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Teams in the Open, Women's, Senior and Mixed Teams are down to the last three sessions in the semi-finals today, with some upsets in the works.
In the Open, two of the favored teams - Poland and Monaco - are in trouble.
After three sessions on Wednesday, Monaco is looking at a I07-6I deficit to Spain, who defeated the strong USA team in the quarter-final round and took that momentum into the semifinals. Poland, winners of the Bermuda Bowl last year in India, find themselves behind the Netherlands 77-53 with 48 boards to play.
The spreads varied in the other events. France, after trailing by 26 against Scotland in the Women's, is down II6-I02, but USA in the Women's is up 45 against China. In the Mixed, USA's margin against Russia is just 2 IMPs. Also in the Mixed, Bulgaria, winners against Germany on the final board of the quarter-final, are trailing the Netherlands 106-77.
USA, last year's Senior winners, finished play on Wednesday with an 83-56 lead against Denmark, and France was up II7-III over Chinese Taipei.

Today's Programme Pairs:
Semi-finals
Session 6-10:00
Session 7-11:50
Session 8-14:30
Session 9-16:20
Session 10-18:10

Today's Programme Teams: Semi-finals Segment 4 - 10:30 Segment 5-14:00
Segment 6 - 17:00

## 111

Bank Polski

## 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.

Press Conference on Friday
There will be a press conference on Friday, Sept. I6, at 10 a.m. in the Pergola Terrace.

## Open Teams Semi-finals



## Women's Teams Semi-finals

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CHINA USA | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 12 \\ 33 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 40 \\ 31 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 5 \\ 38 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline 57 \\ 102 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |
| FRANCE SCOTLAND | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline 63 \\ 36 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33 \\ 34 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 46 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 102 \\ & 116 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |

## Senior Teams Semi-finals

|  | 12 |  | 3 | 4 | 56 |  | Tot |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| USA DENMARK | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 34 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27 \\ & 26 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 22 \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 83 \\ & 56 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Tot |
| FRANCE <br> CHINESE TAIPEI | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 53 \\ 41 \end{array}$ | 31 32 | 33 38 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 117 \\ & 111 \end{aligned}$ |

## Mixed Teams Semi-finals



Format for the Finals of the Pairs Competitions
There Will Be No Carry Over
Women and Seniors Pairs
The number of qualifiers to Final $A$ is equal to 18
Open Pairs Format
The number of qualifiers to Final $A$ is equal to 52 : 46 coming from Semi-final A, 6 coming from Semi-final B

Mixed Pairs Format
The number of qualifiers to Final $A$ is equal to 26 :
22 coming from semi-final A, 4 coming from Semi-final B

