins with the ace and returns the $\boldsymbol{J}$, say. Even if declarer holds off the Q and South then plays another spade rather than switching to diamonds, declarer has only eight tricks on a passive continuation.
What actually happened was that Bowley played the 10 at Trick 1. Declarer then scored the same ten tricks as in the Open Room. There are some situations, with West holding the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, where it can work well to put in the 10 . The aim is to retain the AA as a later entry in the suit. This was not one of them and the chance for a swing was missed.

Board 25. Dealer North.E/W Vul.

- AKJ
© A Q J 72
$\diamond 43$
4864


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Castner | Verbeek | Gold | Molenaar |
|  | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$. |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \&{ }^{*}$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |

All Pass
Molenaar showed his diamonds with a secondround $3 \%$ transfer and an easy 450 in the heart fit was missed. A diamond game would also have been cold but 3NT depended on not losing five club tricks. Gold started with the $\% \mathrm{~K}$ (\%J from West) and continued with the ( 2 from West). He then switched to a spade and 11 tricks were made. At the other table, the bidding was 1NT - 3NT and a spade was led. That was all 13 tricks to Simon Cope, the 10cc North, and a gain of 2 IMPs.


E-W held potential slam values here:
Board 28. Dealer West. N-S Vul.

- 842
$\bigcirc 753$
$\diamond$ A 974
\& A 74

4. 10763

- Q J 6
$\diamond$ K Q J 6
\& K 8


A AKJ5
$\checkmark$ AK 1098
$\diamond---$
\& Q 1062
A Q 9
$\bigcirc 42$
$\diamond 108532$
\& J 953

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Castner | Verbeek | Gold | Molenaar |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $1 \uparrow$ | Pass | $3 \star *$ | Pass |
| $4 \uparrow *$ | All Pass |  |  |

West rebid 14 (rather than 1 NT ) in the USA style and Gold's 3 was then forcing. West's subsequent 4 4 was marked as conventional. Obviously the lack of a cue-bid is discouraging. It's possible that they also make use of the 'serious 3NT' to distinguish between strong and moderate cue-bidding hands, in which case 44 shows a dead minimum. Well done for keeping out of trouble, although it was the sort of deal where on an unlucky day you might lose a slam swing.
North led the $\diamond A$, ruffed in dummy, and declarer continued with the ace and king of trumps. The Q fell and 12 of the available 13 tricks were taken for +480 . They stopped in game at the other table for a flat board. The 10CC team won the match by 22-1 in IMPs, which is 16.18 VPs to 3.82 , and moved into first place.

$$
\Delta \diamond \diamond d
$$
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## THE COMPLIMENT WITH A STING

by Patrick Jourdain

David Berkowitz had a compliment to pay his opponent in Round 9 of the Open Teams Qualification. This was the deal in question:

Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

| - AQ 32 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | AK 962 |
| $\diamond$ | A K 107 |
| 0 |  |
| 4 | K 1094 |
| $\bigcirc$ | J |
| $\diamond$ | Q 32 |
| \& | K J 1082 |

The auction of Berkowitz (South) and Alan Sontag was unopposed and ambitious:

North
Sontag
$1 \%$
$2 \diamond$
34
5\%
74
1\% Precision
$2 \diamond$ Transfer to hearts
5\& Exclusion Keycard Blackwood
$5 \diamond$ One key card outside clubs

South
Berkowitz
2*
2か
3NT
$5 \diamond$
Pass

West led a small club against Berkowitz's grand slam. How do you plan the play?

You are going to need a favourable lie of the cards. Let us suppose the hearts are 4-3 and the trumps 3-2. You can ruff the opening lead, play ace of hearts, ruff a heart, diamond to dummy, ruff a heart, draw trumps, and cash two winning hearts.
That will give you 12 tricks. You still need to take care of

the fourth diamond. Either the suit must come in, or the diamond guard may be in the same hand as the club ace in which case the defender will be squeezed.

That line would not have worked, as a glance at the full diagram will show.

Round 9 Board 28. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

|  | A A Q 32 <br> $\checkmark$ AK 962 <br> $\diamond$ AK 107 <br> o - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 J 5 | N | ¢ 876 |
| $\bigcirc 10754$ | W E | $\bigcirc$ Q 83 |
| $\diamond 54$ | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ | $\diamond$ J 986 |
| \& A Q 953 |  | \& 764 |
|  | A K 1094 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 32 |  |
|  | \& K J 1082 |  |

How did Berkowitz make his thirteenth trick?
He paid West, Lukasz Brede of Poland, the great compliment of having underled his ace at trick one against the grand slam.

Appreciating that a defender would not readily lead into a bid suit unless he was looking at the ace, at trick one he threw a diamond from dummy, winning his club eight in hand, and then proceeded with the line described earlier.

The sting in the tail for West's imaginative lead is that it provided declarer with his thirteenth trick. Deep Finesse tells us that on a more passive lead (anything but the $\bigcirc 10$ ) declarer can be held to six.

The contract was the same at the other table, and on the lead of the $\checkmark 5$ it failed, so the swing was 20 IMPs to team Berkowitz.
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This is a hand that Pierre Zimmermann reported to Arianna Testa.

Today in the sixth round of the European Open Teams Championships, Monaco fought against Hoff. Monaco won by 11.14 to 8.86 .
On Board 28; Pierre Zimmermann and Franck Multon declared a difficult slam in spades, missing two aces and the trump queen. This is what happened:

Dealer West. N/S Vul.

| ¢ 10763 | ¢ AKJ5 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q J 6 | $\bigcirc$ AK 1098 |
| $\diamond$ K Q J 6 | $\diamond$ - |
| - K 8 | \& Q 1062 |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zimmermann |  | Multo |  |
| 1NT* | Pass | 24** | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | $30 *$ | Pass |
| 4\%** | Pass | 5ゝ* | Pass |
| 50* | Pass | 6a | All Pass |

1NT 10-12
$3 \bigcirc$ Spade fit
4\% Cue bid
$5 \diamond$ Exclusion Keycard
$5 \checkmark 0$ keycards

Declarer received the lead of the seven of diamonds and ruffed in dummy. He continued with a club to his king, North won with the ace and returned a club to dummy's $\& \mathrm{Q}$.
Declarer elected to cash the $\boldsymbol{A K}$ and saw the queen fall doubleton on his right. He came to hand with a club ruff, overtook the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ with dummy's ace and ruffed dummy's last club with the 10 .
Overtaking the $\odot J$ with dummy's $๑ K$, declarer drew the outstanding trump and claimed, +980 points.
At the other table, the opponents stopped in game, making 11 tricks, +450 so 11 IMPs for Monaco and the match.

The full deal:


## 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.
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## VISSI D'ARTE

by Mark Horton

Early yesterday morning I was able to listen to an extract from Act 2 of Puccini's Tosca, featuring a performance of one of the best known arias by the legendary Maria Callas.
At this point in the story the heroine finds herself before the tyrannical chief of police, Scarpia, who has arrested her boyfriend, Mario, on suspicion of abetting a fugitive. Mario is sentenced to die, but Scarpia offers to free him on the condition that Tosca submit to his lustful advances.
In the aria Tosca is lamenting the hopeless situation into which she has been thrust despite her lifelong piety and devotion to her art.
(Alas, Opera and classical music is not to everyone's taste. Our duplicating chief, Monica Gorreri insisted that we lower the volume. It reminded me of this scene from the famous sitcom Fawlty Towers:
Basil has been listening to classical music in the office instead of typing the lunch menu or hanging a picture in the lobby.
Sybil Fawlty: 'You could've had them both done by now if you hadn't spent the whole morning skulking in there, listening to that racket.'
Basil Fawlty: 'Racket?' That's Brahms! Brahms's third racket!)


