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The European Championships is running already in full force, all 187 pairs are present and are showing great enthusiasm, trying to win titles, medals in their respective age groups, or are simply having fun!
The current leaders in the U26 are Kohutova-Klems. They are representing the Czech Republic and already won silver in the Mixed Pairs on Thursday.They are ahead of Marcinowski-Sobczak from Poland and Ezion-Yekuteli of Israel.

The U26 Women are led by the Dalpozzo sisters from Italy, close behind Gahan-Wiseman from England, and a gold medalist from the Mixed is currently in third: Sjodal playing with Kjensli now.

The U2I age group is led by Goor-Goor of the Netherlands, followed by Bulgarians Yaninski-Kostova and yet another Israeli pair, MatatyahouSliwowitz round out the current podium positions.

The UI6/UI3 combined section is led by the French pair Rombaut-Gallard, with the Tylvad brothers from Denmark in second. Bloch and Zobel, also from France, are currently third.

The Qualifiers continue today with 3 more sessions starting at the same time as yesterday.

## FORMAT, QUALIFICATION AND CARRYOVER CONDITIONS

Published in accordance with Section I.2.2 and I.2.4 of the Supplemental Conditions of Contest

|  | Pairs in Qualifier | Movement in qualifier | Pairs in <br> Final | Carryover |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under 26 | 61 | Truncated Howell | 26 | 2 tops (48 MP) ${ }^{\text {' }}$ |
| Under 26 Women | 32 | Round Robin | 14 | 2 tops (24 MP) ${ }^{\text {l }}$ |
| Under 21 | 49 | Round Robin | 18 | 2 tops (32 MP) ${ }^{\prime}$ |
| Under 16 | $34{ }^{2}$ | Round Robin | 14 | 2 tops (24 MP) ${ }^{\text {' }}$ |
| Under 13 | $11^{2}$ |  | 11 | See note 3 |
| President's Cup | - | - | About 104 | none |

All finals will be Round Robin movements
Note I:The carryover is equivalent to 2 tops (in the final) for the first classified pair, down to zero linearly for the last.

Note 2: In the qualification stage the UI6 and UI3 Series will be amalgamated into one section of 45 pairs.
Note 3:The number of tops in the Final is equal to the percentage score in the qualifying $X$ number of boards in the qualifying (88) $X$ coefficient (0.2)


## CRIME STORY <br> Jean Paul Meyer

One of the legendary figures of French Bridge, JeanPaul Meyer, died peacefully at his home in France on 9 July. The introduction to this story in the February 1964 edition of Bridge Magazine described him as 'the brilliant young French player and writer'.

As you may have noticed the French team in the last European Championship in Baden was much stronger than the previous ones. Our achievement was far from being great but we could have done much better (as far as the age was concerned) if we had let my nephew, Rodolph, come in.

The Chief Inspector of the Police Judicature was quite upset. He had to investigate the most unusual case of his career, and he was getting nowhere.

## Murder in the Fishbowl

It was the rubber Bridge match of the century and the four greatest players ever known were the actors in the drama.
The Inspector had no difficulty in establishing that Alexandre had been poisoned. Nobody except the other players, Cesar, Charles or David had the opportunity to pour the fatal mixture in Alexandre's whisky.
Anyone who has dealt with top class bridge players knows how easy it is to find a motive for this crime and Alexandre's death was witnessed by thousands of Kibitzers for the match was played on TV.
Nevertheless the Inspector could not discover the assassin.
Someone suggested calling in Rodolph. I know Rodolph quite well. He is my nephew and though he is only seven, he considers himself as quite an expert in bridge.
And in fact he certainly knows more bridge than Latin.
After some discussion, it was decided to call for Rodolph.He took a little notebook out of his pocket and said:'I have noted a few hands I played recently with some success and no doubt all of you are able to play just as I did provided you are in possession of all your faculties.
You are playing rubber bridge and all I ask is that you take the best chance to ensure bringing home your contract.

You are playing South and you merely have to decide which is your next move.'
Charles was the first to be in the limelight.
Rodolph said: 'West leads the three of spades, East playing the jack. Your contract is $6 \diamond$, how do you play?'

| 1 | 87 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ | K 876 |
| $\diamond$ | 103 |
| \% | K 8765 |
| 1 | A Q 62 |
| $\bigcirc$ | AJ 3 |
|  | AKQJ 6 |
| 9 | A |

Charles examined the hands for only a few seconds and then said:'I play the queen of spades and lead the 2 .'
Rodolph nodded but did not say a word. Turning to Cesar he asked 'How do you play the next hand in 4@. West leading ace, king and queen of clubs?'


Cesar grumbled, shook his head and said, 'Elementary, my dear Rodolph, I ruff and play the queen of spades.'
David was then invited to play 3NT on the lead of the K K by West.

What a nuisance to have to answer such an easy problem; I play a Bath coup, the three of spades.' Rodolph was now the centre of attraction. Would he solve the mystery?
'All three of you are good players, but one of you made a mistake. Charles, you were quite right; the danger in the hand is that West might have a singleton spades and if if you draw the ace of spades before ruffing West could ruff the ace and play back a trump and now you might lose the spade ruff and another trick.
Well done, too, Cesar; the king of trumps might be guarded with three small ones, so if you cross to dummy with a diamond you are in danger of losing a diamond ruff. To play ace and then queen of spades could be equally fatal; your opponent holds off until the third spade and plays back a club taking your last trump. Playing the queen of spades and then the jack leaves you with the nine of spades in dummy as protection against another club ruff.