| Open Pairs SF A after R5 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | BERTHEAU P - HULT S | SWE-SWE | 60.88 |
| 2 | GRAVERSEN H - CLEMMENSEN P | DEN-DEN | 59.58 |
| 3 | VOLHEJNV - MACURA M | CZE-CZE | 59.19 |
| 4 | BERGDAHL T - SYLVAN J | SWE-SWE | 58.94 |
| 5 | THOMPSON B - JACOBS W | AUS-AUS | 58.59 |
| 6 | SZULEJEWSKI B - DARKIEWICZ-MONIUSZKO G | POL-POL | 57.92 |
| 7 | NAWROCKI P -WIANKOWSKI P | POL-POL | 57.53 |
| 8 | KING P - McINTOSH A | ENG-ENG | 57.18 |
| 9 | STARKOWSKIW - GOLEBIOWSKI S | POL-POL | 56.69 |
| 10 | KRISHNAN R - KIRUBAKARAMOORTHY N | IND-IND | 56.65 |
| 11 | STAMATOV J - DANAILOV D | BUL-BUL | 56.62 |
| 12 | RIMSTEDT M - RIMSTEDT O | SWE-SWE | 56.48 |
| 13 | FERGANI K - POLLACK F | CAN-CAN | 55.55 |
| 14 | JANISZEWSKI P - NOWAK K | POL-POL | 55.16 |
| 15 | LI J - ZHANG B | $\mathrm{CHN}-\mathrm{CHN}$ | 54.64 |
| 16 | NADAJ J-OGLOBLIN A | POL-POL | 54.39 |
| 17 | SZTYRAK L - JASZCZAK A | POL-POL | 54.34 |
| 18 | EIDE E - EIDE H | NOR-NOR | 54.26 |
| 19 | LINDE J - SCHWERDT C | GER-GER | 54.15 |
| 20 | TEWARI R - SHIVDASANI J | IND-IND | 53.24 |
| 21 | BARYLEWSKI M - KRZEMINSKI C | POL-POL | 53.12 |
| 22 | AUKEN S -WELLAND R | GER-GER | 52.88 |
| 23 | GILL P - PEAKE A | AUS-AUS | 52.82 |
| 24 | BLACHNIO A -WUJKOW A | POL-POL | 52.79 |
| 25 | WILDAVSKY A - WEINSTEIN H | USA-USA | 52.69 |
| 26 | SCHOLLAARDT M - NETTL O | NED-NED | 52.64 |
| 27 | SCHILHART N - BUCHLEV N | GER-GER | 52.45 |
| 28 | DI F - MANNO A | ITA-ITA | 52.39 |
| 29 | BACH A - CORNELL M | NZL-NZL | 52.39 |
| 30 | WIELOWIEYSKI A - KLIMACKI P | POL-POL | 52.37 |
| 31 | DIAMOND J - HAMPSON G | USA-USA | 52.33 |
| 32 | ANKLESARIA K - CHOKSHI S | IND-IND | 52.16 |
| 33 | VANDERVORST M - BAHBOUT S | BEL-BEL | 52.03 |
| 34 | GIERULSKI B - SKRZYPCZAK J | LTU-LTU | 51.92 |
| 35 | WITEK M - BYZDRA A | POL-POL | 51.87 |
| 36 | LEWACIAK G - ZUBIEL P | POL-POL | 51.63 |
| 37 | BROWN M - WHIBLEY M | NZL-NZL | 51.51 |
| 38 | HOYLAND S - HOYLAND S | NOR-NOR | 51.46 |
| 39 | PIETRASZEK M - ZNAMIROWSKI J | POL-POL | 51.29 |
| 40 | CHUMAKY - ROVYSHYN O | UKR-UKR | 51.22 |
| 41 | KUBAC N - ZORLU N | TUR-TUR | 50.95 |
| 42 | KRUPOWICZ M - SAKOWICZ R | POL-POL | 50.92 |
| 43 | JAGNIEWSKI R - GAWEL W | POL-POL | 50.86 |
| 44 | EIDE P - GRAESLI B | NOR-NOR | 50.82 |
| 45 | TOMASZEK W - GARDYNIK G | POL-POL | 50.69 |
| 46 | DZIEKANSKI K - SALINSKI P | POL-POL | 50.51 |
| 47 | SHUKHMEYSTER B - RYBNIKOV G | UKR-UKR | 50.50 |
| 48 | FLACASSIER F - GROSSET C | FRA-FRA | 50.38 |
| 49 | KWIECIEN M - ZATORSKI P | POL-POL | 50.22 |
| 50 | KOWALCZYK I-WISNIEWSKIT | POL-POL | 49.74 |
| 51 | TANAKA R - YOKOI H | JPN-JPN | 49.68 |
| 52 | VAINIKONISV - OLANSKIW | LTU-LTU | 49.28 |
| 53 | VAINIKONIS E-ARLOVICH A | LTU-LTU | 49.26 |
| 54 | SZELKA W - WOLCZAK C | POL-POL | 48.92 |
| 55 | OZDIL M - OZBALCI E | TUR-TUR | 48.82 |

## Women's Pairs SF after R5

|  | PILIPOVIC M - SVER N |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | GU L - ZHOUT |
| 3 | MOSZCZYNSKA Z - PIESIEWICZ D |
| 4 | SZCZEPANSKA K - MAJ-RUDNICKA M |
| 5 | YANG J - LIY |
| 6 | HARDING M - FUGLESTAD A |
| 7 | SANDSTROM K - MYLLAERI M |
| 8 | GLADIATOR A - WEBER E |
| 9 | LEVI H - ASULIN A |
| 10 | TEBHA A - HOWARD A |
| 11 | ARNOLDS C -VERBEEK M |
| 12 | DUFRAT K - ZMUDA J |
| 13 | BREWIAK G - BUSSE G |
| 14 | GRUDE L - OIGARDEN B |
| 15 | HUMPHRIES S - JACOB S |
| 16 | PAVLUSHKO O-RUDAKOVA E |
| 17 | JOYCE E - FITZGERALD J |
| 18 | XIA M - LIU S |
| 19 | BIRMAN D - POPLILOV M |
| 20 | BROWN F - SENIOR N |


| CRO-CRO | 58.49 |
| :--- | :--- |
| CHN-CHN | 56.69 |
| POL-POL | 55.91 |
| POL-POL | 54.78 |
| CHN-CHN | 54.73 |
| NOR-NOR | 54.13 |
| FIN-FIN | 53.57 |
| GER-GER | 53.20 |
| ISR-ISR | 53.14 |
| USA-USA | 53.04 |
| NED-NED | 52.69 |
| POL-POL | 52.49 |
| POL-POL | 52.40 |
| NOR-NOR | 52.31 |
| NZL-NZL | 51.98 |
| RUS-RUS | 51.86 |
| IRL-IRL | 51.53 |
| CHN-CHN | 51.36 |
| ISR-ISR | 51.21 |
| ENG-ENG | 51.18 |