Roumen Trendafilou

The players here are devoted to bridge and try their hardest at all times. Nevertheless, as one slips down the table and out of contention it is possible to drop one's guard, as Brian Senior reports on this deal from Table 43 in Round 8 of the Open Teams:

Dealer East. N/S Vul.


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Spillum | Senior | Kjonsvik <br> Penfold |  |
|  |  | 106 | Pass |
| 1NT | Dble | Rdbl | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | Rdbl | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

North's untypical boldness was harshly treated.
The defenders started with three rounds of spades and declarer won in dummy cashed the ace of clubs and played a club to the queen, escaping for -500 when the heart queen proved to be well placed.
Now gentle reader, can you solve this conundrum?
How did this result translate into a 1 IMP gain for $N / S$ ?

Open Room

| West | North <br> Karaivanov | East <br> Bjorkan | TrendafilouOlsen <br> $1 \& *$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14** Pass |  |  |  |

That made on the nose for +520 .

Sherlock Holmes is known for his logical reasoning, his ability to adopt almost any disguise and his use of forensic science to solve difficult cases. A bridgeplayer that has been around at the highest level for the last 40 years is Swede Anders Morath, who often comes up with conclusions and questions that no-one else had thought about, in the best Sherlock Holmes style.
"Detection is, or ought to be, an exact science and should be treated in the same cold and unemotional manner. You have attempted to tinge it with romanticism, which produces much the same effect as if you worked a love-story .... Some facts should be suppressed, or, at least, a just sense of proportion should be observed in treating them. The only point in the case which deserved mention was the curious analytical reasoning from effects to causes, by which I succeeded in unravelling it."

Sherlock Holmes
Have a look at this problem, presented by Moriathy.
Board 26. Dealer South. All Vul.

|  | a K Q 107 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | A 107 |  |
|  | 0 | A K J 85 |  |
| A |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc \quad \mathrm{w}^{\circ} \mathrm{E}$ - |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 4$ |  | $\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond$ |
| \& 5 |  |  |  |
|  | 4 | A J |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ | K 9732 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ | K 83 |  |
|  | 0 | Q 74 |  |


| West <br> Efraimsson | North <br> Jensaas | East <br> Morath | South <br> Ingebrigtsen |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1NT |  |  |  |

When the four of diamonds was led, declarer rose with the ace of diamonds from dummy, and West played the jack!

Declarer then played five rounds of clubs, learning that West had begun with one and East with four. West discarded two diamonds and two hearts, while East threw a spade. Next came four rounds of spades; the third round of that suit showed that West had started with two and East with five, since West discarded another diamond on the third round of the suit.

Declarer is now down to the following four card ending when he plays the king of spades.


Declarer plays the king of spades, East follows suit. Now If East holds the ace of hearts, a diamond should be pitched from hand and you simply play a heart to the king to make the contract. If West has the ace of hearts you should discard a heart and throw West in with the king of hearts to make the contract assuming that he has to lead into the diamond tenace.

So now my Dear Watson,
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Board 26. Dealer South. All Vul.
^ K Q 107
$\checkmark 6$
$\diamond$ A 107
\& AKJ 85


It's Elementary, says Morath. Why on Earth would East have discarded a spade on the fifth club if he had the ace of hearts, and therefore could have defeated the contract alone by retaining a spade winner in the three card ending?

East can work out to discard a heart from QJ8 since declarer's line of play marks him with $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$, and thus West must hold either $\backsim \mathrm{A}$ or $\vee \mathrm{K}$.

Ingebrigtsen didn't find that analysis at the table, and instead went one down by playing on diamonds. At the other table, Dan Bylund, declarer for team Anna, was in Six Clubs. When the jack of diamonds was led (Russinow, according to their
convention card). Bylund won, cashed one round of clubs before trying a heart to the king. West now played back a diamond which East could ruff, for a push...

Worth noticing was that Richard Ritmeijer for team Orange Red, who also declared 6NT, found the winning play in their match against Black for a 2 IMP win, when their opponents had bid and made Six Clubs.


## 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.
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100 teams $\infty 270$ pairs $\infty 50$ years tradition $\infty$ over 40 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 p.m. | Welcome Pairs | ngle session |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sat, Sept $5^{\text {th }}$ | 9 p.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 p.m. | Lara Mixed \& Open Pairs | single session |
| Wed, Sept ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 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 | $3^{\text {rd }} \boldsymbol{\&} 4^{\text {th }}$ session |
| Fri, Sept 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 3 p.m. | Open Teams | final A |
| Fri, Sept 11 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ | 9 p.m. | Brk Open Pairs | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ session |
| Sat, Sept $12^{\text {th }}$ | 1 p.m. | Brk Open Pairs | $2^{\text {nd }}$ session |
| Sept, $13{ }^{\text {th }}-16^{\text {th }}$ | 9 p.m. | Daily Additonal Pairs | single sessions |
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PDC VS LAZER

## by Ram Soffer

## Open Teams Swiss Round 6

This match started the second day of the qualifier. Both teams were in excellent positions after five rounds, but this did not guarantee an easy passage to the knockouts, as the number of qualifying spots was reduced from 32 to 16 . Nor was the presence of many World and European champions in the team roster a guarantee of success. One had to play well (and sometimes to be lucky) when it mattered.
PDC had the more illustrious squad which included legendary Italian Dano De Falco as well as 2014 World Pair champions Ehud FriedlanderInon Liran and their Israeli teammate in the forthcoming Bermuda Bowl Dror Padon.
However the Australian team Lazer put up a stubborn fight, and there were not many big swings. Ultimately, the fate of the match depended on one big board.
The first five boards were a battle of small swings.
Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.
a AKQ972
$\diamond 97$
$\diamond$ AK 42
of J

| ค 103 |  | ¢ J 64 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 42$ | $\mathrm{w}^{\mathrm{N}}$ E | $\checkmark$ AKQ 85 |
| $\diamond$ Q 75 | $\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{S}} \mathrm{E}$ | $\diamond 103$ |
| \& KQ 10965 |  | \& A 74 |
| 4 | 85 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ | J 1063 |  |
| $\diamond$ | J 986 |  |
| 0 | 832 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Braithwaite | De Falco | Robinson | P. Cayne |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 14 | $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Many Norths overbid this hand to game, but Dano De Falco bid it very sensibly. He managed to show a big hand without climbing too high. The final contract was good, even though 3 was simpler.
Robinson started with three high hearts, forcing declarer to ruff while West discarded a spade. The
simple play of $\diamond A K$ might have led to a disaster in case of 4-1 trumps, so Dano played high spades instead. West ruffed the second round, but it was at the expense of his natural trump trick, and the contract made. PDC +110.

| West <br> Friedlander | North <br> Gumby | East <br> Liran | South <br> Lazer <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{}$ | $3 \circlearrowleft$ | All Pass |

A surprising auction in the Closed Room led to an unexpected gain for Lazer. $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ was strong, and Liran made a very risky overcall at the three level with a balanced hand, notwithstanding his good suit (after all his partner wasn't expected to be on lead).
Well, this wasn't a forcing pass situation for the Australian pair, and Liran found himself playing 30.