Really, David, do you think that your opponent will fall into the trap of a simple Bath coup? Unless he is a palooka, the player in the West position will switch to a heart, and if the king of diamonds is on the wrong side, down you go. If you had been in good form, David, you would certainly have played the jack of spades under the king at the first trick. You can congratulate your opponent if he still finds the heart switch but you must admit that it is not easy. He will almost certainly lead a second spade when the jack falls and then you can win and finesse the diamonds with equanimity. If East has a third spade, the suit will be divided four-three.'
David duly confessed to the crime.
You know bridge players prefer to plead guilty to a crime than admit they have made a mistake!

Jean Paul Meyer



## BITS AND PIECES

Branko Špilijak

Today I decided to go watch ladies qualifying round. I was rewarded with thrilling hands.

## Unlucky?

Board I immediately brought excitement
Dealer North None Vul

© AK 74
○K 53
$\diamond K J 7$
\& A 76


- 3
- Q 87
$\diamond 109864$
\& 842

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 20 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 4NT | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| 6 | All Pass |  |  |

West managed to avoid finding spade fit by selecting artificial forcing. That is great in theory because there are only 12 tricks in spades while both hearts and notrumps make all I3. Poor North is triple squeezed if declarer guesses hearts. Furthermore, spades is only small slam where you absolutely need to find queen of hearts. On the other hand, that's probably easy - you finesse a girl having (considerably) less spades. A kind of percentage play.
As it was, more "direct" route was taken. In my opinion after RKCB revealed absence of trump queen 6NT is much better bid. It scores more if nothing else.
Play was probably frustrating for declarer (indeed it was, they never recovered from that shock). Lead was spade
3. Declarer took it in hand, crossed to dummy with king of trumps and finessed on a way back. Spade lead looked like possible singleton so finessing other way is too dangerous.
South took her trump queen and exited with heart (excellent play not giving anything away). Declarer played spade and received another bad news. She now had only 10 tricks and had to rely on both finesses to work.

They didn't. She went down two.
Note how taking first spade in hand is wrong play. It killed possibility of triple squeeze. Without this crucial entry dummy is squeezed in front of North. If declarer decided to take a lead in dummy and continue with heart king and finesse then position when south exists with last heart is:

$\wedge K 74$
$\diamond-$
$\diamond K J 7$
\& A 76


Cashing two last trumps now and discarding spade and club from dummy could not hurt. North can part with one club but she needs all other cards. If she discards spade then declarer simply cashes spades (discarding a club from dummy). Last spade puts North in jaws of crisscross squeeze in minors. If she discards club then declarer plays club to the ace and North is squeezed in spades and diamonds on second club. If she discards diamond, declarer reels off diamonds and North must abandon either spades or bare her king of clubs.
I'm not saying that this is better chance. In fact it's 50-50 compared with "bot finesses right" play. I would always choose "tripe squeeze" line because it's so much sexier (and a hell of a story to tell afterwards).


Matchpoints
Board 5 brought typical matchpoints decision.
Dealer North NS Vul


Vulnerable against not you hold $\$ 8632 \bigcirc$ K532 $\diamond$ J865
\&A. Partner opens $1 \%$ and RHO jumps to $4 \checkmark$. You pass and partner reopens with a double. What now?

It was passed at the table for down three and 500 while there were easy eleven tricks in spade game. 500 was in fact worth $50 \%$ but it is nevertheless very bad decision. In IMP scoring it is clear pass but chances of spade game making are simply too high in matchpoints.

Board 6 was another "what do you bid" problem.
Dealer East EWVul

- A
© K 3
$\diamond$ QJ9 852
\& A 765
- 108753
$\bigcirc 1098$
$\diamond 763$
$\because 2$

- KQ 642

คAJ764
$\diamond 4$
\& Q 4
LHO opens INT, partner overcalls with 20 (Landy, showing both majors) and you hold $\$ \mathrm{~A} \cap \mathrm{~K} 3 \diamond \mathrm{Q} 9852$ 9A765.

Our hero selected $2 \checkmark$ hasn't declared all too well and made 9 tricks. I40 was I0\%. Reasonable because 10 tricks are there for taking in notrump and heart contract (even in spades).

Unless they bid Landy with random hands there is only one choice here - straight leap to 3NT. Even if you have second thoughts about your partner strength 2NT should be much better then sign off in hearts.

Festival of errors
Board 8 brought amazing number of misplays.
Dealer North NSVul

- 87
-A654
$\diamond 54$
\& K Q 987


## 4AKQ93 <br> คKQ 98 <br> $\diamond$ A Q <br> \& 52



West decided to open 2NT and quickly found herself declaring notrump game after partner's raise.
2NT opening bid is dubious at best with that hand. Point count is right but everything else is wrong. Hands like that should at least try major suit game first.

Lead was really nice - North produced 8 of spades, South covered with 10 and declarer took with an ace. Prospects are not too bright. Even though you can bring spades in with second round finesse you still lack tricks. Unless some opponent has J9 doubleton in diamonds you need a bit of deception.
Hoping for lucky diamond break on top of lucky lead is a bit too much. Opponents obviously have at least 4 clubs plus hearts ace for taking. You have to find a way to steal a couple of tricks before they get accurate picture of a hand.