Open Pairs SF B after R5

|  | GAWECKI J - PAJAK S | POL-POL | 59.07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | FANTUN J - VENTOS V | FRA-FRA | 58.47 |
| 3 | STRZEMECKI W - ZAWADA P | POL-POL | 58.15 |
| 4 | MARCINOWSKI P - SOBCZAK M | POL-POL | 57.72 |
| 5 | MAJCHER A - MAJCHER A | POL-POL | 57.65 |
| 6 | SZWENKEL K - OSINSKI T | POL-POL | 57.12 |
| 7 | AYDIN A - SUZER U | TUR-TUR | 57.11 |
| 8 | CHODACKI M - BOJARSKI M | POL-POL | 55.98 |
| 9 | KUC-DZIERZAWSKI P - STRYSZAWSKIT | POL-POL | 55.81 |
| 10 | TERPILOWSKI M - KLUKOWSKI T | POL-POL | 55.79 |
| 11 | HASENSON P - SHERMAN D | ENG-ENG | 55.42 |
| 12 | CZUBAK E - KUCZYNSKI Z | POL-POL | 55.21 |
| 13 | GULA A - BLACH M | POL-POL | 55.06 |
| 14 | PAWSZAK B - CHINDELEWICZ P | POL-POL | 54.98 |
| 15 | WASZYNSKI A - HINTERTAN A | POL-POL | 54.68 |
| 16 | BARTOSZEWSKI M - MAKATREWICZ M | POL-POL | 54.60 |
| 17 | RUDZINSKI M - GORCZYCA W | IRL-IRL | 54.38 |
| 18 | SERPOI G - STIRBU C | ROM-ROM | 54.27 |
| 19 | CICHON A - HEICHEL M | POL-POL | 54.26 |
| 20 | DRAGANV - PORKHUNV | UKR-UKR | 54.23 |
| 21 | BRUNET F - ANCESSY A | FRA-FRA | 53.52 |
| 22 | GOTZOV S - TAKOV T | BUL-BUL | 53.38 |
| 23 | RUBINS K - LORENCS M | LAT-LAT | 53.34 |
| 24 | WEGNER B - MICHALSKI M | POL-POL | 53.19 |
| 25 | AAVA J - KURIG V | EST-EST | 52.79 |
| 26 | HUTYRA M - WOJNAROWICZ J | POL-POL | 52.72 |
| 27 | WITTENBECK M - PIOTROWSKI P | POL-POL | 52.70 |
| 28 | UZUM D - KIZILOK O | TUR-TUR | 52.37 |
| 29 | EIDE L - ELLINGSEN K | NOR-NOR | 52.11 |
| 30 | JACOB T - JACOB N | NZL-NZL | 52.04 |
| 31 | ASH M - DUNCAN S | SCO-SCO | 51.60 |
| 32 | STANIOW J - GRODZKI M | POL-POL | 51.47 |
| 33 | NADAR K - SATYA B | IND-IND | 51.33 |
| 34 | TENN M - SIROTIN O | EST-EST | 51.25 |
| 35 | TUSZYNSKI P - JASKIEWICZ R | POL-POL | 51.25 |
| 36 | VOZABAL D - SLEMR J | CZE-CZE | 51.03 |
| 37 | URBANSKI M - DABROWSKI M | POL-POL | 50.67 |
| 38 | PATER M - STANISZEWSKI J | POL-POL | 50.66 |
| 39 | CHMURSKI B - CHALUPEC I | POL-POL | 50.54 |
| 40 | HOOGENKAMP E - HELLE R | NED-NED | 50.43 |

