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| :---: |
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| Quarter-finals |
| Segment $4-10: 30$ |
| Segment $5-14: 00$ |
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| Pairs: |
| Qualification |
| Session 9-10:00 |
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| Session I2 - I6:20 |
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From left to right - the Video Makers: Arianna Testa, Simon Fellus, Cristian Matias Cuchian, Mario Chavarria-Kaifmann, Carlotta Venier, Fernando Lema

At the halfway point of the quarter-finals in the Open, Women's, Senior and Mixed Teams there are some matches at or near runaway status - notably USA 137-50 over France in the Mixed and Monaco 126-43 over Canada in the Open - but with 48 boards to play, there is plenty of time for trailing teams to make up ground. The closest match - 79-79 - involves Poland, the hometown favorite. They are in a tough battle with Sweden, winners of the Open event in Lille four years ago. Two members of the 2012 team are playing for Sweden in Wroclaw: Fredrik Nystrom and Johan Upmark. Poland, winners of Group $B$ in the round robin qualifying, is fielding the same team that won the Bermuda Bowl in Chennai, India, last year.
In the Senior series, USA is the heavy favorite to win a second straight championship after dominating the senior field in Chennai last year, but they are locked in a tight battle with a veteran team from Australia. USA is ahead, but by only 10 IMPs. In the same event, Turkey is leading Denmark by just 5 IMPs.

## Prize Giving and Closing Ceremony

The ceremony will take place on Saturday 17th in the auditorium, beginning at 20:00. It will be followed by a reception at the "La Pergola" restaurant.
Players who wish to attend the dinner must collect their invitation card at the Hospitality Desk. If you do NOT bring your invitation you will not be admitted.

## Important : Pairs entry deadline

Pairs coming from teams events quarter-finals and wishing to play in one of the pairs events should register before the deadline:

Wednesday 14th 9:30 A.M.


## Open Teams Quarter-finals



## Women's Teams Quarter-finals



## Senior Teams Quarter-finals

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 56 |  | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USA AUSTRALIA | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 15 \\ \mathbf{3 0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 48 \\ 12 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 21 \\ & 32\end{aligned}\right.$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 84 \\ & 74 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |
| TURKEY DENMARK | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 41 \\ 21 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} 28 \\ 33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 27 <br> 37 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 96 \\ & 91 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |
| CHINESE TAIPEI ITALY | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 56 \\ 42 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 45 \\ 19 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 14 <br> 9 |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 115 \\ 70 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 1 | 2 | 34 |  | 5 | 6 | Tot |
| CHINA FRANCE | $\begin{array}{\|l} 32 \\ 45 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 30 \\ 23 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}5 \\ 37\end{gathered}\right.$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 67 \\ 105 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

## Mixed Teams Quarter-finals



## BBO and OURGAME SCHEDULE

BBO I = VuGraph, BBO 8 is also OURGAME
10:30

| O | Netherlands v England | BBO I |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| O | New Zealand v Spain | BBO 2 |
| O | Poland v Sweden | BBO 3 |
| W | USA v Sweden | BBO 4 |
| M | Bulgaria v Germany | BBO 5 |
| M | Russia v Denmark | BBO 6 |
| S | USA v Australia | BBO 7 |
| W | China v England | BBO 8 |

14:00 and 17:00
To be decided


## No cell phones

No cell phones will be allowed in the playing area, but players can leave them at the registration


## PAIRS FORMAT

Open pairs format.
Following the qualifying rounds, the pairs will be split into semi-final $A$ and semi-final $B$.
Semi-final A will consist of 100 pairs, including the drop-ins from the Knock-out, playing 10 sessions of 10 boards in two days.
Semi-final B will consist of the rest of the field
Information concerning the number of finalists and carry-forward scores will be published later.
Women's and Seniors pairs
Because of the low number of entries, there will not be a semi-final. The drop-in pairs from the Knock-out will join the qualification, which will be carried on two more days.
At the end, it is foreseen that a total of 26 pairs will qualify to the final, though that number may vary in case of a low number of dropins. If so, the number will be promptly announced. Carry-forward scores will be announced later.
Mixed pairs
After the qualification, the pairs will be split into semi-final A and semi- final B.
The number of qualifiers to semi-final A will be usually be 23 or24.
However, in case of some of the drop-in pairs do not show up, the number might be increased to get to a total of 52 .
Further information about the number of finalists and carry-forward scores will be published later. desk.

## Badges !!

Players, please note that without a badge you will not be allowed into the playing area. If you lose your badge, replacing it will cost you 5 Euros.

No smoking or drinking policy Please be reminded that smoking and drinking is prohibited at any time and in any place
 during sessions.