The defence was very accurate. The spade lead was won by North's $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$. Then came $\diamond \mathrm{K}$, followed not by $\diamond A$ but rather by two more rounds of high spades. South ruffed higher than dummy, got back to partner's hand with a diamond, and a fourth round of spades promoted a trump trick. Lazer +200 and a well-deserved minor swing of 3 IMPs.


Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
© AKJ
$\checkmark$ A Q J 72
$\diamond 43$
864


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Braithwaite | De Falco | Robinson P. Cayne |  |
|  | $1 N T$ | Pass | 2NT* |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |

Patricia Cayne's sequence was an invitation to a diamond slam without any shortness. De Falco declined to continue beyond 3NT, and once again he was right. Robinson picked up the 6 - fourth best of his longest suit, and when it hit the table declarer had 14 top tricks. PDC +520 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Friedlander | Gumby | Liran | Lazer |
|  | $1 N T$ | Pass | 3NT |

The Australian auction was less revealing, but Liran still made the wiser choice of $\& \mathrm{~A}$ for his lead. Lazer +400 .
The presence of the 10 made a disaster less in likely the worst case, when the a long club suit is in declarer's hand or in dummy. As the cards lay, Gumby was thankful that clubs broke evenly, but this lead still cost her team 3 IMPs.


After five boards Lazer led by 5:3, and then came this:


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Braithwaite | De Falco | Robinson P.Cayne |  |
|  |  | $1 \Omega$ | Pass |
| 1ヵ | Pass | 1 NT | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

The Australians bid conservatively to 3NT and scored +690 after a diamond lead.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Friedlander | Gumby | Liran <br> Lazer |  |
| $2 \%$ |  | $1 \varnothing$ | Pass |
| $2 \%$ | Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass |
| $3 \uparrow$ | Pass | $4 \%$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $6 \%$ | All Pass |  |  |

Friedlander just showed his suit, and the crucial step towards slam was taken by Liran when he bid $4 \%$ rather than $3 N T$. East knew that J and $\& \mathrm{Q}$ were excellent working cards. Of course he would have liked to have at least one red ace, but you can't have a perfect hand for your bid every time.
$6 \%$ was duly bid. Looking only at the $\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{W}$ hands, one can see 11 top tricks with chances for the 12 th mainly in hearts, but also in case there is some luck in diamonds.
However, the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ was led!
Friedlander found it hard to believe that Pauline Gumby was making it so easy for him. A sensible line of play would have been to win in dummy with $\diamond \mathrm{K}$, draw trumps, try heart to the king, and when that didn't work - finesse diamonds against South. But the world champion took the view that North was tricking him with a lead from $\diamond$ QJ(+), perhaps even QJ doubleton. In almost no time he
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won the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$ and ducked a heart to South.
When Warren Lazer gave his partner a diamond ruff, the realization sank in that he has just gone down in a slam which most ordinary bridge players would have made easily.

As far as the remaining boards of this match are concerned, there was no recovery for PDC from this adverse 13 IMP swing (which could so easily have been 12 IMPs the other way). At least
they pulled back 7 IMPs in Board 10 due to same aggressive bidding by Robinson-Braithwaite.
The match was lost 12:19, and the momentum was lost as well for PDC. They continued to go down the rankings and at the end of the day they missed the knockouts by 3.53 VPs. Lazer, on the other hand, made it to the next stage. Despite some ups and downs in their remaining matches they finished the qualifier in a respectable ninth place.

## ANATOMY OF A DISASTER: A LATERAL THINKING PROBLEM by Barry Rigal

The bulletin team has often been compared unfavourably to the Hideous Hog. You may recall that the Greek commented bitterly of him that he laughed when he saw a portly old gentleman trip on a banana skin, not because it was intrinsically funny but because he hoped that he might have broken his leg.
We are occasionally inclined to laugh at other people's accidents - but today's is especially entertaining because it involves a lateral thinking problem. Consider the deal below - where the field performed admirably given the intrinsic challenges of the wild distribution of all of the hands...
N/S generally managed to go quietly plus defending 1NT - typically defeating 1NT by a trick on a spade lead, by more on a heart lead. Well done Fredrik Helness (son of Tor) and Svein Olsen who were able to double 1NT by West (10-1 -x-P-1NT-P-P-x-AP) and collect 800. But that wasn't the result that interested me. We won't give the names - yes, perhaps we are mellowing in our old age - but would anyone like to speculate on how E/W finished in the third most obvious contract (after 1 NT and $2 \diamond$ ) of $7 \diamond$ ?

Round 7. Board 4 Dealer West. Both Vul.


ANSWER: The auction started sensibly enough. West opened $1 \diamond$ (remarkably, showing diamonds and an opening bid). North overcalled $1 \uparrow$ (equally strangely, spades and overcalling values). The rot set in when East bid $2 \diamond-$ yes, this showed diamonds and a weak hand according to East. Alas, from West's perspective this systemically promised hearts and game-forcing values. From this point onwards the auction was more distinguished by its ardour than its accuracy. We shall draw a veil over proceedings, other than to say that in the other room N/S had conceded +90 on an unfortunate lead of $\triangle$ Q by South, and the unlucky pair said that given that their teammates had gone minus, their -1400 hardly mattered. And the team that lost 1400 did win the match comfortably...
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## THE STORY OF TEAM LEVY'S STERN AMAZING COMEBACK <br> by Ram Soffer

The all-Israeli Levy Stern team included former European Champions Israel and Doron Yadlin as well as Israeli under-20 international Lior Urman.
At the beginning of the event they had to face some great teams with well-known stars, and after four rounds out of 10 they were languishing in 94th place. Time to give up?!
Not necessarily. With a dose of healthy optimism the Israelis managed to reverse the trend and began their journey up the rankings.

Round 5. Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- K 532
© Q 94
$\diamond$ Q 7
\& K 872


| West | North <br> Stern | East | South <br> Urman |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $1 N T$ |
| Pass | $2 \propto$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

1NT was only 14-16, but after such a poor start to the event you have to go all out for anything resembling a vulnerable game.
As might be expected, West (perhaps not a student of Anthias/Bird?) led a mundane heart. Urman won with dummy's $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ and cleared the clubs in three rounds. The moment of truth arrived. East decided to persist in his partner's suit, allowing the contract to make. Levy Stern +600 .
This is a useful hand for partnerships seeking to improve their signalling methods. West should be able to show his preference for diamonds either by the order of his small clubs or by his discard on the $\%$ A.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| D. Yadlin |  | I. Yadlin |  |
| Pass | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | All Pass |

Israel Yadlin's natural weak-two bid at the third seat stole the pot. Levy Stern -50 and 11 IMPs on the way to a 50:0 victory and a clean sweep of all the available 20 VPs , which took them to 71st place at the end of day one.