In my opinion best bet is to play queen of hearts from hand. It will most likely hold a trick and now you continue with low heart. The idea is to find North with heart ace and have her duck twice. If that happens then you simply make spade finesse and cash at least 9 tricks. At the table it was so much different! Declarer first cashed ace and queen of diamonds and then played low heart to dummy.

Dunno what was North thinking about but she DUCKED! It was really obvious that their only hope was in clubs but...
Reaching dummy to be able to cash third diamond was a gift from heavens but declarer hasn't finessed in spades. She played instead a spade to king and went two down (NS woke up after all and cashed their club tricks).

Pessimist

Board I2 was a test of courage (and common sense).
Dealer West NSVul
4 K 109842

- AJ5
$\diamond$ A 10
- 18


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | 1. | $3>$ | $?$ |

Vulnerable against not you hold $\uparrow \mathrm{AQ} 75$ \$9 $\vee$ KQ95 \&AI074, what do you do?
The choice is simple here - you simply must show slam interest. $4 \curlyvee$ bid stands out as a best choice by far.
At a table South was content with a game so she simply bid 44. She then quietly watched partner take all I3 tricks quickly!
It's amazing that on this hand only 3 pairs (out of 16 ) found slam. They probably didn't have such helpful opponents. Heart opener and preemptive jump raise created perfect situation for slam investigation.


## MIXED PAIRS FOREVER

Lucie Kohutova and Erik Klems of the Czech Republic were one of the big surprises of the mixed event, climbing from $17^{\text {th }}$ place they qualified at to fourth, third, then all the way to second following the final sessions, and who knows, they might have won the whole thing if there was another round. They averaged above 60\%, which is always a great achievement in such long events. So some may think 'oh, just another mixed pair', but when I checked the standings at the end of the U26 qualifying, they were second again, with an almost $65 \%$ score! So I thought it is time to check out the Chech wonder pair in action. As I found out, they are not even a regular partnership, just happened to be without their regular partners for this long weekend, so decided to attend both events together. It looks like it was a very good idea!

Dealer North None Vul
, K 84
ค1062
$\diamond$ K Q 96
\& A 8
4. 10962
$\bigcirc$ K Q 9
$\diamond$ AJ 103

- Q 4

| N | Q Q J 3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | ¢AJ 3 |
| S | $\diamond 85$ |

- A 75

ค8754
$\diamond 742$

- J 52

They do not like to play right after lunch (who does?), so there was a slight slip in defense that was costly on the very first board.

| West | North | East |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Klems | Weiss | Kohutova |
| - | INT | All Pass |

Lucie led the 9 , which showed the 10 and a higher card, so Erik did well to duck the first trick. Declarer tried not to give away anything, and played the spade 9 to the jack and ace, and another to the 10 and queen. Since Erik showed interest in clubs via the Smith echo, Lucie could continue clubs, but which one? Had she played the ten, her partner could have switched to hearts, and they could have gotten 8 tricks. The 97 was far from clear: if it is her lowest, it is asking for diamonds, so Klems played the king of that suit, and it allowed declarer to build an extra diamond trick, for down 2, and that gave only 19 points out of the possible 58 , for a $33 \%$ score for the Czechs.

Dealer East NSVul

- AJ9 4
$\bigcirc 102$
$\diamond 107$
- AKQ 72

Q Q 103
$\triangle$ A9863
$\diamond 6$

- 」965
$W_{S}^{N} E$
- K 52

QQ 75
$\diamond$ K Q J 4
\& 1083

- 876
©KJ 4
$\diamond$ A 98532
- 4

West

Klems

## North <br> Weiss

—

East
Kohutova

Pass

## South

 Scheberan$2 \diamond$

All Pass
This bidding did not last long this time, either. Scheberan's weak 2 shut out everyone, and that was good news to our heroes, who could have tried (like many other pairs) some number of hearts, which were not making at all, 2-3, or even 4 down on different levels was the norm.

Declarer did not play the hand optimally, either, and ended up with only 8 tricks, which is only 90 , just below the popular score in this hand, 100 for down 2 . This gave 96\% to K\&K.

Their next opponents were Thuillez-Combescure, a French ladies pair. At the table I wondered why they are not playing in the Women's U26, but this lasted only until I saw their score - after the second session, they were leading the U26 open!

Other pairs probably entered the bidding, as I could see several 170s and 500s (in the good club save) on board I9, but here it went $1 \vee-2 \vee-4 \checkmark$, which rolled home easily, for a near top to the French girls (85\%). Raising to 2 with a 3-count, and 4 trumps is not everyone's cup of tea, but it worked for them. featured players.

Dealer West All Vul
4 875

- K 4
$\diamond$ Q 87532
\& 10

| \$10642 | N | ¢ AKJ 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ A 87 | W E | $\bigcirc$ Q 1062 |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 9 | S | $\checkmark$ K 6 |  |
| 29743 | S | \% Q J 2 |  |
|  | ¢ Q 9 |  |  |
|  | ¢J 953 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 104 |  |  |
|  | \%K 865 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Thuillez | Klems | Combescure | Kohutova |
| Pass | Pass | INT | Pass |
| 2\% | Pass | 2NT* | Pass |
| 3 *** | Pass | 49 | All Pass |

*4-4 in the majors
**invitational with 4 spades
Combescure tried to hide her values, and on the diamond lead, she simply cashed both winners in the suit, and finessed trumps, losing to the queen. This created an illusion to both players that partner has a spade honor, and neither played clubs, fearing to give away something, and the club ruff got away. Still, the contract was down, which meant 37 points ( 200 would have been 51 ). Still, $64 \%$ is not a bad score at all - six declarers somehow got home in the same contract, surprisingly.