| Open Pairs after 88 |  |  | Women's Pairs after 08 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I JAGNIEWSKI R - GAWELW | POL-POL | 62.44 |  | MOSZCZYNSKA Z - PIESIEWICZ D | POL-POL | 62.31 |
| 2 KUBAC N-ZORLU N | TUR-TUR | 62.22 |  | YANG J-LIY | CHN-CHN | 58.39 |
| 3 ANKLESARIA K - CHOKSHI S | IND-IND | 59.71 |  | GU L - ZHOUT | CHN-CHN | 56.84 |
| 4 KING P - McINTOSH A | ENG-ENG | 58.47 |  | PILIPOVIC M - SVER N | CRO-CRO | 56.78 |
| 5 WOJCIESZEK J - BOCHENSKI A | POL-POL | 57.75 |  | HARDING M - FUGLESTAD A | NOR-NOR | 54.96 |
| 6 BARYLEWSKI M - KRZEMINSKI C | POL-POL | 57.53 |  | SANDSTROM K - MYLLAERI M | FIN-FIN | 53.51 |
| 7 AUKEN S-WELLAND R | GER-GER | 57.09 |  | PAVLUSHKO O-RUDAKOVA E | RUS-RUS | 53.05 |
| 8 SZULEJEWSKI B - DARKIEWICZ-MONIUSZKO G | POL-POL | 56.90 |  | SZCZEPANSKA K - MAJ-RUDNICKA M | POL-POL | 53.05 |
| 9 EIDE P - GRAESLI B | NOR-NOR | 56.86 |  | NILSEN L - GRUDE M | NOR-NOR | 52.39 |
| 10 GIERULSKI B - SKRZYPCZAK J | LTU-LTU | 56.46 |  | NORDGREN M - BERGLUND A | FIN-FIN | 52.28 |
| II CHUMAKY - ROVYSHYN O | UKR-UKR | 55.97 |  | XIA M - LIU S | CHN-CHN | 51.64 |
| 12 VAINIKONIS E-ARLOVICH A | LTU-LTU | 55.66 |  | LEVI H-ASULIN A | ISR-ISR | 51.41 |
| 13 GRAVERSEN H - CLEMMENSEN P | DEN-DEN | 55.52 |  | BAKER L - McCALLUM K | USA-USA | 50.96 |
| 14 NARKIEWICZ G - INGIELEWICZ Z | POL-POL | 55.51 |  | ZORANOVIC J - PEPIC S | SER-SER | 50.77 |
| 15 KWIECIEN M - ZATORSKI P | POL-POL | 55.40 |  | LIPSHITZ C - KENNY R | RSA-RSA | 50.64 |
| 16 NAWROCKI P -WIANKOWSKI P | POL-POL | 55.24 |  | JOYCE E-FITZGERALD J | IRL-IRL | 50.46 |
| 17 TOMASZEK W - GARDYNIK G | POL-POL | 55.23 |  |  |  |  |
| 18 SKALSKIA - KOLUDA P | POL-POL | 55.15 | Senior Pairs after Q8 |  |  |  |
| 19 KRUPOWICZ M - SAKOWICZ R | POL-POL | 54.96 |  |  |  |  |
| 20 OZDIL M - OZBALCI E | TUR-TUR | 54.94 |  |  |  |  |
| 21 STAMATOV J - DANAILOV D | BUL-BUL | 54.91 |  | WAKSMAN S - USZINSKIW | FRA-FRA | 57.90 |
| 22 THOMPSON B -JACOBSW | AUS-AUS | 54.79 |  | VOGTW - FRESEN L | GER-GER | 56.73 |
| 23 WILDAVSKY A -WEINSTEIN H | USA-USA | 54.79 |  | HOEGER W - MALCHUS P | GER-GER | 54.91 |
| 24 SCHILHART N - BUCHLEV N | GER-GER | 54.61 |  | JELENIEWSKI A - WACHNOWSKI J | POL-POL | 54.40 |
| 25 VANDERVORST M - BAHBOUT S | BEL-BEL | 54.60 |  | KIERZNOWSKI R - KACZANOWSKIT | POL-POL | 54.27 |
| 26 STARKOWSKIW - GOLEBIOWSKI S | POL-POL | 54.50 |  | FRONCZAK - KONOPKA R | POL-POL | 54.07 |
| 27 TEWARI R - SHIVDASANIJ | IND-IND | 54.23 |  | KOWALCZYK S - SUCHARKIEWICZ J | POL-POL | 53.77 |
| 28 BLACHNIO A -WUJKOW A | POL-POL | 54.16 |  | HIRATA M - OHASHI M | JPN-JPN | 53.36 |
| 29 JANISZEWSKI P - NOWAK K | POL-POL | 54.13 |  | OHNO K - Yamada a | JPN-JPN | 53.28 |
| 30 DALECKI M - MODRZEJEWSKI M | POL-POL | 54.10 | 10 | BAKKET - HANTVEIT H | NOR-NOR | 53.15 |
| 31 BURAKOWSKIW - PAWELEC J | POL-POL | 53.97 | 11 | MICHALOWSKI J - DOLNY W | POL-POL | 52.92 |
| 32 CARROLL - GARVEYT | IRL-IRL | 53.95 | 12 | MARSTRANDER P - ANDERSSEN R | NOR-NOR | 52.91 |
| 33 KUCHARSKI P-KLIS M | POL-POL | 53.90 | 13 | HACKETT P - HOLLAND J | ENG-ENG | 52.03 |
| 34 GOWER C - VANV | RSA-RSA | 53.90 | 14 | HUSSAIN M - MAZHAR M | PAK-PAK | 51.00 |
| 35 PAWLOWSKI A - GRZELCZAK J | POL-POL | 53.75 | 15 | DANYLYUKT - DANYLYUKV | UKR-UKR | 50.70 |
| 36 CIESLAK J - MAKARUK J | POL-POL | 53.72 |  |  |  |  |
| 37 CARACCI M - CUEVAS L | $\mathrm{CHI}-\mathrm{CHI}$ | 53.72 | Mixed Pairs after 88 |  |  |  |
| 38 LINDE J - SCHWERDT C | GER-GER | 53.68 |  |  |  |  |
| 39 FLACASSIER F - GROSSET C | FRA-FRA | 53.61 |  |  |  |  |
| 40 SHUKHMEYSTER B - RYBNIKOV G | UKR-UKR | 53.60 |  | HUBERSCHWILLER M - HUBERSCHWILLER A | FRA-FRA | 60.43 |
| 41 JANOWSKIJ - DOBRZYNSKI M | POL-POL | 53.55 | 2 | FISCHER D - SAURER B | AUT-AUT | 60.33 |
| 42 DROZDOWSKIJ-KULESZA P | POL-POL | 53.50 |  | JIN K - ZHU P | CHN-CHN | 59.11 |
| 43 HOYLAND S - HOYLAND S | NOR-NOR | 53.23 |  | WROBEL M - PIETRZYK A | POL-POL | 58.58 |
| 44 KRASNICKI M-WITKOWSKI L | POL-POL | 53.20 | 5 | EFRAIMSSON B - ZACK E | SWE-SWE | 57.02 |
| 45 BENDIKS J - BETHERS J | LAT-LAT | 53.01 | 6 | KHAZANOV I-LEBEDEVA M | RUS-RUS | 56.69 |
| 46 BERTHEAU P-HULT S | SWE-SWE | 52.97 |  | SAUTAUX M - SZCZEPANSKI R | POL-POL | 56.56 |
| 47 MATKOWSKI P - SLIWON K | POL-POL | 52.96 | 8 | SAPORTA P - SAPORTA-TWORZYDLO R | FRA-FRA | 55.53 |
| 48 JOHANSEN J-SKREE M | NOR-NOR | 52.91 |  | WINCIOREK T - STACHOWIAK-KLUZ J | POL-POL | 55.44 |
| 49 BALASOVS J - BETHERS U | LAT-LAT | 52.83 | 10 | JANECZEK M - BUNIKOWSKIA | POL-POL | 55.07 |
| 50 LESNICZAK J - JANIK S | POL-POL | 52.83 | 11 | KARMARKAR M - KARMARKAR S | IND-IND | 54.90 |
| 51 MISZEWSKA E-ILCZUK P | POL-POL | 52.78 | 12 | SCHROEDER M - SCHROEDER M | GER-GER | 54.70 |
| 52 BOLESTA S - BLINSKIT | POL-POL | 52.64 | 13 | KHANDELWAL R - KHANDELWAL H | IND-IND | 54.49 |
| 53 LEWACIAK G - ZUBIEL P | POL-POL | 52.63 | 14 | ROZENBLYUM M -VOROBEYCHIKOVA O | RUS-RUS | 54.39 |
| 54 SHEK D - RASMUSSEN J | MAS-MAS | 52.52 | 15 | WALSH T - KEMPLE B | IRL-IRL | 54.38 |
| 55 AMIRY R - SAMIR A | EGY-EGY | 52.51 | 16 | MECKSTROTH S - TUNCOK C | USA-USA | 54.36 |
| 56 KARIMI O - CANTOR M | GER-GER | 52.50 | 17 | HARASIMOWICZ E - LESNIEWSKI M | POL-POL | 53.79 |
| 57 EIDE E-EIDE H | NOR-NOR | 52.41 | 18 | RETEK G - RETEK M | CAN-CAN | 53.67 |
| 58 SZTYRAK L - JASZCZAK A | POL-POL | 52.40 | 19 | SHI B - TIANW | CHN-CHN | 53.58 |
| 59 SZELKAW -WOLCZAK C | POL-POL | 52.31 | 20 | LILLIS H - McGLOUGHLIN M | IRL-IRL | 53.41 |
| 60 CIECHOMSKI J - GLASEK G | POL-POL | 52.29 | 21 | SOBOLEWSKA E-KUSION A | POL-POL | 53.15 |
| 61 SCHOLLAARDT M - NETTL O | NED-NED | 52.25 | 22 | GUMBY P - LAZER W | AUS-AUS | 52.75 |
| 62 GROMOELLER M - FRITSCHE J | GER-GER | 52.19 | 23 | HUNG Y - HSIEH H | TPE-TPE | 52.28 |
| 63 KMIECIK C -WLODKOWSKI R | POL-POL | 52.11 | 24 | SIKORA M - WALCZYNSKI A | POL-POL | 52.10 |
| 64 VOLHEJNV - MACURA M | CZE-CZE | 52.07 | 25 | HADDAD W - TRABOULSI S | LIB-LIB | 52.03 |
| 65 WITEK M - BYZDRA A | POL-POL | 52.02 | 26 | HANNA N - EATON J | CAN-CAN | 51.97 |
| 66 RODZIEWICZ-BIELEWICZ O-PIECHOCKI S | POL-POL | 52.00 | 27 | KACZMAREK E - PYCLIK-CHOJENKA A | POL-POL | 51.90 |
| 67 KEMMER C-CASTNER K | GER-GER | 51.96 | 28 | CLAIR P - PAGNINI-ARSLAN C | ITA-ITA | 51.74 |
| 68 WRECZYCKI M - BAJEK G | POL-POL | 51.96 | 29 | HOOYKAAS P - RANKIN P | AUS-AUS | 51.71 |
| 69 SIELICKIT-TUCZYNSKI P | POL-POL | 51.87 | 30 | NG K - LIAN S | SIN-SIN | 51.25 |
| 70 PATER M - STANISZEWSKI J | POL-POL | 51.79 | 31 | HANLONT - BARTON G | IRL-IRL | 51.23 |
| 71 GILL P - PEAKEA | AUS-AUS | 51.76 | 32 | ZHOUY - HU M | CHN-CHN | 50.93 |
| 72 KOWALCZYK I-WISNIEWSKIT | POL-POL | 51.59 | 33 | ERIKSON A - PYYKKOY | SWE-SWE | 50.92 |
| 73 EDIST-EDIS E | UAE-UAE | 51.56 | 34 | MAKAREWICZ A - FECHNER M | POL-POL | 50.75 |
| 74 MARCINOWSKI P - SOBCZAK M | POL-POL | 51.45 | 35 | HOFFMAN D - BOURKE M | AUS-AUS | 50.56 |
| 75 BARTOSZEWSKI M - MAKATREWICZ M | POL-POL | 51.43 | 36 | DOBROWOLSKI M - MADUZIA A | POL-POL | 50.25 |
| 76 GILLIS C - GARVEY M | SCO-SCO | 51.42 | 37 | RUDAKOV E - DIKHNOVA T | RUS-RUS | 50.15 |
| 77 RUBINS K - LORENCS M | LAT-LAT | 51.39 | 38 | OPPENSTAM A - NILSSON H | SWE-SWE | 50.14 |
| 78 SZWENKEL K - OSINSKIT | POL-POL | 51.32 | 39 | STEPHENS R - ROSSLEE D | RSA-RSA | 49.83 |
| 79 WANGW-CHENY | CHN-CHN | 51.28 | 40 | SOLOMONW - CAPALT | ENG-ENG | 49.77 |



As it had taken the two teams some time to finish the six manually dealt boards to be played in segment 5 , this final segment had a late start as well. As a consequence, the teams could not play the first five pre-dealt boards of this final set - they would have to play five manually dealt boards after finishing the regular boards 22-32.
Spain went into the final session with a slender lead of I IMP but they added a few right on the very first board:

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
KJ 52
© K 9
$\diamond$ Q 109

- A9 32
© A 763
ค7432
$\diamond$ KJ 5
2 54


คA85
$\diamond 632$
-KQJIO86

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bathurst | F Goded | Lall | Lantaron |
|  |  | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | I $\vee$ | Dble | 29 |
| $2 』$ | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

North's $\ \S$ showed spades. East led the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ to dummy's ace. When declarer next cashed his clubs, West discarded just one spade and East threw the 4 and $\uparrow 10$. As declarer knew that East was 4-4-4-I and had not opened the bidding, he continued by leading a spade to his king. When this held, he had his contract and even made an overtrick in the end. Spain +430 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik | Hampson <br> Knap | Greco |  |
| Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{3 \%}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

With no information available from the bidding, Hampson was in a much worse position. He too won the heart lead and rattled off the clubs, but when he tried a spade to the jack and queen, he had to accept one down. Spain +50 and 10 IMPs to lead by II.
A few boards later, East at both tables made the same overcall, which looks sound enough:

Board 25. Dealer North. E/WVul.