Round 6. Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { A } & \text { J } 10 \\
\diamond & 9632 \\
\diamond & \text { Q J } 2 \\
\& & \text { A Q J } 10
\end{array}
$$

| ¢ 82 |  | A KQ97543 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ KQ 5 | $\mathrm{w}^{\text {N }}$ - $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ J 1087 |
| $\diamond 108$ | $W_{\text {S }}$ E $\diamond$ | $\diamond 6$ |
| \& K98432 |  | \& 6 |
| A | A 6 |  |
| $\checkmark$ | A 4 |  |
| $\diamond$ | AK 97543 |  |
| \& | 75 |  |

At most tables $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ missed a makeable slam when North passed as dealer and East preempted with 3 . Levy Stern, however, decided to upgrade North's hand due to his two ten spots and the concentration of strength in clubs.

| West | North <br> Stern | East | South <br> Urman |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $1 \uparrow$ | $3 \uparrow$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

Facing an opening, Urman wished to be in a grand slam, but his $5 \checkmark$ invitation was obviously declined.
North's concentrated club power was indeed instrumental in making $6 \diamond$. Essentially the slam depended only on the placement of the $\& \mathrm{~K}$ at the hand of the non-preemptor.
Lior won the spade lead, drew trumps in two rounds and finessed clubs successfully. The rest was an easy loser-on-loser play. A spade was discarded on the $\boldsymbol{d} \mathrm{J}$, taken by the $\% \mathrm{~K}$, and later a heart was dispatched on the $\% 10$.
In this match Team Levy Stern scored 18.44 VPs, going up to 49th place.
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Round 7. Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

- K Q 1094
$\bigcirc 875$
$\diamond$ AJ 3
\& 85



A 65
$\checkmark$ AQJ 9
$\diamond 75$
Q Q 7642

| West | North <br> Stern | East | South <br> Urman |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \uparrow$ | $1 N T$ | All Pass |

Urman led 6, and Stern's $\$$ held the trick. When he found the accurate heart switch, declarer was helpless. Urman won the $\bigcirc \mathrm{J}$ and continued spades, allowing Stern to clear the suit. He still possessed a side entry with the $\diamond$ A. Both major suits were now running, so the defence collected nine tricks. $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}+300$.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $D$. Yadlin |  | I. Yadlin |  |
| $1 \diamond$ | 2 | All Pass |  |

Oleg Rovyshyn (North) decided to overcall more aggressively at level two and bought the contract. He was not in danger of going down, but making his contract was worth only +110 . That was 5 more IMPs to Levy Stern. They won the match by $18: 5$, advancing to 31 st place. At this stage they were clearly in contention for the knockouts.

Round 8 produced another win by 18:10, and their Round 9 match finished 17:2. 11 of those IMPs were due to a good lead by Doron Yadlin.


Round 9. Board 30. Dealer East. None Vul.


- A95
$\diamond$ J 986
\& 1076


A K 3
$\checkmark$ KQ10 32
$\diamond$ AQ 732
\& 5

| West | North <br> Stern | East | South <br> Urman |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

East used a multi $2 \diamond$, which gave South a chance of showing both his suits at a cheap level. Nevertheless North (who was still looking for urgent IMPs trying to improve his team's standing) decided to up the stakes and bid a game.
The lie of the cards wasn't favourable, but the opening lead was. Simon Gillis (West) decided to lead his partner's suit, and South's \$K became his vital 10th trick.

| West | North | East <br> I. Yadlin | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| D. Yadlin |  | $2 \wedge$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| $3 ム$ | Pass | Pass | $4 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Doron Yadlin decided that his opponents were too high and doubled. Even more importantly, he realized that all side suits were under his control. His trump lead gave away nothing, and passive defence sufficed to beat the contract. As long as the defenders don't break spades for him, Declarer is destined to finish one trick short.

After nine out of ten rounds, the Israelis lay in 20th place, just four steps away from the next stage, which seemed to be so far away just 24 hours earlier.
Their last match was against team South Africa. Both teams needed a substantial win in order to advance, but neither got it. Levy Stern prevailed yet again by 20:16, but it was a bitter-sweet victory, as their final tally of 115.66 VPs didn't make the cut. Despite their great comeback team
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Levy Stern finished 1.4 VPs short and they will try their luck again in the BAM teams.
This was their best board from the final match:
Round 10. Board 8. Dealer West. Vul None.
At both tables the bidding started as follows:


$\sqrt{20}$

## CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

by Barry Rigal

Mark Horton published this deal yesterday, commenting on the fact that the play in slam offered declarer the chance to make his contract, based on a clue from the auction and the play. Of the 102 tables in play, most played slam, the vast majority tackling 64 from the West seat (10 tables played it from East).

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.


At many tables East received a top diamond lead after North had pre-empted in diamonds and

South had raised to game, after either a raise to 3 or $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ by East. As Mark commented, after winning the top diamond lead from North, declarer might conceivably risk a round of clubs before touching trumps? North might well have led a card other than $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ if looking for a club ruff.
And as Mark said, the player who jump raises the preempter is the one who is more likely to have some shortage. Imagine a South with Q Q74 and a relatively balanced hand - say a 3-2-5-3 pattern with not much in the way of high cards. Would YOU jump to $5 \diamond$ ? Of course not. It is far more likely that South has shortage somewhere - and the most likely place is in spades.

But the point of this article is not to recycle Mark's incisive comments. It is to congratulate one table that had produced an honourable push at +980 . Congratulations to the declarers in Penfold-de Michelis. Kalin Karaivanov and Luca de Michelis both reached slam after South had raised a pre-empt to the five level. Both declarers won the opening diamond lead and duly finessed North for the Q . Well done gentlemen!
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## Open Teams Round-of-16

Monaco faced a team containing Norwegian and Australian players (as will be immediately apparent from their team-name). They were unlucky on this board:

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- AKJ5 3
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond$ A Q 1074
\& 104


Open Room

| West <br> Sueindal | North Helness | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | RasmussenHelgemo |  |
|  |  |  | $1 \diamond$ |
| 4® | 4NT* | 5® | 6\% |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pas |  |

The diamond slam was proof against four trumps with West, since declarer can ruff one loser and ditch the other on the spades. All four trumps with East could not be overcome. A top heart was led and Helgemo went one down. What would happen at the other table?

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Multon | Dyke | Zimmer | Howard 18 |
| 10 | Dble * | Pass | 20 |
| 3\% | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | 5\% |
| Pass | 64 | All Pa |  |

North's double showed spades. The spade slam seems to have the same two losers but Multon led the $\checkmark 8$, hoping that his partner could win and deliver a diamond ruff. (He knew he would perform a starring role in the bulletin
for one reason or another.) Howard was soon writing +980 in his card and that was 14 IMPs to Noralia.

Board 6. Dealer East. E-W Vul.


Sveindal won the club lead with dummy's ace and there was discussion among the BBO commentators as to whether it was better to duck a round of trumps or to cash the ace and switch to spades. With spades 3-3, it does not matter what you do. Sveindal chose to lead a low trump from dummy to the 10 and jack. He then won the club return with the king. What next?
Declarer crossed to the $\checkmark A$, North showing out, and made the contract when spades were $3-3$. Suppose you switch the J and the $\diamond 2$, making the spades $4-2$. Ducking the first trump would then be necessary, but when you won the club return you would go down if you played the $V A$ next. You would have to play the three top spades instead, discarding the club loser. South would ruff and return the $৩ \mathrm{~K}$ to the $\odot$ A. After the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, a diamond ruff and a spade ruff (setting up a long spade), South would be powerless whether he overruffed with the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ or not.