Against a Belgian pair, the part-score battles were not too interesting. The first one, $2 \Omega-I$ was better for the opponents, as they stayed low enough, while the second was above average for the Czechs, as they played not their longest minor fit, but still made their contract while at other tables, the opponents found their 5-3 8 -fit - maybe it WAS useful after all to play 2e in the 5-2!

Against the Bulgarians, Lazarov-Teneva some more quiet part-scores were played. First, Lazarov landed in $2 \triangleleft$ that lost the obvious 6 tricks for -100 and $58 \%$ the Czech's way, then they did well not to try $3 \diamond x$ as that would have rolled home, but instead opted for $3 \bigcirc$, going down I, for a better score - several tables were in $4 \diamond$ making, with bad misdefense all around. The MPs scored for our heroes was 34 and 14 points, so the table was below average for them.

Kolek-Tomis, the fellow Czechs were much more helpful opponents. First, they never located their 5-4 heart fit to find the good save in 5 ), so +650 proved to be worth $67 \%$, but the worst (for them) was still to come:

Dealer East All Vul

- J 5

Q75 2
$\diamond$ A 106
\& A 8643

| ¢ Q 8732 | N | ¢ A 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 8 |  | QJ 96 |  |
| $\diamond 52$ |  | $\diamond$ K Q 43 |  |
| \% Q 97 | S | ¢K1052 |  |
|  | ¢K 1096 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ KQ 1043 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 97 |  |  |
|  | 9 - |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Klems | Kolek | Kohutova | Tomis |
| - | - | $1 \%$ | 18 |
| Dble | $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | Pass |
| 3\% | Dble | All Pass |  |

Klems' double showed 4+ spades, so Kohutova denied even 3-card fit with her pass. Now Klems saw, that despite le only promising 2 cards, his partner had to have 4 clubs at least (she could not have more than 3-2 in the majors by the bidding, and with 5 diamonds, she would have opened $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ ). So he simply tried the normal-looking 3\%, which brought an instant double from Kolek. Had the defense been more accurate, they would have been happier, but not as it was...

The heart king lead was taken by the ace, and a diamond ran to declarer's king. Now Lucie erred: she should have simply played the heart jack to be able to ruff her third card of the suit, and later play another diamond up, eventually ruffing her fourth card of THAT suit, as well. But she played a trump, and now Kolek could have beaten the hand by simply returning another trump - and when in with the diamond ace, play a third. He tried the heartreturn, which got the contract back to the original, making situation, and now declarer made no more mistakes, for a nice +670 and a $96 \%$ score.

At the next table, Lember of Estonia mistimed a hand to go down in a 24 contract he could have made, to be just below average, and then hit an exact $50 \%$ for one of the most boring games ever.

Board 29 was yet another quiet hand, but keeping Toleda-no-Zamir at 9 tricks in 2 was worth $70 \%$.

Dealer North Both Vul

- A 53
-A 108
$\diamond$ QJ 95
\& 109
ⓀQJ942
-Q 94
$\diamond$ A 2
- 82

Board 30, Klems did well to pass his partner's strong notrump with a bad 8 -count, and eventually defeated 28 one trick for another $68 \%$, and things started to look up.

That was until the last table...I promised Erik not to tell when went down, so all I can say is, he tried his hand at some experimental bridge, and both his ideas could have worked out, but they didn't, and the score for the 2 hands did not reach $30 \%$ - combined.

So, despite the last 2 boards, this young pair showed real talent and enthusiasm for the game, their score being $51 \%$ only this time, but were lying in third place after the round. I would not rule them out to be on or near the podium at the end of this event, either!

They are leading the field after 3 sessions!


## MISUSE

Branko Špiljak

I once read an article about bridge convention misuse. It concluded that Blackwood is most misused convention of all times. I liked it so much that I even played a system where there was no ace-asking bid. We used specialized cue bids instead. Just to make something clear. We didn't play this in our club league, we played it in the Olympiad. It went fine, we never really needed Blackwood.

I'm not trying to advise playing without conventions. What l'm trying to advise is think before you bid!

A simple fact of bridge is that only the final contract counts. No matter how you get there if it is a good one. Players often bid just because it's their turn and they have just the bid to describe their hand (or point range, or ...). We rarely remember to ask IMPORTANT questions

- where would I like to be in the end
- do I know our best (most likely) contract already
- how can I help my partner in hand evaluation

In old days (very old) people didn't have the arsenal of conventions for every possible purpose. They were forced to think and "bid with the odds". They were much happier. They had fewer disasters!

What I do advise (strongly) is:

- if you know what best contract is - bid it
- if you have a suitable natural bid to describe your hand, don't use conventional one

Let's look at "dull" example for today's $3^{\text {rd }}$ round of qualifications.

Dealer East Both Vul
Q 9
$\checkmark$ Q J
$\diamond$ K 9865
\& Q 543

-AK 1082
$\triangle$ A 8753
$\diamond 10$
\& 9
 Partner rebids natural INT.

Now you remember that you play Gazzilli and really like your hand. You don't waste opportunities for your fancy convention use so 2 e. "What can go wrong!" you think. "I'm in control anyhow so partner can't do anything stupid".