A classic auction, North's double being a sensible alternative to a spade rebid. South led his spade and declarer ruffed the second round with the $\diamond I 0$, South discarding a club. In spite of this ominous discard, declarer tried to cash some club tricks quickly but North ruffed the second round. Another spade was ruffed with the nine and overruffed with the jack and the club return was ruffed and overruffed as well. A heart then went to North's king and the next spade was ruffed by declarer's queen and overruffed with South's king.As South still held the $\vee A$ and the master club, declarer had to concede down three, Spain +800 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik | Hampson | Knap | Greco |
|  | $1 \$$ | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

After their variation of the strong $1 \boldsymbol{\mu}$, Hampson was not in a good position to double when $2 \triangleleft$ came round to him. He preferred to show his suit and South then bid the obvious 3NT. Ten tricks, USA +430 but 9 IMPs to Spain.
Spain's lead had gone up to 22 now. On the remaining seven boards, USA twice picked up an overtrick so they went into the five supplementary boards with Spain still leading by 20 . Spain then quickly secured their quarterfinal berth when they made $5 \triangleleft$ doubled on the first board - the same contract going down two at the other table. The final score was 183-149 to Spain, a lead of 34 (including, as we have said earlier, the IOIMP penalty.)
In the quarter-finals, Spain would have to face another shock winner: New Zealand, who had managed to beat France, the reigning European champions.

## Hainan Bridge Festival China 2016

Date:Oct $22^{\text {nd }}$ Nov $5^{\text {th }}, 2016$
Venue:sanya Bay Mangrovetree Resort,Sanya,City,Hainan Province,China(the venue for Senior team will be Haikou Tower Hotel,Haikou City,Hainan Province,China)

Entry:the Festival is open to all the players

## Events:

| Events | Date | Prize Money (RMB) | Entry Fee (RMB) | Master Point |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Open Teams | Oct $22^{\text {nd }}$ to $27^{\text {th }}$ | 300,000 | 2,000 | CCBA <br> Gold <br> Master <br> Point will be awarded |
| Open Pairs | Oct $25^{\text {th }}$ to $27^{\text {th }}$ | 150,000 | 800 |  |
| Pro-Am Pairs | Oct $27^{\text {th }}$ to $28^{\text {th }}$ | 150,000 | 600 |  |
| Mixed Teams | Oct $29^{\text {th }}$ to Nov $2^{\text {nd }}$ | 300,000 | 2,000 |  |
| Mixed Pairs | Nov $1^{\text {st }}$ to Nov $2^{\text {nd }}$ | 150,000 | 800 |  |
| Senior Teams | Nov 3 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ to Nov $5^{\text {th }}$ | 120,000 | 1,500 |  |

Side Events(all with prize) will also be held during the Hainan Bridge Festival:
-Board A Match, Quick KO, IMP Pairs(CCBA Silver Master Point will be awarded)
-Prize Pairs@every day (CCBA Red Master Point will be awarded)
Prize:The total Prize Money and Rewards will be 2,000,000 RMB
Cooperating Hotel:Mangrove Tree Resort World Sanya Bay CoconutGrove Branch (Five-Star) Special Price for Hainan Bridge Festival:Single/Twin RMB 400 per room per night (including breakfast)

Reservation contact:Yum Yan
Email: yumyan.mts@mangrovetree.cn
Reservation Tel: +86 15595766298/18308940095
For more detalls about Hainan Bridge Festival and the hotel,please visit http://www.ccba.org.cn/hainan2016


Mangrove Tree Resort World Sanya Bay is located just a stone's away to the city center, 9.8 kilometers to the Phoenix International Airport and 2.5 kilometers to the railway station.

Mangrove Tree Resort World Sanya Bay integrates Fashion, Art, Leisure, Entertainment and other elements into a five-star resort complex, leading a new lifestyle. Resort World adjacent to the Sanya Bay, the well-known "Coconut Dream Corridor", is inclusive of six towers (Kapok Tower, Buddha Tower, Coconut Tower, Grand Palm Tower, King Palm Tower and Queen Palm Tower).

More than 3,700 fine designed rooms, feature a cozy holiday atmosphere.
Signature restaurants, Southeast Asian style shopping street, Today Art Galleria, Panviman SPA, and upcoming 71 restaurants and bars, more than 20,000 square meter Conference and Exhibition Center, 33,000 square meters Water Park, movie studio, and 2200 square meters of Wedding Square, as well as 40,000 square meters shopping street.

Hotel name : Mangrove Tree Resort World Sanya Bay ( $\star \star \star \star \star$ ) Address: No. 155, Fenghuang Rd.Sanya, Hainan, 572000 P.R.China


Italy started their Round of 16 match as firm favourites, since their opponent, Canada, got there by virtue of having the best record of the teams that finished sixth in the Round Robin. The Italians built a 44IMP lead early in the second session, but Canada won the next three sessions to lead by 5 going into the final sixteen boards.
There was a late start to the final session as the play started from board 19, while boards 17-18 were redealt and played at the end.
Canada started by winning 4 IMPs on board 19 by making $2 \vee$, a contract that was slightly misplayed at the other table for one down. Italy responded with a 5IMP swing on board 21 where, despite adverse vulnerability, the Canadian North competed agressively to 3s with 4 HCP and a 4-4-3-2 pattern, facing a 2sercall of a weak INT showing the majors. That was minus 300 , but luckily for Canada neither of the Italians found the red card.
Then came a series of fascinating deals, involving some tough problems for play and defence.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/WVul.
, KJ5 2
$\bigcirc$ K 9
$\diamond$ Q 109
\& A 932
上 A 763
Q 7432
$\diamond$ K J 5
\& 54

$\bigcirc$ A 85
$\diamond 632$
\& K Q J 1086

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fergani | Di Franco | Pollack | Manno |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 \vee$ | Pass | $2 \stackrel{2}{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

According to Italian systems, 2e is an artificial gameforcing response to any one-level opening in a suit, involving relays. Thereafter North was asking and South was describing his shape and values. Eventually North became declarer in 3NT.
Pollack led $\triangle Q$. Declarer took the ace and immediately played the 8 . This appeared to be a classical text book problem on the subject "when not to play second hand low". From the fact that declarer did not touch clubs, West should conclude that North possesses \%A and has six clubs ready to run in addition to the $\triangle A K$. Why is he
playing a spade? He would like to steal the ninth trick with his $\Phi$ K.Time to rise immediately with $\Phi A$ and switch to $\Delta K$ followed by $\diamond$ J (which is what Fergani did).
In the textbook, East's diamonds would be $\diamond$ AI 074, when the Canadian defence would be crowned with success and applauded. Unfortunately, in the real world East's diamonds were merely $\diamond$ A874 and declarer soon claimed ten tricks.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Di Bello | L'Ecuyer | D'Avossa <br> Pass | Marcinski |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \dot{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

The Canadian bidding, starting with a precision 2\& was simpler. Here East also started with $\vee Q$ against $3 N T$ and at trick 2 Di Bello was faced with the same defensive problem, but he instantly played a low spade. Thus declarer believed he didn't have the ace, and tried which lost to East's Q Q. Now it was all over for him, as after the next heart lead the defence had five tricks.
This instructive board demonstrated that the technically correct solution (employed by the Canadian defender) is not always the best practical decision at the table.

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | ¢K63 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 9754$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AJ 4 |  |
|  | \& Q 94 |  |
| ¢ 1074 | N | ¢ 92 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ}$ |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 63 |
| $\diamond 972$ | W E | $\diamond$ KQ 65 |
| \&KJ10 75 | S | \& 632 |
|  | - AQJ 85 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1082$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 1083$ |  |
|  | ¢ A 8 |  |

In the open room, Fergani (West) was one down in 3\%, as expected.
In the closed room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Di Bello | L'Ecuyer | D'Avossa | Marcinski |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 乌$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \varphi$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

The simplest way to beat the contract was by leading partner's suit (diamonds) and (if necessary) leading another diamond after partner's heart return.
However, the Italian pair employed a strong losystem when not vulnerable, so diamonds were not necessarily a
real suit. Di Bello preferred the aggressive lead of $\oslash K$. Everything seemed to be fine as the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ and J won the first two tricks, but in fact the defence was somewhat late in attacking diamonds, and there was a danger that one of their winners would disappear on the 2 Q .
At trick three, Di Bello finally switched to a diamond. His partner won the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ and cashed the $\ulcorner\mathbf{A}$. Surely there was no point of ruffing, he thought, as a fourth heart may promote a trump trick in case partner has $\boldsymbol{x} \mathrm{Jx}$. Wrong! This was the final chance for him to lead a second diamond before declarer got his discard. Marcinski ruffed the fourth heart with 0 , drew trumps and played A followed by a low club (in case this didn't work he could always resort to the diamond finesse later). Thus 2 Q became declarer's eighth trick before the defenders got their sixth, and Italy lost 2 IMPs instead of gaining 3.
In the next board Italy did even worse, missing good chances at both tables and conceding 6 IMPs while they could have gained at least II.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/WVul.