Board 8. Dealer East. E-W Vul.


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Dyke | ZimmermannHoward |  |
| $1 \propto \boldsymbol{R}^{*}$ | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 1NT |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |

The bidding is puzzling to my eye - South's 1NT, in particular. Anyway, the trap snapped painfully on Dyke. Zimmermann led the $\bigcirc 10$, Multon overtaking with the $\bigcirc \mathrm{J}$ to return a trump to the king and ace. The $\triangle 9$ to the queen was ruffed by Dyke, who led the $\Phi \mathrm{Q}$ to West. Another trump went to the jack and queen. Zimmerman was then able to draw two further rounds of trumps. He played ace and another club to dummy's king and the contract was 1100 down.
If South had let 19 run to West, E-W might well have matched the 3NT made at the other table. (Helness kept his peace as North over West's 1 NT .) It was 12 IMPs away.



Board 9. Dealer North. E-W Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sueindal | Helness | RasmussenHelgemo |  |
|  | Pass | 2\% | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 20 | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 4 | All Pass |

North led the $\% 6$. What to do? Calling for dummy's $\& \mathrm{Q}$ would cost the contract after a diamond switch. Sveindal cleared the first hurdle, rising with the \&A. He continued with the $\uparrow A$ and this proved costly. After the $๑ A, \bigcirc K$ (diamond away) and a heart ruff, he returned to dummy with the $\mathbf{~} \mathrm{K}$. A diamond to the king lost to the ace and that was one down.

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Multon | Dyke | Zimme | Howard |
|  | Pass | 10 | Pass |
| 140 | Pass | 2\%* | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 4か | All Pass |

Multon also rose with the \&A but played three rounds of hearts immediately, the $\triangle \mathrm{Q}$ not appearing. He was able to cross to the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, ruff another heart, and return to dummy with the A . A second diamond was pitched on the thirteenth heart and the game was made for a swing of 12 IMPs.

| Go to page: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | BRACKETS |  |  |

Board 10. Dealer East. Both Vul.
A Q 10864
$\bigcirc 109$
$\diamond 7$
\& AKQ 73

|  | A J 5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\diamond$ | A Q 53 |
| $\diamond$ | Q J 6 |
| $\leftrightarrow$ | J 102 |



A K 32
$\checkmark 86$
$\diamond$ AK 10832
\& 65

Open Room

| West <br> Sueindal | North <br> Helness | East <br> RasmussenHelgemo |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  | Pass <br> Pasth |  |
| Dble | Rdble | $2 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ |
| $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

Helness surprised us by redoubling instead of bidding his spades. Rasmussen subsequently went 300 down, undoubled, when $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ was there on the lie of the cards. It may not be a particularly splendid spade game after West's take-out double, but it was bid and made at the other table for a gain of 8 IMPs.
Those of you with long memories will recall on unlucky slam swing lost by Monaco on Board 13.


They suffered more of the same medicine here:
Board 13. Dealer East. Neither Vul.

| \& | J 9 6 4 3 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\diamond$ | J |
| $\diamond$ | A 1053 |
| $\&$ | Q 84 |



Closed Room

| West | North | East | South <br> Multon |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dyke | ZimmermannHoward |  |  |

Zimmermann stretched to open a 15-17 1NT, Multon showing his hearts and then bidding a pick-a-slam 5NT. Howard made the commendably safe lead of the $\checkmark 9$ against the eventual 6NT.
Zimmerman won with the queen and led the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ to North $\diamond \mathrm{A}$. When a diamond was returned, declarer had no reason whatsoever to run this. He rose with the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ and played the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$, South showing out. Zimmermann continued with the ace and king of hearts, which would have squeezed North in three suits if he held $\& \mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{J}-\mathrm{x}$. As it was, he could afford to discard a club and the slam went one down.
At the other table, the bidding started $1 \diamond-1 \wedge$ 1NT (12-14). Sveindal used check-back and heard $3 \diamond$, implying that East had $2=3=5=2$ shape. It was unlikely that his partner held the necessary collection of honour cards for 6NT - particularly as he had not upgraded his hand, as Zimmermann did. Very reasonably, Sveindal shut up shop in 3NT and made 660 for a 13 IMP gain.
Largely as a result of the two slam swings, Noralia took the first half by 41 IMPs to 27 .

PLAYER 1
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
FILIPOWICZ Dominik
NAB Bart
WILLENKEN Chris
TOWNSEND Tom
NOKLEBY Jan Roger
FANTONI Fulvio
HOMONNAY Geza
SAYILKAN Tevfik
MCGARRY Dennis
GIERULSKI Boguslaw
MORATH Anders
OEVERLI Jan Arild
HARDING Marianne
KHANDELWAL Rajeev
BAREKET Ilan
BOLAND Rory
KING Philip (Phil)
BIGDELI Faramarz
SMIRNOV Alexander
NILSEN Jimmy
LINDQVIST Espen
EBER Neville
PADON Dror
MOLENAAR Danny
RITMEIJER Richard
QUANTIN J.Christophe
NANEV Ivan
STRAND Kay BRINK Sjoert MULLER Bauke HANTVEIT Trond MARSTRANDER Peter LANZAROTTI Massimo SHAH Shivam
STERN Levy
LARSEN Espen
COLDEA Ionut
HELNESS Tor
KRISTOFFERSEN C.
GAWRYS Piotr
BAUMANN Karl Christian
SEN Tezcan
KWIECIEN Michal
NYSTROM Fredrik
COPE Simon
GROSSACK Adam ISPORSKI Vladislav N. BRAITHWAITE A. AA Terje JANSONS Ugis SAETRE Jan Einar GOLD David
SVEINDAL Jon

PLAYER 2
NARKIEWICZ Grzegorz
DRIJVER Bob
BILDE Dennis
SANDQVIST Nicklas
KIZILOK Omer
LEVINE Mike

SKRZYPCZAK Jerzy
EFRAIMSSON Bengt-Erik
LARSEN Fred Endre
FUGLESTAD Ann Karin
KHANDELWAL Himani
LENGY Assaf
MORAN Mark
McINTOSH Andrew
POLET Guy

PIEKAREK Josef
JOHNSEN Jarno Mikael
BROGELAND Boye
BOSENBERG C. Henry
TARNOVSKI Bar
VERBEEK Tim
TICHA Magdalena
LORENZINI Cedric
GUNEV Rossen
HELMERSEN Kjell Ove
DRIJVER Bas

| DE WIJS Simon | 0,82 | 82 | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## HOYLAND Sam Inge