Well, partner responds with 2 and you proudly shows your second suit with $3 \bigcirc$ bid. Partner now rebids 3NT and suddenly you have problems. You don't know anything more about partner's hand then you knew after INT (except that he doesn't have 4 hearts). You feel that 3NT is not where you wanted to be.

Our (anti)hero has bid $4 \bigcirc$ at the table and was left there on board 10 . He went down two for a $10 \%$ result. Poor partner had 93 QQJ $\diamond$ K9865 E Q543.

You may say that this is not a good example for Gazzilli misuse.And you're right, this hand is no Gazzilli for several reasons.

But the point is that there was perfect natural bid available and that is 39 . You can show your $5-5$ in the majors and game interest in a simple way and let partner look at his hand and decide.


## INTERVIEW WITH MIXED PAIRS WINNNERS

Daniel Guliás

We had the pleasure to talk to last night's winners, Sofie Grasholt SJODAL and Christian BAKKE of Norway. It came to me as a huge surprise that Sofie is only sixteen years old, so she has a very bright future ahead of her in this beautiful game, while Christian is also only 22.

DG: How long have you been playing?
CB: I started playing when I was seven, and I became competitive by about II.

SGS: My first bridge experiences are from the age of 8 , but soon after I started playing in tournaments as well.

DG: Have you played together before? Is this a regular partnership?

SGS:Actually, we played two years ago in the same event, and were IIth, so it is not new.

CB:We don't play together regularly, since we live so far from each other. I live in Bergen and she lives near Oslo. But it looks like it is working!

DG: Is this your first title, or have you had other successes already?

CB: I had had a few silvers and bronzes, but it is my first gold.

SGS: I had a bronze earlier, but gold feels much better!
DG: So I assume you will be back here, trying to defend the title in two years' time?

CB\&SGS:Yes, certainly!
DG: Can you give me an interesting hand or story from this tournament? Or give me a general idea what it felt like to win?

CB :Winning is always nice, there is nothing like standing on the podium, listening to our national anthem.

SGS: Sorry, I cannot recall any hands worth mentioning, but the feeling, the atmosphere of the city and tournament is fantastic!

DG: I noticed you are not playing together now. How are you doing today?

CB:We have had a bad set, so we are down to 34th I think in the U26 section. There is one more day, so I plan to qualify for the finals with my partner, Marcus Scheie.

SGS: We won the first session this morning, and still keeping up - we are currently third in the U26 Women's event with my regular partner, Agnethe Kjensli.

DG:What are your plans for the future? Is this just a game, or maybe you want to turn professional when the time is right?

CB : I plan on making a living playing bridge for sure.
SGS: Maybe it is too early to tell, but if you ask me now, I certainly say yes!

DG: Congratulations once more, best of luck for the rest of the tournament, and thank you for the interview!