- AKQJ 106

คK863
$\checkmark 42$
\& 10


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fergani | Di Franco | Pollack | Manno |
|  | $1 \boldsymbol{1}$ | $\mathbf{2} \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| Rdbl | $2 \boldsymbol{s}$ | All Pass |  |

Di Franco's bidding was inconsistent. When he decided to double $2 \triangleleft$ in the re-opening seat, he was prepared to stand a penalty pass by partner. So why did he change his mind after West redoubled for SOS? He could hardly be afraid of a heart contract.
Assuming perfect play, $2 \triangleleft$ is I down after the normal spade lead and 2 down after a $\vee A$ or club lead, but after the SOS redouble Canada would have played $2 \boxtimes$, which is down 2 after both normal leads (spade or trump). Cooperating with partner would have probably brought in +500 , but North's indisciplined 2 bid resulted in only +170 (after East erred by going up with $\diamond$ A too early).

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Di Bello | L'Ecuyer | D'Avossa | Marcinski |
|  | 19 | $I \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | $1 乌$ | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | $4 \varrho$ | All Pass |  |

In the other room, L'Ecuyer upgraded his hand to a strong le opening, and doubling the opponents at level one was out of the question. However, South's hand was good enough to force game facing a 16+ 1s opening.
Declarer took the $\triangleleft$ Q lead with his king and drew trumps in five rounds. D'Avossa correctly discarded three diamonds and a heart, but he erred when declarer led a diamond. Dummy still had a heart entry, so going up with the ace would not have helped even in case declarer's $\diamond 2$ was a singleton. Declarer always has nine tricks, but in the actual layout the early play of ace gives him a tenth by finessing against the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$. Instead, playing low, winning the next club trick and leading a heart to remove dummy's entry would have set the contract.

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.

- A 93
$\checkmark$ AK 1054
$\diamond 3$
2 10975

| $\pm 102$ |  |  | Q Q J 85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 83$ |  |  | $\bigcirc 172$ |
| $\diamond$ K 10 | 54 W | E | $\diamond$ AJ962 |
| \& K 8 |  |  | \& $A$ |
|  | ¢ K |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Fergani | Di Franco | Pollack | Manno |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 24 | Pass | 3 - | All Pass |

West's 2s was some kind of a mixed diamond raise. Both Italians abstained from bidding despite the fact that their opponents had announced a diamond fit. Declarer lost the obvious four tricks for plus IIO.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Di Bello | L'Ecuyer | D'Avossa <br> $1 \diamond$ | Marcinski |
| $3 \diamond$ | $3 \oslash$ | Pass | $4 \triangleright$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

In the replay, Canada displayed less timidity, but they were unable to stop below game. There are two ways for the defence to beat $4 \Omega$. The prosaic one is to lead a spade and develop a trick there before declarer gets a discard on dummy's clubs. However, that didn't happen at any table, because the singleton A is a standout lead. But after the club lead, a spade switch will not do, nor is the $\diamond A$ any good. East must find the diamond underlead and get a club ruff before it's too late.
Is this play too difficult? The record of play in the Round of 16 proved that at this level (at least) one may expect the defenders to find it.At several matches, $4 \checkmark$ was defeated by the diamond underlead at both tables. However, at trick, I Di Bello signalled with 8 rather than 2 . This card may
have misled his partner. In any case after East's spade switch declarer drew trumps and played on clubs for his +620 . This mistake was costly: 12 IMPs to Canada instead of a push.
Overcoming a deficit of 17 with eight boards to go was not an impossible task for the strong Italian team, but this was just not their day.

Board 30. Dealer East. None Vul.
, K 6
คKQ9632
$\diamond A 5$
\& K 63

-A5432
$\vee$ J 7
$\diamond 6$
\& A 10752

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fergani | Di Franco | Pollack <br> Pass | Mass |
| $3 \diamond$ | $3 \bigcirc$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

It is not easy to find fault with any of Italy's bids at this table, but the bottom line was a ridiculous 3NT contract. After the expected diamond lead, Canada had no problem to beat this by three tricks - this is why people preempt in bridge!
North would have liked to rebid $4 \diamond$, had this meant "choice of games," but most players would have interpreted this as "good overcall with spade support".

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Di Bello | L'Ecuyer | D'Avossa | Marcinski |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | $3 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \curvearrowright$ |

All Pass
In the other room there was a small but important difference in the bidding: East supported his partner to $4 \diamond$. Was this really a "pressure bid"? According to East's cards, facing a diamond preempt, the opponents were likely to make $4 \oslash$ (but not $6 \vee$ ) and certainly East should not have been afraid of 3NT.
The unnecessary $4 \diamond$ bid simply forced South to find the right solution and bid $4 \checkmark$. The play was quite easy with II obvious tricks. In fact, only a lead of $\vee \mathcal{A}$ holds this to II tricks. East's diamond lead allowed declarer to ruff a diamond, draw trumps and develop a black-suit squeeze against him for the second overtrick.
This squeeze had no influence on the state of the match, as Italy was booked for a I2-IMP loss anyway. Canada's lead climbed to 29, and at the end of the day it was 41 .
Canada's 214-173 win was somewhat shocking, but clearly

Italy isn't the same team since some of its greatest players left it after winning the 2013 Bermuda Bowl. Canada has also suffered from the exodus of some of its best players to the USA, but now it is the sole representative of North America in the Open quarterfinals. Their next opponents are the formidable Team Monaco.

## Juanita Chambers 1956-2016

Three-time world champion Juanita Chambers passed away on July 29, 2016. In June, she was on the U.S. Women's team (Lynn Deas, Beth Palmer, Janice Seamon-Molson, Tobi Sokolow and Sylvia Shi) that won the right to represent the U.S. In Wroclaw. Palmer noted, "Although in retrospect she was already sick, Juanita played great."
Chambers won her first World Championship, the 1987 Venice Cup, in Jamaica, also playing on a team with Lynn Deas and Beth Palmer. Playing with Peter Weichsel, she won the Mixed Pairs in 1990. In 1996, she was on the winning team in what was then the Women's Olympiad. In addition, she won 18 North American championships.
Chambers dropped out of bridge in 2001, overcome by years of drug addiction and alcoholism. She returned in 2013, having beaten her demons through a combination of rehab and religion. Said Palmer, "Bridgewise, it was as though she had never left."
Last year, when Sylvia Moss was unable to go to Chennai at the last minute, the USA 2 team (Deas, Joanna Glasson, Palmer, Seamon-Molson and Sokolow) added Juanita. She and her partner had never played together before Chennai, but they played well and helped the team to a silver medal. Juanita was thrilled and valued it more than the medals she won while addicted. "Sadly," said Palmer, "Juanita did not live long enough to compete in Wroclaw, but the U.S. Team, who added Kerri Sanborn, is dedicating this tournament to her memory."


# Welcome to Vinius Cup 2016 

## 30th September-2nd October Vilnius, Lithuania



## Schedule



Prize pool starts from 4000 euro.

## Venue

The tournament venue is Panorama Hotel. www.panoramahotel.lt
Standard double rooms $48 €$ (breakfast included).
You can book rooms in Panorama Hotel till 23rd of September.
Please send your reservations to reservation@mikotelgroup.com with special note "BRIDGE" in order to get speclial prices. Also please indicate arrival and departure date, and guest names.

## Registration

Visit our website sportbridge.lt for more information and registration form filling.


All knockout matches here comprise 96 boards. The logic behind this format is to minimize the element of luck. In most matches, the stronger team built up a good lead at some stage and the weaker team had no answer. Few matches did go to the wire, including a Mixed Teams match that ended in a dramatic I-IMP victory for USA against Japan. The Italy-China match in the same category turned out to be even closer.
Two boards to go, China led I88-I82.
Board 31. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- KQ 7632
-1053
$\triangleleft K 7$
\& 83
- 104
$\bigcirc$ K Q 2
$\diamond A 986$
\& K Q J 4

| N | 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\bigcirc{ }^{\circ} 7$ |
| W E | $\checkmark$ QJ 10543 |
| S | - A 1062 |

- 

คA9864
$\diamond 2$
8975

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Hou | Golin | Wang <br> Pass |
| 10 | IQ | 39 | 49 |
| 50 | All Pass |  |  |

The normal contract for East-West was $5 \diamond$, the success of which depends upon the trump finesse. Five clubs, reached at this table, was not much worse, but the $\diamond$ K was offside so China scored +50 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fu | Mariani | Zhang | M. Buratti |
| INT | Pass | 2Q | Pass |
| 3e | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

The Chinese pair went awry somewhere in the bidding and reached the terrible $3 N T$. N/S have seven top tricks plus maybe the $\diamond$ K, but look what happened: North led $\boldsymbol{\Delta} 2$. South won $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ and continued $\$ 9$. North covered declarer's ten with the king and continued with $\stackrel{Q}{\mathrm{Q}}$. After some thought, South... played small and blocked the suit. When she won the $\$ 8$, Monica Buratti had nothing better to do than cashing $\vee A$. Her partner still got a trick with $\diamond K$ at the end. So this was +100 and 2 IMPs to Italy, instead of 3 IMPs available by taking all of their top tricks. China led by 4 with one board to play.