0,81

| 0,81 | 81 | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

MANNO Andrea

0,77

| 0,76 | 53 | 70 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

URMAN Lior SVENSTAD Stian
EVENSTAD Stian
ROTARU Iulian
HELGEMO Geir
SAUR Oyvind 0,6

| KLUKOWSKI Michal | 0,64 | 51 | 80 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| EILERAAS Simon | 0,63 | 44 | 70 |
| MUSAOGLU Adnan | 0,62 | 62 | 100 |
| PSZCZOLA Jacek | 0,61 | 43 | 70 |
| UPMARK Johan | 0,60 | 60 | 100 |
| BOWLEY Richard | 0,60 | 30 | 50 |
| GROSSACK Zachary | 0,58 | 58 | 100 |
| KOVACHEV Valentin | 0,58 | 58 | 100 |
| ROBINSON Ian | 0,58 | 58 | 100 |
| LIVGARD Allan | 0,57 | 40 | 70 |
| GERMANIS Aigars | 0,57 | 57 | 100 |
| OVESEN Steingrim | 0,53 | 37 | 70 |
| CASTNER Kevin | 0,51 | 41 | 80 |
| RASMUSSEN Arild | 0,49 | 49 | 100 |
|  |  |  |  |

7th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS


| 二a**v | 7th EUROPEAN OPEN | BRIDGE CHAMPIO |  | Tromsø, Norway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PLAYER 1 | PLAYER 2 | BUTLER | SUM IMP | BOARDS |
| 114 | SAELENSMINDE Erik | HAUGE Rune | 0,08 | 5 | 60 |
| 115 | BAREL Michael | ZACK Yaniv | 0,06 | 6 | 100 |
| 116 | LAKATOS Peter | DOMBI Gergely | 0,05 | 5 | 100 |
| 117 | HEGGE Kristoffer | ELLINGSEN Kristian | 0,05 | 5 | 100 |
| 118 | GOWER Craig | APTEKER Alon | 0,04 | 4 | 100 |
| 119 | HOFSETH Johnny | KRISTENSEN Anders | 0,03 | 2 | 60 |
| 120 | EIDE Mats | GUNDERSEN Anders | 0,03 | 3 | 100 |
| 121 | TATLICIOGLU Sinan | KAYTAZ Bulent | 0,03 | 3 | 100 |
| 122 | NARKIEWICZ Grzegorz | JASZCZAK Andrzej | 0,03 | 1 | 40 |
| 123 | HARR Gunnar | STOKKVIK Dag-Jorgen | 0,02 | 1 | 60 |
| 124 | KIRCHHOFF Liliane | SECHRIEST Stuart | 0,01 | 1 | 69 |
| 125 | BERTHEAU Peter | HALLBERG Gunnar | 0,01 | 1 | 70 |
| 126 | VENTIN CAMPRUBI J.C. | WRANG Frederic | 0,01 | 1 | 100 |
| 127 | ENGEBRETSEN Geir | LOEN Lars | 0,00 | 0 | 100 |
| 128 | YADLIN Doron | YADLIN Israel | -0,02 | -2 | 100 |
| 129 | JOHANSEN Jon Helge | JOHANSEN Arnfinn | -0,02 | -2 | 100 |
| 130 | GUMBY Pauline | LAZER Warren | -0,02 | -2 | 100 |
| 131 | HELNESS Fredrik | OLSEN Svein Arild Naas | -0,03 | -3 | 90 |
| 132 | VERHEES Jr Louk | VAN PROOIJEN Ricco | -0,04 | -3 | 80 |
| 133 | KARAIVANOV Kalin | TRENDAFILOV Roumen | -0,07 | -6 | 90 |
| 134 | HAETTA Lemet Ivar | KOFOED HANSEN Ingar | -0,07 | -5 | 70 |
| 135 | HELGESEN Lars | GJOES Tom | -0,08 | -8 | 100 |
| 136 | GILL Peter | DAWSON Jane | -0,10 | -10 | 100 |
| 137 | SMILGAJS Andris | BENDIKS Janis | -0,10 | -10 | 100 |
| 138 | THOMASSEN Paul | ANDERSEN Svein | -0,11 | -11 | 100 |
| 139 | FAILLA Giuseppe | DE MICHELIS Luca | -0,11 | -11 | 100 |
| 140 | HOFF Geir | HJELMELAND Geir | -0,12 | -12 | 100 |
| 141 | ERBIL Erdinc | ZOBU Ahu | -0,13 | -10 | 80 |
| 142 | HUANG Yan | LU Dong | -0,13 | -9 | 70 |
| 143 | BESSIS Thomas | VOLCKER Frederic | -0,13 | -13 | 100 |
| 144 | WINKEL Marcel | VAN HOOIJDONK Marcel | -0,14 | -14 | 100 |
| 145 | PELLE Inez | HAVERKATE Jan | -0,14 | -14 | 100 |
| 146 | FENESS Jorunn | KOPSTAD Kjell Otto | -0,16 | -16 | 100 |
| 147 | MALINOWSKI Artur | DE BOTTON Janet | -0,16 | -8 | 50 |
| 148 | LEVIN Robert (Bobby) | WEINSTEIN Steve | -0,17 | -17 | 100 |
| 149 | REINHOLDTSEN Jonny | ELLINGSEN Olav | -0,17 | -17 | 100 |
| 150 | HELMICH Aarnout | HOP Gerbrand | -0,17 | -17 | 100 |
| 151 | BAKKE Sigmund Ivar | RIISNAES Svein Harald | -0,18 | -18 | 100 |
| 152 | RAJADHYAKSHA Pratap | GORDON Mark | -0,18 | -9 | 50 |
| 153 | LINDE Julius | SCHWERDT Christian | -0,18 | -11 | 60 |
| 154 | HOILAND Tom | OVESEN Jo-Arne | -0,20 | -20 | 100 |
| 155 | MULTON Franck | ZIMMERMANN Pierre | -0,20 | -8 | 40 |
| 156 | VAN LANKVELD Joris | VAN DEN BOS Berend | -0,21 | -21 | 100 |
| 157 | RYDLAND Bjorn Erik | BOGEN Jarle | -0,23 | -16 | 70 |
| 158 | KOPSTAD Ole K. | GRUDE Tor Eivind | -0,23 | -22 | 95 |
| 159 | BIRKELUND Norman | JENSEN Raymond | -0,24 | -24 | 100 |
| 160 | AUKEN Sabine | WELLAND Roy | -0,26 | -18 | 70 |
| 161 | CHARLSEN Thomas | HOFTANISKA Thor Erik | -0,26 | -18 | 70 |
| 162 | VOLL Roar | KINDSBEKKEN Asbjorn | -0,28 | -17 | 60 |
| 163 | NYMOEN Arnstein | DALING Tormod | -0,29 | -29 | 100 |
| 164 | BANASZKIEWICZ Ewa | BREDE Lukasz | -0,32 | -19 | 60 |
| 165 | FRANCHI Arrigo | ZALESKI Romain | -0,32 | -32 | 100 |
| 166 | MALUISH A.E. | MILL Andrew John | -0,34 | -34 | 100 |
| 167 | HANLON Tom | McGANN Hugh | -0,35 | -28 | 80 |
| 168 | DE FALCO Dano | CAYNE Patricia | -0,35 | -14 | 40 |
| 169 | SVENDSEN Odin | GILLIS Simon | -0,36 | -36 | 100 |
| 170 | BRIGHTLING Richard J | QUAIL Christopher | -0,36 | -36 | 100 |
| 171 | ARONOV Victor | DAMIANOVA Diana | -0,37 | -37 | 100 |
| 172 | STEPHENS Robert | ROSSLEE Diana | -0,40 | -40 | 100 |
| 173 | PENFOLD Sandra | SENIOR Nevena | -0,40 | -20 | 50 |