Christian BAKKE and Sofie Grasholt SJODAL - Norway

| I KOHUTOVA Lucie | KLEMS Erik | CZE - CZE | 58.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 MARCINOWSKI Piotr | SOBCZAK Mateusz | POL - POL | 57.69 |
| 3 YEKUTIELI Asaf | EZION Amir | ISR - ISR | 56.99 |
| 4 SPRINKHUIZEN Thibo | MENDES DE LEON Guy | NED - NED | 55.92 |
| 5 ALTER Florian | STRECK Lauritz | GER - GER | 55.55 |
| 6 KRAWCZYK Blazej | SZYMANSKI Marcin | POL - POL | 55.47 |
| 7 KOLEK Lukas | TOMIS Zdenek | CZE - CZE | 55.37 |
| 8 IHER Mirjam | MAIDE Rasmus | EST - EST | 55.03 |
| 9 THUILLEZ Mathilde | COMBESCURE Sarah | FRA - FRA | 54.89 |
| 10 STOECKLI Jeremie | CALMANOVICI Alessandro | SUI - SUI | 54.74 |
| II ILZINS Janis | MAASIK Martin | LAT - LA | 54.35 |
| 12 BRASS Tommy | ROBSON lan | ENG - ENG | 54.08 |
| 13 TIJSSEN Luc | KILJANVeri | NED - NED | 54.05 |
| 14 MAJCHER Arkadiusz | SUCHARDA Edward | POL - POL | 53.26 |
| 15 WEISS Florian | SCHEBERAN Philip | AUT - AUT | 53.20 |
| 16 THORPE Stephan | PIIBOR Johanna | AUT - AUT | 53.07 |
| 17 LAFONT Gregoire | LALOUBEYRE Clement | FRA - FRA | 52.96 |
| 18 RIMSTEDT Mikael | STOKKA Adam | SWE - SWE | 52.80 |
| 19 TOLEDANO Oren | ZAMIR Ami | ISR - ISR | 52.75 |
| 20 MACZKA Stanislaw | TRENDAK Lukasz | POL - POL | 52.62 |
| 21 CASPERSEN Soeren Veel | LAHRMANN Christian | DEN - DEN | 52.55 |
| 22 LAZAROV Dobromir | TENEVA Gergana | BUL - BUL | 52.41 |
| 23 CHIARANDINI Francesco | GAIOTTI Alvaro | ITA - ITA | 52.37 |
| 24 ALISHAW Michael | KENNEDY Stephen | ENG - ENG | 52.06 |
| 25 VANDEWIELE Emiel | DEWIT Dennis | BEL - BEL | 51.98 |
| 26 GOTINK Kevin | HUVERS Wisse | NED - NED | 51.95 |
| 27 HERMANN Sophie | EDER Felix | AUT - AUT | 51.87 |
| 28 NAKAMARU-PINDER Jun | PINKERTON Stewart | SCO-SCO | 51.71 |
| 29 VAN BRANDT Leopold | VAN BRANDT Carl Louis | BEL - BEL | 51.51 |
| 30 DOYLE Nathan | CONNOLLY John | IRL - IRL | 51.42 |
| 31 SAU Roberto | PERCARIO Giacomo | ITA - ITA | 51.03 |
| 32 KITA Maciej | GRABIEC Maciej | POL - POL | 50.93 |
| 33 KVOCEK Juraj | VODICKA Martin | SVK - SVK | 50.47 |
| 34 BAKKE Christian | SCHEIE Marcus | NOR - NOR | 50.34 |
| 35 VALENTINE Richard | OBRIEN Liam | SCO-SCO | 50.15 |
| 36 NORTON Ben | NATT Shahzaad | ENG - ENG | 49.91 |
| 37 EVACIC Emanuel | BILUSIC Ivan | CRO - CRO | 49.60 |
| 38 MAJEWSKI Konrad | GODLEWSKI Piotr | POL - POL | 48.95 |
| 39 BIJSTERVELDT Niels van | LEUFKENS Felix | NED - NED | 48.87 |
| 40 BUNE Soren | TODD-MOIR Victor | DEN - DEN | 48.80 |
| 4I KOFOED Johanne Bilde | BUNE Sophie | DEN - DEN | 48.46 |
| 42 PUERTO MORENO Daniel | RAFECAS Jordi | ESP - ESP | 47.90 |
| 43 BARR Stephen | DONNELLY Michael | IRL - IRL | 47.59 |
| 44 SCHOLS Michel | WESTERBEEK Ricardo | NED - NED | 47.11 |
| 45 CARIS Youp | DUPONT Pim | NED - NED | 46.82 |
| 46 ERICSSON Joakim | JOENSSON Daniel | SWE - SWE | 46.66 |
| 47 ROPER William | SELWAY Louise | ENG - ENG | 46.64 |
| 48 NEVEU Loic | MOUGEART Clement | FRA - FRA | 46.14 |
| 49 ANDONOV Mark | FEROV Zahari | BUL - BUL | 46.05 |
| 50 CLARKE Joshua | BISSELL Henry | ENG - ENG | 45.84 |

5TVASAR Martin LEMBER Manglus

EST - EST

52 STEFANEC Kristijan
53 LESKOVAR Viktor
54 JAKABSIC Jakub
55 FALCONER Glen
56 BUUS THOMSEN Emil
57 WINTER Daniel
58VIDOVIC Toni
59 GUL Josef
60 KAMPARA Diana
61 IRVINE Gavin

FERENCA Matko
GRSKOVIC Zvonimir
RUMANCIK Jakub
HAJDARA Botond
PLEJDRUP Andreas
CLARK Jonathan
BADROV Nikola
CRISAFULLI SADABA Patricio
BARONS Rudolfs
LIGHTOWLER Ryan

CRO - CRO 45.05
CRO - CRO 44.47
SVK - SVK 44.38
SCO - SCO 43.53
DEN - DEN 43.43
ENG - ENG 42.56
CRO - CRO 42.32
AUT - AUT 42.26
LAT - LAT 39.58
IRL - IRL 32.63

## WOMEN

| IDAL POZZO Valentina | DAL POZZO Federica |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 WISEMAN Yvonne | GAHAN Elizabeth |
| 3 SJODAL Sofie Grasholt | KJENSLI Agnethe Hansen |
| 4 BALDYSZ Zofia | ZAREBA Anna |
| 5 KOLEN Sandra | VISSER Esther |
| 6 MYLLAERI Maria | AHLVIK Gabriella |
| 7 DI MAURO Agnese | MONTALTI Irene |
| 8 DUFRENE Beryl | COUPEL Marie-Valentine |
| 9 SUCHODOLSKA Monika | KRUPNIK Patrycja |
| 10 DZIUBINSKA EWA | MROZEK Maja |
| I I HERNANDEZ RIZO Mariana SZYMASZCZYK Joanna |  |
| 12 BIRCHALL Alex | COVILL Laura |
| 13 BEKO Zsofia | JALSOVSZKY Janka |
| 14 WACKWITZ Janneke | CHRISTENSEN Malene Holm |
| 15 LELEU Anais | JOUNIN Emeline |
| 16 TUUS Hanna | LEEMING India |
| 17 TORV Helina | LAAN Susanna |
| 18 CIUNCZYK Hanna | ZALEWSKA Joanna |
| 19 BEEKMAN Fleur | BERWALD Juliet |
| 20 STRBOVA Barbora | KUPKOVA Barbora |
| 21 LAPCIKOVA Renata | DOLANSKA Veronika |
| 22 JASKULECKA Alicja | MYSLIWIEC Alicja |
| 23 DASKO Dominika | MANKIEWICZ Agnieszka |
| 24 MELKONYAN Karolina | ZARZYCKA Maria |
| 25 DI LORENZO Anastasia | COLOMBO Alice |
| 26 OEBERG Ida Marie | KJENSLI Maren Hansen |
| 27 SCHLUMBERGER Wilhelmine BELLOY Constance |  |
| 28 KAMPERMANN Mareille | DAMMANN Alexandra |
| 29 OELKER Fiona | SANNE Kim |
| 30 KOKOT Joanna | OCYLOK Dominika |
| 31 JONES Megan | LA CHAPELLE Imogen |
| 32 RIEGER Mona | BEDNARSKI Lara |