Board 32. Dealer West. E/W Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lanzarotti | Hou | Golin | Wang |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $3 \dot{5}$ | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

China bid bravely to game with 22 HCP , but after the heart lead Wang could not make it. She ended up one trick short - Italy +50 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fu | Mariani | Zhang | M. Buratti |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | INT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Mariani found the winning pass over his partner's INT. In order to win the match, Italy needed 5 IMPs, i.e. a difference of 170 or more in their favour. Could Monica



Yu Zhang, China
Buratti take eight tricks? Surely. She won the heart lead with her $\vee \mathrm{Q}$, conceded a diamond to the king, won the next heart with her $>\mathbf{A}$ and cashed the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$. Three tricks have already been won, and there were four high minor-suit cards in her hand. The eighth tricks should have come from spades - a simple play. Even in case the holder of has all four remaining hearts, her contract would not be in danger.
But she preferred to get it over with quickly and cashed her top tricks. After all, everyone says overtricks do not matter at IMPs.
Well, in a very close match they do matter. Making seven tricks tied the match at I88. Italy had to play eight more boards after missing two easy chances to win outright.
In the first tie-break board, Italy had a dream start:
Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.

- A 92
$\checkmark$ AKJIO 2
$\diamond 106$
\& K 82

| Q Q 753 | N | -106 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 5$ |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 93 |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 84 | W E | $\diamond$ K J 92 |
| \& AJ106 | S | \& 9543 |
|  | ¢ KJ8 4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 8764$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 753$ |  |
|  | 2 Q 7 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Montanari | Fu | Cesari | Zhang |
|  | 18 | Pass | $2 \varnothing$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | 2NT | Pass |
| 39 | $3 \varangle$ | All Pass |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hou | Mariani | Wang | M. Buratti |
|  | I $\varnothing$ | Pass | $3 \varnothing$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

The direct jump to $3 \bigcirc$ was much more successful than the slower route. Hou (West) doubled aggressively for takeout and his partner saw nothing better than leaving it in. Both tables made nine tricks, but Italy were doubled into game so they gained 9 IMPs.
However, they blew it in the very next deal, where North's 4-3-3-3 shape contrasted sharply with the crazy distributions all around him.

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| ¢ K Q J 10 | 542 |  | ¢ 73 |
| $\bigcirc 108$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ - |
| $\diamond 2$ |  |  | $\diamond$ A Q 108543 |
| \& K 6 |  |  | 2 J 874 |
|  | 4 |  |  |
|  |  | J 75 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Montanari | Fu | Cesari | Zhang |
|  |  | 3 - | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| 49 | 5 | 54 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pas |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Hou | Mariani | Wang | M. Buratti |
|  |  | 3 | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| 49 | Dble | All Pas |  |

After East, South and West bid what they had, North had a decision to make, and Fu got it right by competing one level further, while Mariani doubled 4s.
There was only one way to defeat 4e: leading 4 A followed by a low spade, which would have prevented heart ruffs. Fu was close by leading a low trump, but declarer finessed diamonds so one heart was parked on the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ while the other one was ruffed. This sufficed for one down in 5s doubled.
Mariani's heart lead allowed two heart ruffs. There was no need to finesse diamonds. Declarer lost just two clubs and a spade, scoring +590 which was worth 12 IMP to China, who led by 3 at this stage.
There were no more crazy deals to come, and this small lead stood up. China moved on to the Quarter-finals while Italy were left to regret their missed opportunities.


# 8th European Open Championships 

## Palazzo dei Congressi \& Teatro Verdi

# Montecatini Terme, Italy 10th to 24th June 2017 

## MIXED/OPEN/WOMEN/SENIORS Pairs and Teams

## PROGRAMME

| From | To | Championship | Event |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Saturday $10^{\text {th }}$ June | Tuesday $13{ }^{\text {th }}$ June | Mixed Teams |  |
| Monday $12^{\text {th }}$ June |  |  | Open BAM |
| Tuesday $13{ }^{\text {th }}$ June | Friday $16^{\text {th }}$ June | Mixed Pairs |  |
| Thursday $15^{\text {th }}$ June | Friday $16^{\text {th }}$ June |  | EBL Cup |
| Saturday $17^{\text {th }}$ June | Wednesday $21{ }^{\text {st }}$ June | Open Teams |  |
| Saturday $17^{\text {th }}$ June | Tuesday $20^{\text {th }}$ June | Women/Seniors Teams |  |
| Monday $19^{\text {th }}$ June |  |  | Open BAM |
| Tuesday $20^{\text {th }}$ June | Saturday $24^{\text {th }}$ June | Open Pairs |  |
| Tuesday $20^{\text {th }}$ June | Thursday $22^{\text {nd }}$ June | Women/Seniors Pairs |  |
| Friday $23{ }^{\text {rd }}$ June | Saturday $24^{\text {th }}$ June |  | Open Pairs Event |

$\square$
was certainly that chance for the French with 32 boards to

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volcker | Tislevoll | Bessis | Ware <br> Pass |
| $I \diamond$ | Dble | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  | play.

In the fifth of six sessions, New Zealand sent Matthew Brown and Michael Whibley to play in the open room against Cedric Lorenzini and Jean-Christophe Quantin. In the closed room, it was Geir-Olav Tislevoll and Michael Ware for New Zealand against Frederic Volcker and Thomas Bessis. The score was I32-8| for New Zealand.
The match started with three pushes, then France scored. Lorenzini in the open room made eight tricks in while Volcker in the closed room played in $2 \triangleleft$ making three. Plus 110 twice meant 6 IMPs to the French. This board was good for another gain for France.


The 9 went to dummy's ace.At trick two, Quantin called for a low heart from dummy. Whibley won with the 8 K and played the $\diamond I O$ to the jack and king, ruffed in dummy. Quantin played a heart to his jack, ruffed a diamond, pitched a diamond on the $\vee Q$ and played the $\triangle A$. Whibley ruffed with the 7, but Quantin overruffed with the 10 and played the 10 . Brown ruffed and played the $\diamond A$, forcing declarer to ruff with the Q Q. The defenders still had a spade trick coming, but that was it. Quantin had made 10 tricks for plus 170.At the other table:

Ware also got the singleton club lead. He won the ace and tried to cash the king, butVolcker ruffed and played the $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, ruffed in dummy. Ware tried a club ruff with his jack, but Volcker overruffed with the king.When the smoke cleared, Ware was two down for minus 200 and France had a 9-IMP gain. The score was I35-97 for New Zealand.
France closed the gap further on this deal:
Board 9. Dealer North. E/WVul.
© K J

- J 107
$\diamond$ Q 86
2K Q 983


West

## Brown

3\%
It's not clear what 30 was intended to show. It appears to be a transfer fit-jump in diamonds. If so, it's strange that Whibley declined to bid game. Quantin led the $\diamond 5$, solving the problem of locating the queen. Three rounds of trumps allowed Whibley to pitch a losing club from dummy and the friendly split in trumps allowed him to take II tricks for plus 200.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Volcker | Tislevoll | Bessis | Ware |
|  | 19 | 19 | Dble |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \varphi$ | All Pass |

Bessis didn't get the overtrick, but plus 620 was good for 10 IMPs to France, now trailing by 28 IMPs.
New Zealand had a reply on this deal:

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

- J 10854
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond$ K 105
- AKJ4

$$
2
$$

$\diamond 11075432$
$\diamond 984$
\& 52


| West | North |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Lorenzini |$\quad$| East |
| :--- |
| Whibley |$\quad$| South |
| :--- |
| Quantin |
| Pass |

The 10 went to declarer's king, and the was covered by the queen and king. Lorenzini played the $\odot \mathrm{K}$ to Whibley's ace. The heart return was taken by the queen and a diamond played to declarer's IO. Lorenzini could not avoid three down for minus 500 and an 8-IMP loss (Bessis scored plus 140 in 38 ). The score was 143-107. New Zealand's lead grew on the next board.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
¢ 82

- A 3
$\triangleleft A 8652$
* K 1098

| , AKJIO 753 | N | ¢ 96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 108$ |  | $\bigcirc 97542$ |
| $\checkmark$ - | W E | $\diamond 1973$ |
| 9 7432 | S | - 65 |
|  | , Q 4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K Q J 6 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KQ 104 |  |
|  | \& A Q J |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Lorenzini | Whibley | Quantin |
| $4 \varsigma$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | $4 N T^{*}$ | Pass | $5 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

4NT Pick a minor
It was over quickly as Brown cashed two high spades for plus 100. The auction was the same at the other table except that Tislevoll passed when his Ware bid $5 \diamond$. Plus 600 meant 12 IMPs to New Zealand, now ahead I55-I07. The set ended with New Zealand in front 159-I20. France had 16 boards to try to catch up.
The French won the sixth and final set $30-8$, but it was not enough. New Zealand was in the quarterfinal round against Spain, upset winners over the strong USA team.