| Gо то PAGE: | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 25 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | PLAYER 1 | PLAYER 2 | BUTLER | SUM IMP | BOARDS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 174 | SARGENT Diccen | AARS Jon | -0,42 | -42 | 100 |
| 175 | HARRIS Jonathan | ROOT STEVEN | -0,42 | -42 | 100 |
| 176 | AAL Sverre Johan | FORFOT Aasmund | -0,42 | -42 | 100 |
| 177 | PICUS Sue | HOFFMAN David | -0,42 | -42 | 100 |
| 178 | KARLSEN Leif | JAKOBSEN Goran | -0,43 | -43 | 100 |
| 179 | HAY James | PHILIP Andrew | -0,44 | -44 | 100 |
| 180 | JOHNSEN Sverre | STOKKELAND Lsmund | -0,44 | -44 | 100 |
| 181 | EIDE Lars | LOMSDALEN Olav | -0,44 | -44 | 100 |
| 182 | PETTERSEN Gunnar | FJAESTAD Joern | -0,45 | -45 | 100 |
| 183 | GROETHEIM Glenn | TUNDAL Ulf Haakon | -0,45 | -27 | 60 |
| 184 | AASELID Joern | ECK HANSEN Tarjei | -0,46 | -46 | 100 |
| 185 | HAGA Oyvind | BAARDSEN Tore | -0,46 | -46 | 100 |
| 186 | OHREN Jan Guldbrand | BRENTEBRAATEN Finn | -0,47 | -47 | 100 |
| 187 | ARNTSEN Raymond | SOTTAR Ronny | -0,49 | -49 | 100 |
| 188 | GINOSSAR Eldad | RESHEF Ophir | -0,50 | -30 | 60 |
| 189 | FURUNES Jon-Egil | STORNES Helge | -0,50 | -20 | 40 |
| 190 | CHUMAK Yuliy | PORKHUN Volodymyr | -0,52 | -51 | 99 |
| 191 | SONTAG Alan | BERKOWITZ David | -0,53 | -42 | 80 |
| 192 | LYNGEN Idar | LARSEN Haavard | -0,54 | -54 | 100 |
| 193 | SEAMON Michael | CAYNE Jimmy | -0,55 | -22 | 40 |
| 194 | STABELL Leif-Erik | STABELL Tolle | -0,56 | -56 | 100 |
| 195 | DAHL Verina | BECKSTROM Eva | -0,60 | -60 | 100 |
| 196 | DYBDAHL Stig | UELAND David | -0,60 | -24 | 40 |
| 197 | SILVERSTEIN Aaron | ROSENTHAL Andrew | -0,64 | -32 | 50 |
| 198 | CAPAL Steve | SOBELL Andrew | -0,65 | -65 | 100 |
| 199 | EIDE Lisbeth Aulid | ANDREASEN Arne | -0,66 | -66 | 100 |
| 200 | OEVERVATN A.H. | OEVERVATN Jostein | -0,68 | -68 | 100 |
| 201 | VAN DER GAAST Niels | WESSELING Agnes | -0,69 | -69 | 100 |
| 202 | SAETHER Joakim | SCHEIE Marcus | -0,70 | -70 | 100 |
| 203 | KRISTIANSEN Tommy | FAGERDAL Roger | -0,71 | -57 | 80 |
| 204 | VAINIKONIS Vytautas | OLANSKI Wojtek | -0,72 | -36 | 50 |
| 205 | WEINBERGER Simon | ELIASSEN Nils-Otto | -0,73 | -73 | 100 |
| 206 | CARROLL John | GARVEY Tommy | -0,73 | -44 | 60 |
| 207 | VESTERLUND Andreas | BRAENDVANG Morten | -0,82 | -82 | 100 |
| 208 | WANG Yanhong | LI Xiaoyi | -0,83 | -33 | 40 |
| 209 | DINKIN Sam | TUNCOK Cenk | -0,89 | -89 | 100 |
| 210 | CHMURSKI Bartosz | CHALUPEC Igor | -0,92 | -92 | 100 |
| 211 | SUNDELL Bo | ALMLI Svein Erik | -0,92 | -46 | 50 |
| 212 | PONOMAREVA Tatiana | ROVYSHYN Oleg | -0,93 | -92 | 99 |
| 213 | SIVERTSEN Svenn Hugo | JOHANSEN Johnny | -0,93 | -93 | 100 |
| 214 | NORDVIK Viggo | IVERSEN Tor Inge | -0,94 | -94 | 100 |
| 215 | TER LAARE Marco | MOLLE Linda | -0,94 | -47 | 50 |
| 216 | SERPOI Gheorghe | TEODORESCU Cornel | -0,96 | -96 | 100 |
| 217 | JENSAAS Jon Are | INGEBRIGTSEN Truls | -0,96 | -96 | 100 |
| 218 | KREUNING Hans | OUDA Sahar | -1,04 | -104 | 100 |
| 219 | LEV Sam | MAHAFFEY Jim | -1,13 | -45 | 40 |
| 220 | SHAMI Anisia | CAMP Owen | -1,13 | -113 | 100 |
| 221 | HOEL STABELL Leif-Erik | HAMAR Robert Bauck | -1,15 | -115 | 100 |
| 222 | TISLEVOLL Geir-Olav | BREKKE Vegard | -1,17 | -117 | 100 |
| 223 | KJONSVIK Odd | ABEL ARNTZEN Christoffer | -1,19 | -83 | 70 |
| 224 | BYLUND Dan | STROMBERG Helena | -1,19 | -119 | 100 |
| 225 | ELIASSEN Erik | SOOILAND Tommy | -1,20 | -84 | 70 |
| 226 | UZUM Dogan | KIZILOK Omer | -1,24 | -62 | 50 |
| 227 | BILDE Morten | FARHOLT STIG | -1,28 | -77 | 60 |
| 228 | MIDJO Ragnar | UKKELBERG Olav | -1,29 | -129 | 100 |
| 229 | BUIJS Pieter | DE HULLU Henk | -1,31 | -131 | 100 |
| 230 | BARDSEN Trond | SIVERTSEN Are | -1,34 | -67 | 50 |
| 231 | FILIPOWICZ Dominik | JANISZEWSKI Przemyslaw | -1,38 | -55 | 40 |
| 232 | PETTERSEN Ann Marie | PETTERSEN Knut | -1,60 | -160 | 100 |
| 233 | RYNNING Erik | BREKKA Geir | -2,12 | -127 | 60 |