| ITA - ITA | 60.37 |
| :--- | :--- |
| ENG - ENG | 59.11 |
| NOR - NOR | 57.14 |
| POL - POL | 56.61 |
| NED - NED | 56.25 |
| FIN - FIN | 55.31 |
| ITA - ITA | 55.13 |
| FRA - FRA | 54.41 |
| POL - POL | 54.28 |
| POL - POL | 53.70 |
| POL - POL | 53.45 |
| ENG - ENG | 52.10 |
| HUN - HUN | 51.76 |
| NED - NED | 51.75 |
| FRA - FRA | 51.36 |
| ENG - ENG | 50.41 |
| EST - EST | 50.17 |
| POL - POL | 49.88 |
| NED - NED | 48.96 |
| CZE - CZE | 48.91 |
| CZE - CZE | 48.05 |
| POL - POL | 47.90 |
| POL - POL | 46.52 |
| POL - POL | 46.30 |
| ITA - ITA | 46.00 |
| NOR - NOR | 45.60 |
| FRA - FRA | 44.18 |
| GER - GER | 43.98 |
| GER - GER | 43.20 |
| POL - POL | 32.74 |
| ENG - ENG | 35.35 |
| GER - GER | 35.66 |
|  |  |


| I GOOR Ronald | GOOR Sander | NED - NED | 60.46 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 YANINSKI Nikolay | KOSTOVA Liya | BUL - BUL | 59.74 |
| 3 MATATYAHOU Gal | SLIWOWICZ Yonatan | ISR - ISR | 59.60 |
| 4 LOONSTEIN Tomer | ZEITAK Aviv | ISR - ISR | 59.48 |
| 5 BOULIN Arthur | GUILLEMIN Theo | FRA - FRA | 59.47 |
| 6 KHUTORSKY Nir | BANIRI llai llan | ISR - ISR | 58.57 |
| 7 PATREUHA Jakub | PATREUHA Patryk | POL - POL | 58.33 |
| 8 DOERMER Felix | FARWIG Sven Niklas | GER - GER | 58.29 |
| 9 KOIVU Oskari | KOIVU Aarne | FIN - FIN | 57.91 |
| 10 VAN OOSTEN Sibrand | PABST Philipp | GER - GER | 57.25 |
| I I CAPOBIANCO Sophia | LOMBARDI Matteo | ITA - ITA | 56.70 |
| 12 KOPKA Kacper | CICHY Krzysztof | POL - POL | 56.66 |
| 13 NIJSSEN Oscar | VAN DE PAVERD Tim | NED - NED | 56.65 |
| 14 OTTO Viktor | LITTERST Maximilian | GER - GER | 56.04 |
| 15 GOUDZWAARD Dieter | WESTERVELD Tobias | NED - NED | 55.89 |
| 16 FRAGOLA Maxence | TEIL Clement | FRA - FRA | 54.70 |
| 17 JASINSKI Piotr | KIELBASA Tomasz | POL - POL | 54.44 |
| 18 GIUBILO Gianmarco | GIUBILO Gabriele | ITA - ITA | 54.26 |
| 19 GAVRILOVA Elizaveta | STRAUME Toms | LAT - LAT | 52.83 |
| 20 HULANICKI Pawel | RACEWICZ MACIEJ | POL - POL | 52.45 |
| 21 BELLICAUD Luc | BASLER Raphael | FRA - FRA | 51.57 |
| 22 TROJANSKI Filip | SHINDLER Aron | POL - POL | 51.36 |
| 23 GOSCIANSKI Kajetan | JOZKOWIAK Lukasz | POL - POL | 50.96 |
| 24 ANOYRKATIS Theo | ANOYRKATIS Samuel | ENG - ENG | 50.87 |
| 25 RONAYNE Jack | GILLIS Theo | ENG - ENG | 50.41 |
| 26 KALETA Michal | OKUNIEWSKI Wojciech | POL - POL | 50.09 |
| 27 MADDEN Harry | PANCHAGNULA Kripa | ENG - ENG | 49.86 |
| 28 BACZEK Krystian | BAZYLUK Jakub | POL - POL | 48.96 |
| 29 BLOM Jasper | FRIESEN Xavier | NED - NED | 48.74 |
| 30 FINNEGAN Leah | WALSH Denise | IRL - IRL | 48.23 |
| 31 GABRIEL Richard | GABRIEL Lukas | SVK - SVK | 48.00 |
| 32 PRIEDITIS Arnis | SUSS Emils | LAT - LAT | 47.92 |
| 33 PEMBERTON Alexander | COPE Andrew | ENG - ENG | 47.42 |
| 34 CANKUDIS Mikolaj | MORAWSKI Patryk | POL - POL | 46.88 |
| 35 VAVRA PremysI | VAVRA David | CZE - CZE | 45.38 |
| 36 FARWIG Niels Ole | WROBBEL Tim | GER - GER | 45.35 |
| 37 CIESLINSKI Jan | JANKOWSKI Mikolaj | POL - POL | 45.29 |
| 38 KINDL Jan | KVACEK Robert | CZE - CZE | 45.09 |
| 39 WALSH Sheila | KANE Ariane | IRL - IRL | 44.52 |
| 40 JAUNSKALZE Roberts | OZOLINS Pauls Eriks | LAT - LAT | 43.43 |
| 4I PYSZKO Adam | KASTOVSKY Ondrej | CZE - CZE | 42.83 |
| 42 GROCHOWSKI Maksymilian | n GORSKI Michal | POL - POL | 42.57 |
| 43 BUGAJEWSKI Jozef | JOZEFOWSKI Fryderyk | POL - POL | 41.52 |
| 44 WALSH Ceara | NOONAN Emma | IRL - IRL | 40.61 |
| 45 QUIRKE Roisin | MAHON Katie | IRL - IRL | 40.17 |
| 46 THORNE Monica | MCAULIFFE-HICKEY A.K | IRL - IRL | 39.39 |
| 47 SHANMUGARASA Senthur | VICKNESWARAN Kavinthan | ENG - ENG | 37.83 |
| 48 KRUPNYK Bohdan | KRYNYTSKYI Petro | UKR - UKR | 34.35 |
| 49 O'KANE Lucy | O'DONNELL Mollie | IRL - IRL | 31.88 |