## Much ado about nothing

There were many comments on social networks about the draw of the three groups in the Open series.
They seemed to lead to one consensus: Group B was much too strong, Group $C$ much too weak.
Rumours are not always proved by facts!
The "weakest" group allowed five teams to qualify for quarter-finals, while, coming from the "group of death", only three teams are among the last eight.
That means NO team from group A won their Knockout match in the round of 16 .
Is it judgement to be blamed or should we use the French saying:"la glorieuse incertitude du sport"?

- JPM


## Dealing machines and cards

The Duplimates used for the duplication during the championship are sold for 2280EUR. You are strongly advised to order as soon as possible, because they will probably be sold out very quickly. Contact Jannerstens at the bridge stall in the Reception area, or drop a line to per@jannersten.com.
The (new) Wroclaw cards that you are playing with will be sold after usage for l63EUR per 240 decks. Other quantities on request in the book stall.

## World Championship Book 2016 - Wroclaw

The official book of these championships will be ready around April next year. It will consist of approximately 350 large full colour pages and will include coverage of all the championship events, with particular emphasis on the latter stages of the Open and Women's Teams. There will be a full results service and many colour photographs.

The principle analysts, as in recent years, will be John Carruthers, Barry Rigal, Brian Senior and Geo Tislevoll, probably backed up by one or two guest writers who have not yet been confirmed.

On publication, the official retail price will be US\$35 plus whatever your local bookseller charges for postage. For the duration of the championships, you can pre-order via Jan Swaan in the Press Room at the reduced price of 100 Zlotys, 25 Euros, or 30 US\$, including postage.

[^0]thus earned the right to play each other rather than one of

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | F Goded | Whibley | Lantaron |
| $1 \otimes 8$ | Pass | 18 | $1 \$$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | All Pass |  | the so-called favourites.

To accommodate the players on another hot Monday morning, the initial boards were a little sleepy. Spain registered a small part-score swing or two and lost a few overtricks here and there. They were leading 10-3 when the boards gradually woke up. This was board 8:

| Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - K 974 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 542$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ J 72 |  |  |  |
| - 532 |  |  |  |
| - A |  | N | - J 532 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 73 |  | w | 8 J 109 |
| $\checkmark$ K Q 94 |  | W | $\checkmark 653$ |
| - AJ864 | S K Q 10 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q Q } 1086 \\ & \text { Q Q Q } 86 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 108 |  |  |
|  | \& 97 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Wasik | Bach | Knap | Cornell |
| 1\% | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| 2 - | Pass | 32 | All Pass |

It is not a shame to end up in a par-tscore on these E/W hands, non-vulnerable. On this friendly layout, II tricks were easy enough. Spain +I50.


Luis Lantaron, Spain

As 18 showed spades, Lantaron's is was a take-out double. Goded had nowhere to go, so the Spanish pair ended up in a curious 3-3 fit. When neither opponent found a double, the contract went down five at a rate of 50 per trick. New Zealand only +250 , but still 3 IMPs to them. More IMPs went to New Zealand on the next board:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/WVul.

- KJ 2

คAJ74
$\diamond 1064$
Q Q 85

- Q 10854
$\bigcirc 95$
$\diamond 932$
-976

| N | ¢ A 97 |
| :---: | :---: |
| $W^{N}$ | $\bigcirc$ Q 1062 |
| W E | $\diamond$ K Q 7 |
| S | \& KJ2 |
| $\pm 63$ |  |
| $\bigcirc$ K 83 |  |
| $\checkmark$ AJ 85 |  |
| A 1043 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik | Bach | Knap | Cornell |
|  | 12 | INT | Dble |
| $2 \Phi$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | 38 | Pass | 39 |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Though East found the best lead of a low spade to the queen and king, he could not beat the contract.As East was marked with all the missing high cards, declarer could hardly go wrong in creating an endplay on him. He played a diamond to the queen and ace, diamond to the ten and king. As East could exit safely only in diamonds, declarer cashed two tricks on which East pitched a heart. Three rounds of hearts followed, East winning the queen and being obliged to bring a trick in either black suit. New Zealand +400 . Please note the effect of North's very light opening bid.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | F Goded | Whibley | Lantaron |
|  | Pass | INT | Pass |
| $2 \odot$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ | All Pass |

When North did not open in the replay, E/W had a free run to 24. This contract went just one down for +100 to Spain but 7 IMPs more to New Zealand.

A few moments later, both the board numbers and the swings reached double figures:

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

| - - |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 742$ |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 64 |  |  |  |
| 2AK5432 |  |  |  |
| - J9654 |  | N | , Q 73 |
| $\bigcirc$ QJ |  |  | ¢K10865 |
| $\checkmark 983$ |  | E | $\checkmark$ K 72 |
| - Q 108 |  | S | -96 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \triangle A K 1082 \\ & \& A 93 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 105 |  |  |
|  | \& 17 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Wasik | Bach | Knap | Cornell |
| Pass | 180 | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

If West leads the $\vee Q$, which holds the trick, then so long as East overtakes the $\vee$ J, there is no way for declarer to get to nine tricks, no matter whether he ducks the Q to West or not - as West can safely exit in diamonds. Declarer quickly learned about his fate when he won the third round of hearts and took the losing diamond finesse. One down, Spain +100.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | F Goded | Whibley | Lantaron |
| 2 | $3 \&$ | $3 \infty$ | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Brown also led the $\vee Q$ and continued the $\vee J$, but at this point East fell from grace and played low. West continued a diamond but it would not help any more at it was West who would get the defensive club trick. Just made, Spain +600 and 12 IMPs back to regain the lead: 22-14. More IMPs went to Spain on another defensive problem:

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

|  | -10 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A J 7 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 532 |  |
|  | \& J 9843 |  |
| Q K 5 | N | - A Q 92 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 10984$ |  | $\bigcirc 63$ |
| $\diamond$ J8764 | W E | $\diamond$ A |
| 9 K | S | \& A 10752 |
|  | ¢ 87643 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 52 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 109 |  |
|  | \& Q 6 |  |

## West <br> Wasik

INT
2NT
North
Bach
Pass
Pass
Pass
East
Knap
19
29
$3 N T$

South
Cornell
Pass
Pass
All Pass

The normal contract was duly reached and North led a normal diamond. Dummy won the ace perforce and immediately led a heart to the king in his hand. When North made a "routine" duck, declarer had nine tricks. Spain +600 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brown | F Goded | Whibley | Lantaron |
|  | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| INT | Pass | 2\% | Pass |
| $2 \checkmark$ | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 30 | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

After a Gazzilli-style auction, New Zealand reached the same 3NT contract in the other room but here, North led the $\$ 10$, which already had the effect of starting to block declarer's communications somewhat.
Declarer won dummy's queen and immediately tried for his best chances, a heart to his king. When North won his ace and continued a diamond, declarer's chances were gone. Two down, Spain another +200 and I3 IMPs more to them.
The penultimate board of the set was about how much to overbid.

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.


New Zealand overbid to such an extent that even the friendly 4 A lead could not help them when the diamond finesse proved wrong. Spain +100 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | F Goded | Whibley | Lantaron <br> Pass |
| Pass | 10 | 14 | 24 |
| 34 | Pass | Pass | 49 |

## All Pass

Spain did not overbid that much and thus returned to safe ground when West, here too, led the friendly which led to the disposal of a losing heart. Spain a lucky +130 and 6 IMPs more.
New Zealand got part of their revenge on the last board of the set:

Board 16. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
\& K Q 97
$\varnothing$ -
$\diamond$ AKQ 432
\& K 83


A decent auction for a par result: ten tricks, New Zealand +130 .
In the other room, Spain were well overboard:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | F Goded | Whibley | Lantaron |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 s}$ | 3 | $3 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| $4 \diamond$ | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |  |

No doubt, Goded was hoping to find an ace in partner's hand - the bidding suggested that a bit and in fact, Lantaron did hold an ace. When this ace did not help the Spanish cause very much (a club loser went on it when the defence led hearts), the too-freely bid contract had to go two down. New Zealand +100 and 6 IMPs where they could have added another four IMPs by throwing the axe...
After the first set, Spain were leading 4I-20.
Championship cards


The championship cards that you play here are The championship cards that you play here are
for sale for $€ 0.68$ (bulk rate) in the book stall so for sale for $€ 0.68$ (bulk
long as supply lasts.

## Micro Bridge leads robot tournament By Al Levy

Day 2 of the 20th Ourgame World Computer-Bridge Championship ended with six robots in contention for the semi-final KO stage.
The leader after three rounds of the 32-board round robins is Micro Bridge ( 45.80 VPs) followed by pretournament favourite Wbridge5 (38.7I), Q-Plus Bridge (35.1 I), Bridge Baron (32.35), Xinrui (3I.57), Shark Bridge (30.60), RoboBridge (24.67) and Meadowlark Bridge (0.89).