PLAYER 1
BREWIAK Grazyna
WORTEL Meike ARNOLDS Carla ZMUDA Justyna CAMERON Gail SARNIAK Anna LARSSON Jessica LESLIE Paula ANJER Maja Rom BLAAGESTAD Lise GRUDE Liv Marit MIRKOVIC Ann-Mari SHAN Xingxing WANG Wei WENNEVOLD Ida GODFREY Lizzie BROCK Sally YAN Ru PASMAN Jet THORESEN Siv GLADIATOR Anne JOYCE Emer KHONICHEVA Elena HOLMOY Stine SEALE Catherine STOEN Tove WANG Hongli
ROMANOVSKA Maija CHEN Yiyi
CHEDIAK Virginia EGGELING Marie BROGELAND Tonje A. REMEN Solvi GRUDE Marian
BAKER Lynn
NILSEN Louise
LU Yan
PHELAN Lucy JOHANSEN Helen
NILSEN Katja SANDNES Siri ELSTAD Stine FOSSUM Ann Birgitte

PLAYER 2

| KAZMUCHA Danuta | 1,16 | 70 | 60 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MICHIELSEN Marion | 0,95 | 95 | 100 |
| VAN ZWOL Wietske | 0,71 | 71 | 100 |
| DUFRAT Katarzyna | 0,7 | 42 | 60 |
| VOS Vanessa | 0,67 | 67 | 100 |
| BALDYSZ Cathy | 0,575 | 46 | 80 |
| BERTHEAU Kathrine | 0,56 | 56 | 100 |
| PUNCH Sam | 0,54 | 54 | 100 |
| LINDAAS Pernille | 0,54 | 54 | 100 |
| SIVERTSVIK Ranja | 0,54 | 54 | 100 |
| OIGARDEN Bodil Nyheim | 0,52 | 52 | 100 |
| GLAERUM Lisbeth | 0,49 | 49 | 100 |
| WANG Nan | 0,44 | 31 | 70 |
| LIU Jing | 0,35 | 28 | 80 |
| HELNESS Gunn | 0,34 | 31 | 90 |
| COHEN Pauline | 0,31 | 31 | 100 |
| SANDFORD Debbie | 0,3 | 30 | 100 |
| LI Yiting | 0,28 | 23 | 80 |
| SIMONS Anneke | 0,24 | 24 | 100 |
| HESKJE Torild | 0,23 | 23 | 100 |
| WEBER Elke | 0,17 | 17 | 100 |
| FITZGERALD Jeannie | 0,15 | 15 | 100 |
| GULEVICH Anna | 0,11 | 11 | 100 |
| VIST Gunn Tove | 0,05 | 5 | 100 |
| BASA Marusa | 0,03 | 3 | 100 |
| BJOERKAN Hilde | $-0,03$ | -3 | 100 |
| ZHANG Yu | $-0,05$ | -3 | 60 |
| GOLDBERG Connie | $-0,07$ | -7 | 100 |
| ZHAO Bing | $-0,14$ | -7 | 50 |
| MORTENSEN Maria Dam | $-0,23$ | -23 | 100 |
| BRINCK Katharina | $-0,23$ | -23 | 100 |
| SVENDSEN Tone Torkelsen | $-0,26$ | -26 | 100 |
| BREIVIK Kristine | $-0,27$ | -27 | 100 |
| FLAATT Eva | $-0,29$ | -29 | 100 |
| McCALLUM Karen | $-0,49$ | -49 | 100 |
| RASMUSSEN Silje Helen | $-0,57$ | -57 | 100 |
| LIU Yan | $-0,7$ | -42 | 60 |
| MITCHELL Louise | $-0,74$ | -74 | 100 |
| ERIKSEN Marianne | $-0,96$ | -96 | 100 |
| INGEBRIGSTEN Maria Ursin | $-1,1$ | -88 | 80 |
| LINDAHL Solbritt | -116 | -116 | 100 |
| ANDERSEN Wibeke | $-1,24$ | -124 | 100 |
| VOLL Charlotte | $-1,51$ | -121 | 80 |
|  |  |  |  |

THE NEW APP ON BIDDING

FOR TABLETS AND SMARTPHONES

MORE INFO:
jvcleeff@xs4all.nl

## AVAILABLE IN THE APP STORE AND GOOGLE PLAY
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PLAYER 1


PLAYER 2

| TRAPP Leif | 1,02 | 106 | 104 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ALDEBORG Kalle | 1,01 | 105 | 104 |
| TORNBERG SIMONSEN B. | 0,89 | 93 | 104 |
| SUNDSETH Per Bryde | 0,81 | 58 | 72 |
| LINDQVIST Petter H. | 0,55 | 57 | 104 |
| KLUMPP Herbert | 0,50 | 36 | 72 |
| CLEMETSEN Tormod | 0,28 | 29 | 104 |
| WALLE Tor | 0,28 | 22 | 80 |
| HARSANYI Josef | 0,21 | 15 | 72 |
| FRERICHS Hans | 0,20 | 11 | 56 |
| WALTER Stanley | 0,15 | 16 | 104 |
| GOLDENHEIM Petter | 0,10 | 10 | 104 |
| CABAJ Stephan | 0,09 | 9 | 104 |
| FARSTAD Arve | 0,02 | 2 | 104 |
| KOCH Sverre | $-0,02$ | -2 | 104 |
| MAELEN Per | $-0,11$ | -11 | 104 |
| EGGAN Torstein | $-0,12$ | -12 | 104 |
| SMITH Harry | $-0,13$ | -13 | 104 |
| KENDRICK David | $-0,15$ | -12 | 80 |
| MAESEL Roald | $-0,18$ | -19 | 104 |
| KRATZ Ulrich | $-0,21$ | -15 | 72 |
| MONRAD Johan Fredrik | $-0,28$ | -29 | 104 |
| JUURI-OJA Pirjo | $-0,30$ | -31 | 104 |
| LIGGAT David | $-0,33$ | -34 | 104 |
| PEDERSEN Birger | $-0,38$ | -39 | 104 |
| HEGRAND - | $-0,51$ | -53 | 104 |
| GOUVERITH Marie-Claude | $-0,52$ | -29 | 56 |
| AARDAL Jorund | $-0,72$ | -75 | 104 |
| HONKAVUORI Tuula | $-0,83$ | -86 | 104 |
| SLETNER Roar B. | $-1,22$ | -127 | 104 |

## EUSA University Bridge Championships in Poland October 2015

The 3rd EUSA (European University Sports Association, www.eusa.eu) University Bridge Championships will take place in Poland, Warsaw. This is a competition between universities in which at least 2 students must be from the university they represent. The entry must be made by their National University Sports Federations.
Entries can still be made but should be done quickly.
All information on this event can be found at www.unibridge.eu or facebook "Uni bridge". In case of any question, please contact geert.magerman@telenet.be
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7th EUROPEAN OPEN BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS
Tromsø, Norway

## OPEN BAM TEAMS

FINAL RESULTS

"Qualifications Time"
"Migry's Solution"

## OPEN TEAMS KNOCKOUT



## WOMEN TEAMS KNOCKOUT

| POLAND | 47 |
| :--- | :--- |
| CAMERON | 91 |


| CAMERON |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| BAKER | 14 |

## SENIOR TEAMS KNOCKOUT

TAKE: L. Trapp, K. Aldeborg, K. Karlsson, G. Elmroth SORVOLL: J. Sorvoll, E. Bolviken, S. Koch, T. Clemetsen NOTEROY: K. Bertheau, T. Heskje, S. Thoresen, J. Larsson SAGG: P. B. Sundseth, A. Lorentzen, K. Kjernsrod, T. Walle, S. Bjertnes