I ROMBAUT Leo
2 TYLVAD Daniel
3 BLOCH Romain
4 BROGELAND Anders
5 SABBAH Ofek
6 ER Izzet Cagan
7 BETLINSKI Maciej 8WURTZ Georg 9 MORAWSKA EWA
IO BUNE Amalie Rosa
II NAWROCKI Jakub
12 KURLIT Franciszek
13 SELBY Oscar
14 LANGER Emil
15 BUKAT Aleks
16 SAETRE Magnus
17 LOMBARDI Antonio
18 KOWAL Kinga
19 GUENDEL Marius
20 BOREVKOVIC Vlatko
21 HENRIKSEN Line
22 STASIK Michal
23 FRIESEN Gabor
24 GRODZKA Julia
25 GOOR Martijn
26 SWIATKOWSKI Pawel
27 THRANE JACOBSEN Leah
28 DZIUBA JAKUB
29 HEIBERG-EVENSTAD Nicolai NORDBY Jorgen Lindaas
30 ALTUN Toygar Tuncay
3I HULANICKA Sara
32 VACHTARCIKOVA Nikol
33 BROCKEN Rex
34 STRAUME Pauls Olafs
35 TOZCU Ahmet Furkan
36 DRAGICEVIC Eliza
37VAN ZANDBEEK Richard
38 BACIC Franko
39 CVJETOVIC Nina
40 HOLETIC Stjepan
4I CVJETOVIC Marin
42 ZITKOVIC Karlo
43 GRUBISIC Mia
44 DRZANIC Marija
45 ROZYCKI Dominik

GALLARD Aurele
TYLVAD Aron
ZOBEL Thibaut
AUSTAD Marius
MSIKA Daniel
BORA Serdal
ZIMORSKI Sebastian
HENRIKSEN Sarah
NIKLAUS Maria
PEDERSEN Clara Brun
GRAS Szymon
KUFLOWSKI Kacper
ROSE Henry
PAOLELLA Finnley
CIBOROWSKA Lucja
TOESSE Thomas
GARDENGHI Oslo
CIBOROWSKI Konrad
DRANSFELD Karl
STEFANEC Lovro
RASMUSSEN Alma
KASPERCZYK Lukasz
ESSINK Jorn
PYTKA Anna
KLARENBEEK Wout
ZABOROWSKITymoteusz
ALTENBURG Frederikke
GROCHOWSKI Albert

EREN Umut Gorkem
HULANICKA Estera
ZALSKA Veronika
BROCKEN Miel
LIGERS Olivers
ALTUN Tuana
PROBST Kaya Fay
HARTSUIKER Luuk
PROBST Tristan Nicholas
JANCIC Natalija
FABEKOVEC Zlatko
LADOVIC Lara
LUBINA Lara
CIZELVanja
BINA Mihael
JANKOWIAK Kryspin

FRA - FRA
65.07

DEN - DEN
63.65

FRA - FRA 63.04
NOR - NOR 62.14
ISR - ISR 61.63
TUR -TUR 60.94
POL - POL 60.13
DEN - DEN 59.77
POL - POL 59.34
DEN - DEN 58.99
POL - POL 58.45
POL - POL 57.50
ENG - ENG 57.23
GER - GER 55.86
POL - POL 55.66
NOR - NOR 55.43
ITA - ITA 55.4I
POL - POL 54.38
GER - GER 54.10
CRO - CRO 52.86
DEN - DEN 50.42
POL - POL 50.32
NED - NED 49.7I
POL - POL 49.6I
NED - NED 48.99
POL - POL 48.88
DEN - DEN 48.86
POL - POL 48.22
NOR - NOR 46.84
TUR - TUR 46.8I
POL - POL 46.21
CZE - CZE 44.87
NED - NED 44.83
LAT - LAT 44.20
TUR -TUR 43.33
CRO - CRO 42.45
NED - NED 42.02
CRO - CRO 39.8I
CRO - CRO 37.34
CRO - CRO 36.4I
CRO - CRO 35.75
CRO - CRO 34.8I
CRO - CRO 34.43
CRO - CRO 32.54
POL - POL 30.36