With three rounds completed, some guesses are in order. Meadowlark Bridge has not improved, last competing 12 years ago, and the relative showing of the other robots shows the progress that has been made since then. New entry Xinrui shows it is competitive. RoboBridge will have to score big to have an outside chance to advance.
Bridge Baron defeated Wbridge5 is their third-round match, 89-66, with Board 9 helping.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- QJ 752

QJ864
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$

- 1082

© K Q 10532
$\diamond 4$
2 AJ 94
West
Baron
Pass
All Pass
North
Wbridge5
Pass
3
East
Baron
la
Pass


## South

Wbridge5
$2 \nabla$
$4 \checkmark$

## All Pass

West led the 4 to dummy's jack, East contributing the ten and South the six. Declarer tried a low heart from dummy won by West with his ace - East discarding the $\$ 9$. West now played a diamond to partner's ace for a spade ruff. With an unavoidable club loser, declarer had to go down.
At the other table, after an eccentric 2s opening by North, the bidding continued Pass $-3 \bigcirc$ - Pass $-4 \bigcirc$, All Pass. West also led his singleton spade. When dummy's Q held, declarer played the 8 J to West's ace, East contributing the 10 . Now, however, instead of trying to get a spade ruff, West continued with a heart, allowing the contract to be made for plus 420 and 10 IMPs to Bridge Baron.
Steven Smith, developer of Bridge Baron, is checking to see if East's spade plays of the 10,9 indicated the $\diamond A$ or West's double-dummy algorithm chose a diamond over a club return. Algorithms notwithstanding, it seems that when declarer played a heart at trick two, East's play of the $\diamond 9$ would send an unambiguous signal about the location of the ace.

## Open Teams QF - SI <br> Poland v Sweden

By Micke Melander

## Great plays

In Lille four years ago, Sweden and Poland, two giants in the bridge world, met in the final of the World Bridge Games in the Open series. Sweden won quite comfortably in the end. The final was repeated in Chennai in last year's Bermuda Bowl final, where Poland finally won after a very dramatic last set, with both teams leading by just a few IMPs at various stages. So this is the third match, which clearly could have had been the final of these championships as well - but with the big difference now that one has to eliminate the other at the quarterfinal stage. Those following the European Team Championships know that we should expect a very tight battle.
First blood came on the third board and the IMPs went to Sweden.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- Q 1094
$\bigcirc$ AJ 8
$\diamond$ K 102
2 186


| N | ¢ K 32 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | -Q9653 |
| W E | $\diamond 86$ |
| S | 2) A 104 |
| ¢ 187 |  |
| $\bigcirc 2$ |  |
| $\diamond$ A Q 9743 |  |
| * Q 93 |  |

Open Room:

| West <br> Sylvan | North <br> Jassem | East <br> Wrang | South <br> Mazurkiewicz <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | $3 \diamond$ | Dble | Pass |
| 38 | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room:
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{llll}\text { West } & \text { North } & \text { East } & \text { South } \\
\text { M Klukowski } & \text { Nyström }\end{array}
$$ \quad $$
\begin{array}{l}\text { Gawrys }\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{l}Upmark <br>

Pass\end{array}\right]\)| Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| All Pass |  |

When Klukowski in the closed room passed in second seat, the Polish pair sold out to Two Diamonds. Declarer got a heart lead, pulled trumps and simply set up his spades for nine easy tricks.
There was far more action in the open room, where West did open, and East even optimistically enquired if they should try for game with his double. With no extras, West saw no reason to try that and the Swedes settled in Three

Hearts. North led the ten of diamonds, which went to South's ace, the three of diamonds was played back to the jack and North's king. Here was the moment of truth: would North find the shift to spades so the defense would be able to set up the setting trick, before declarer could develop clubs and pitch his losing spade on the last club? Obviously South's three of diamonds was considered enough reason for North to play back the jack of clubs rather than a spade. Declarer won in hand with the king, and put the king of hearts on the table, North won with the ace and played a second club. Sylvan then went up with the ace, played a spade to the ace and finessed in trumps. When clubs were in fact 3-3, he claimed his nine tricks for 140 and 6 IMPs to Sweden. Well done to take advantage of the defender's slip. The Polish team kicked back immediately.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

|  | - 532 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - A Q J 4 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 3 |  |  |
|  | - A653 |  |  |
| - A Q 6 | N |  | - J10984 |
| PK8732 |  |  | $\bigcirc 105$ |
| $\checkmark 10$ |  |  | $\diamond$ J 74 |
| - QJ 84 | S |  | -K10 7 |
|  | - K |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 96$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A | 9 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sylvan | Jassem | Wrang | Mazurkiewicz |
| 18 | Pass | $1 \$$ | $2 \diamond$ |
| $2 \&$ | $3 Q$ | Pass | $3 N T$ |

All Pass
Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M Klukowski | Nyström | Gawrys | Upmark |
| $1 \$$ | Pass | I | 3 |
| Pass | 5 | All Pass |  |

The Swedes in the open room could have sacrificed in Four Spades, maybe pushing the Polish pair into playing Five Diamonds or defending Four Spades. When neither happened the defense did what they could trying to defeat the contract by kicking off with a club. Mazurkiewicz won with the ace of clubs and ran his seven diamond tricks. At the end he was happy with taking his nine tricks and so just cashed out the ace of hearts instead of trying the finesse
there. Plus 600 was great score when the Swedes came to play the wrong contract in the Open Room and didn't find the winning line. Again the queen of clubs was led, Upmark won with the ace and played a diamond to the ace and tried the heart finesse, which worked. To be able to get to his hand to repeat the heart finesse, he had to play a second round of trumps and when the diamonds weren't 2-2 he was down, since East could ruff and return a spade through declarer.
The winning line (which the commentators, with the sight of all four hands, were sure was right - would have been to overtake the queen of diamonds with the king, finesse in hearts, then finesse your way back to hand in diamonds, pull the last trump and finesse in hearts. Certainly not an obvious line, but since you need trumps 2-2 or 3-I with the key singleton in West, maybe it at least should be obvious to start diamonds by overtaking the queen... Still 12 IMPs to Poland, who suddenly were in the lead.
The action was far from over. Sweden took back their pole position immediately when Sylvan made an overcall that drove the Polish into the wrong contract.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

|  | 4 J 952 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 82 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 87 |  |
|  | +98 |  |
| - A 4 | N | -1073 |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ 106 |  | $\bigcirc 75$ |
| $\checkmark$ QJ 104 |  | $\diamond$ K 9632 |
| ¢ J 104 | S | \& 653 |
|  | ¢ K Q 86 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 943$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 5$ |  |
|  | \& AKQ 72 |  |


| Open Room: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| Sylvan | Jassem | Wrang | Mazurkiewicz |
|  | Pass | Pass | I2 |
| I $\vee$ | INT | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |


| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| West | North | East | South |
| M Klukowski | Nyström | Gawrys | Upmark |
|  | Pass | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | I $\vee$ | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | $2 \uparrow$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | $4 \uparrow$ | All Pass |  |

Nyström had no problem in getting his ten tricks in spades for 620 . In the open room, Jassem, with solid heart stoppers, went to declare 3NT. The seven of hearts was lead to West's ace. West returned the queen of diamonds. Why Jassem followed to the first trick with the eight of hearts from his hand is a real mystery.

Maybe he was so affected by the fact that they had missed their great spade game and had to struggle in an inferior game that he missed the point. When clubs were 3-3 declarer had five clubs, one diamond and could in fact pick up the hearts for three tricks - since he had some help from that overcall... but by discarding the eight that was now impossible. Jassem ducked the two rounds of diamonds that followed after the ace of hearts. He was in fact still making, if he would have saved his clubs in dummy since he could win the third round of diamonds and bring down all his winners to squeeze West out of the queen of diamonds and endplay him. But since he chose to pitch two clubs and play on spades, the defense simply collected two down coming from four diamonds and their major-suit aces. The audience (bar the Swedes) were signally unimpressed.
Sweden had more IMPs coming to their account.
Board 6. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- 853
© K 107
$\diamond$ Q 106
\& A 984

| \& AK 10976 | N | Q- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 953$ | W E | $\bigcirc$ Q 8642 |
| $\diamond 54$ | W E | $\checkmark 987$ |
| 2102 | S | Q Q J 63 |
|  | Q Q J 42 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKJ 32 |  |
|  | \& K 75 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | Jassem | Wrang | Mazurkiewicz |
|  |  | Pass | 1\% |
| 14. | 2\% | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |
| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| M Klukowski | Nyström | Gawrys | Upmark |
|  |  | $2 \diamond$ | Dble |
| 3 | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | 3NT | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

With nine sure winners, Mazurkievicz had no problem collecting his nine tricks. In fact, the total went to ten when West led the ten of spades.
More interesting was the play in the closed room, where Nyström was doubled for penalty by Klukowski's "juniordouble." Gawrys knew to lead a spade...but there was a problem: he had none! The queen of hearts came out, and declarer won with the ace and cashed his five diamonds and king and ace of clubs to come down to the following ending:


Nyström, who was pretty sure about the layout of the board now exited with a club throwing Gawrys in with the queen of clubs to lead away into declarer's tenace in hearts for eleven tricks. Smoothly done, and 750 got the Swedes another 8 IMPs.
The Poles got 5 IMPs back a few boards later when Nyström didn't read the situation as well as he had on the previous board and went two down in a contract that could have been made, at the same time as the Swedes at the other table also went one down in their direction.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.


In Six Clubs, Jassem received the eight of hearts as the opening lead. Declarer cashed the ace and king of spades to pitch the losing hearts from hand. But when the diamond finesse didn't work and declarer couldn't solve clubs without having a loser he was bound to go down. The play went the same way in the Open Room, but when Nyström only needed II tricks he had no problem getting them (though he had to consider a club safety play, which would have backfired badly). That wasI2 more Swedish IMPs.

Board I3. Dealer North. All Vul.

$$
10
$$

$\checkmark$ AJ 7
$\checkmark$ Q 532
\& J 9843

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ K 5 | N | - A Q J 92 |
| ¢ K 10984 |  | $\bigcirc 63$ |
| $\diamond 18764$ |  | $\diamond$ A |
| \% K | S | \& A 10752 |
|  | ¢ 87643 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 52 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 109 |  |
|  | \& Q 6 |  |
| Open Room: |  |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sylvan | Jassem | Wrang | Mazurkiewicz |
|  | Pass | 1s | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass |
| 4s | All Pass |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M Klukowski | Nyström | Gawrys | Upmark |
|  | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 3\% | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 49 | All Pass |  |  |

Both declarers played in Four Spades. Wrang got the ten of diamonds lead. He won with the ace and immediately tried a heart to the king and North's ace. Jassem realized the danger that declarer would be able to ruff club in dummy and therefore returned the ten of spades. Declarer won in dummy, unblocked the king of clubs, ruffed a diamond, cashed the ace of hearts and tried to ruff a club, but South could ruff in before dummy with the six of spades to return another round of trumps. There was no way for declarer to make his contract and he had to concede one down.
Gawrys at the other table chose a much better line after receiving a diamond on the opening lead. He played a club to the king, ruffed a diamond, cashed the ace of diamonds and tried to ruff a club, South ruffed in with his six which forced declarer to ruff with the king, which didn't matter when the ten was with North. Three rounds of trumps
followed on which North was now squeezed. He first had to pitch the queen of diamonds and then a club. Gawrys tried to throw Nyström in with the jack of clubs but when he could exit with a small diamond to play hearts through dummy it was all over there as well - one down and again great play!
After the first segment, Sweden was ahead 39-20.

## Bridge is such a difficult game By Micke Melander

This deal comes from the round of 16 match between Poland and Turkey. Plan the play in Four Spades when you know that North opened with One Club and West reopened the bidding with a double, whereupon East bid One Diamond and you eventually got to Four Spades. West leads the seven of clubs.

```
4 A Q 94
& A Q 6 3
\diamond
2 AK 862
\ J 106 3
\diamond J 4
\diamond \9832
& 105
```

For sure it looks like there is a lot to do. You have to try to scramble ten tricks. Let's assume trumps are behaving, with the king onside. You might then have five tricks in spades, two clubs and three hearts. But how on earth do you get to your hand to play trumps? The full deal:

| Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - AQ 94 |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A Q 63 |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ - |  |  |
| \% AK862 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { K } 85 \\ & 810987 \\ & \diamond A K 654 \\ & \& 7 \end{aligned}$ | N | - 72 |
|  |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 52$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ Q 107 |
|  | S | * QJ943 |
|  | 4 J 1063 |  |
|  | - J 4 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J9832 |  |
|  | - 105 |  |

- AQ 94

PAQ6 3
$\diamond-$ AK 86

- K 85

10987
AK 654
7

Open Room:

| West <br> Sarniak | North <br> Ozgur | East <br> Baldysz | South <br> Ozbay <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \&$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Rdb | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \$$ | Pass | $1 \$$ |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West <br> Adut | North <br> Dufrat | East <br> Yavas | South <br> Zmuda <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | $1 \&$ | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 18 | All Pass |  |

In the closed room, Dufrat and Zmuda of Poland were victims of a weakness of the Polish Club, One Club can be a weak INT or any strong hand. One diamond was negative and One Heart still two-way. Zmuda couldn't bid with her scant values after One Heart, while neither could Dufrat value her hand as game forcing.
Against One Heart, Yavas led the queen of clubs. Declarer won with the ace and tried to cash the king of clubs, ruffed by West. Another round of trumps came back, and declarer tried the finesse, which lost to East's king of hearts. East immediately played back another round of trumps and when South won with the jack, she had an easy way to get the required tricks by just running the jack of spades and repeating the finesse for eight tricks.
The defense could have held declarer to seven tricks, but could never beat the contract by playing diamonds.
In the open room, things were much more interesting. North did whatever was within her powers to show a next-to-game forcing hand and eventually hit the jackpot when South worked it out and jumped to game with her three jacks.
In Four Spades Ozbay received the seven of clubs as the opening lead. Declarer jumped up with the ace, so far so good. But that's when the good things stopped. Declarer then called for the queen of trumps, and when West won with the king and shifted to a low diamond, declarer ruffed in dummy but had lost control of the hand. She eventually played the king of clubs. West ruffed and played a heart. Declarer played low and East won the king. When East exited with the queen of clubs, declarer tried to claim for one down, but the defense objected and collected two down.
As always, it's difficult to say what is right or wrong, but if you assume that trumps have to behave, you just have to realize that the heart suit has to be solved, preferably with one loser, so you want the king to be offside. Declarer should win the ace of clubs and call for a low heart. The defense will now be powerless to defeat you!

## The Polish Corner

## DBAJ O PARTNERA SWEGO

Każdy szanujący się brydżysta powinien dbać o swojego partnera. Dobry partner to prawdziwy skarb. No a jednym z elementów tej dbałości musi być pomoc w rozwiązywaniu problemów partnera, upraszczanie mu gry.
Popatrzmy na rozdanie z pierwszej części ćwierćfinałowego meczu kobiet:

Rozd. I2. NS po partii, rozd.W.

|  | $4$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 742$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A D 52 |  |
|  | \& AK 5432 |  |
| ¢ W9654 | N | , D 73 |
| $\bigcirc$ DW |  | ¢K 10865 |
| $\diamond 983$ | W E | $\checkmark$ K 72 |
| ¢ D 108 | S | ¢96 |
|  | ¢ AK 1082 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 93 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ W 105 |  |
|  | \% W 7 |  |

Francuzki wylądowały w słabym kontrakcie 3BA:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dufrat | Żochowska | Żmuda | Reess |
| pas | $1 \%$ | 18 | ktr. |
| pas | $2 \&$ | pas | $2 \boxtimes$ |
| pas | $3 \diamond$ | pas | $3 B A$ |
| pas... |  |  |  |

pas...
Kasia wyszła dama kier, a przepuszczeniu powtórzyła kiery waletem. Justyna przejęła królem. Rozgrywająca ponownie przepuściła. Justyna zagała teraz blotkę kier, as, dziewiątka karo i kier ze stołu. Teraz został ,odegrany as i król pik - z ręki dwa kara, po czym as, król i blotka trefl. Do trzeciego trefla Justyna wyrzuciła króla karo. Tą drogą oszczędziła partnerce męczarni, czy zagranie w karo nie da większej wpadki... W tej sytuacji nastąpiło natychmiastowe zagranie w piki i bez dwóch.

Trzeba tutaj pochwalić naszą parę na drugim stole za to, że ominęła rafę końcówki bezatutowej:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Willard | Sarniak | Cronier | Bałdysz |
| pas | 2\% | pas | $2 \diamond$ |
| pas | 3 | pas | 5\% |
| pas... |  |  |  |
| 2. Precision <br> $2 \diamond$ relay <br> $3 \diamond 6$ e4 $\diamond$, niez | ła ręka |  |  |

Atak nastąpił w kiery, as ze stołu. Teraz as i król pik, nieudany impas karo. E zagrał w pika i po przebiciu w ręce zostały zagrane trzy razy atuty. Swoje i 13 imp dla Polski.
W ćwierćfinale open w tym rozdaniu ponieśliśmy stratę, ale w nieco inny sposób. Tutaj uwidoczniły się problemy z licytacją rąk treflowych we Wspólnym Języku, potęgujące się, gdy nie ma się do dyspozycji otwarcia 2\} Precision.
Szwedzi zatrzymali się w końcówce:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Klukowski | Nystrom | Gawryś | Upmark |
| pas | 20 | pas | 24 |
| pas | 3 | pas | 3 |
| pas | 4\% | pas | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| ktr. | pas | pas | 5\% |

pas...
2e - naturalne, do 16 PC, układ niezrównoważony bez starszej czwórki
Natomiast nasi zapędzili się do szlemika:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | Jassem | Wrang | Mazurkiewicz |
| pas | 1\% | 18 | ktr. |
| pas | 20 | pas | 2 |
| pas | 3 | pas | 3 |
| pas | 4\% | pas | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| pas | 6\% | pas... |  |

Jassem - Mazurkiewicz grają otwarciem 2e na starszych i rebid 2éprawdopodobnie limitował górę siły N. Mimo to obie ręce zostały nieco przelicytowane.
Bez jednej i 12 imp dla Szwecji
the meeting place

Pol-Motors ${ }^{\text {i }}$
"Służąc życiu"
Staropolanka.
SoTrefl


[^0]:    Alternatively, you can pay the same prices via Paypal to Brian Senior at bsenior@hotmail.com