For the complete lists, please go to http://www.worldbridge.org

Mixed Pairs SF A after R5

| 1 | DELMAS-SIRVEN T - PIGEAUD F | FRA-FRA | 58.78 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | FU Z - ZHANGY | CHN-CHN | 58.45 |
| 3 | GROSS S - HYDES A | ENG-ENG | 58.22 |
| 4 | WROBEL M - PIETRZYK A | POL-POL | 56.02 |
| 5 | BODIS G - FISCHER B | HUN-HUN | 54.04 |
| 6 | HUNGY - HSIEH H | TPE-TPE | 54.00 |
| 7 | BUTRYN P - SAKOWSKA N | POL-POL | 53.92 |
| 8 | SHIMAMURA K - TERAMOTO T | JPN-JPN | 53.88 |
| 9 | HONTI L - MEZEI K | HUN-HUN | 53.48 |
| 10 | SHI B - TIAN W | CHN-CHN | 53.45 |
| 11 | PRAMOTTON E - VERSACE A | ITA-ITA | 52.90 |
| 12 | STEPHENS R - ROSSLEE D | RSA-RSA | 52.78 |
| 13 | HANLON T - BARTON G | IRL-IRL | 52.65 |
| 14 | HOU X - WANG H | CHN-CHN | 52.50 |
| 15 | GARTAGANIS J - GARTAGANIS N | CAN-CAN | 52.49 |
| 16 | KAZMUCHA D - SEREK C | POL-POL | 52.31 |
| 17 | SAPORTA P - SAPORTA-TWORZYDLO R | FRA-FRA | 52.16 |
| 18 | FISCHER D - SAURER B | AUT-AUT | 51.90 |
| 19 | HUBERSCHWILLER M - HUBERSCHWILLER A | FRA-FRA | 51.71 |
| 20 | ACAR A - AYAZ I | TUR-TUR | 51.70 |
| 21 | KHAZANOV I - LEBEDEVA M | RUS-RUS | 51.67 |
| 22 | SAKR M - PSZCZOLA J | USA-USA | 51.60 |
| 23 | McLEISH D - McLEISH P | AUS-AUS | 51.60 |
| 24 | KARMARKAR M - KARMARKAR S | IND-IND | 51.58 |
| 25 | CASPERSEN H - FARHOLT S | DEN-DEN | 51.34 |
| 26 | SAUTAUX M - SZCZEPANSKI R | POL-POL | 51.23 |
| 27 | ROZENBLYUM M - VOROBEYCHIKOVA O | RUS-RUS | 51.18 |
| 28 | GRZEJDZIAK I - GRZEJDZIAK S | POL-POL | 50.43 |
| 29 | KONDAKCI S - SENT | TUR-TUR | 50.31 |
| 30 | PASKE T - SEALE C | ENG-ENG | 50.24 |

## Senior Pairs SF after R5

| DAEHR C - ENGEL B | GER-GER | 55.75 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 MARSTRANDER P - ANDERSSEN R | NOR-NOR | 55.01 |
| 3 KIERZNOWSKI R - KACZANOWSKIT | POL-POL | 54.68 |
| 4 BARAN B - DAIGNEAULT P | CAN-CAN | 54.60 |
| 5 KOWALSKIA - ROMANSKIJ | POL-POL | 54.44 |
| 6 HACKETT P - HOLLAND J | ENG-ENG | 54.18 |
| 7 SCHWARTZ A - ZELIGMAN S | ISR-ISR | 54.06 |
| 8 JELENIEWSKIA - WACHNOWSKI J | POL-POL | 53.70 |
| 9 HOEGER W - MALCHUS P | GER-GER | 53.42 |
| 10 FRONCZAK A - KONOPKA R | POL-POL | 53.42 |
| II VOGTW - FRESEN L | GER-GER | 53.02 |
| 12 DAS B - SADHU A | IND-IND | 52.84 |
| 13 WAKSMAN S - USZYNSKIW | FRA-FRA | 52.71 |
| 14 BAKKET - HANTVEIT H | NOR-NOR | 52.17 |
| 15 HIRATA M - OHASHI M | JPN-JPN | 52.00 |
| 16 MANCINI B -VECCHI L | ITA-ITA | 51.95 |
| 17 SELLDEN G - WenNeberg b | SWE-SWE | 51.92 |
| 18 CARRUTHERS J - SILVER J | CAN-CAN | 51.90 |
| 19 ORENSTEIN E-SAGIVY | ISR-ISR | 51.36 |
| 20 LING R -TSE E | HKG-HKG | 51.32 |
| 21 MICHALOWSKIJ-DOLNY W | POL-POL | 51.30 |
| 22 HUSSAIN M - MAZHAR M | PAK-PAK | 51.06 |
| 23 ENGELJ-FRYDRICH J | ISR-ISR | 51.02 |
| 24 KUSHARIP - RAY D | IND-IND | 50.97 |
| 25 DANYLYUK T - DANYLYUKV | UKR-UKR | 50.93 |

## Mixed Pairs SF B after R5

| I | NIKITINA A - GUSEVV |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | RUDAKOV E - DIKHNOVA T |
| 3 | SUWIK A - OSTROWSKA L |
| 4 | SAUVAGEV - BOGACKI P |
| 5 | ROSSARD M - ROMANOWSKI J |
| 6 | SERANGELI F - MAZZA A |
| 7 | KOWALSKA A - TYRAN M |
| 8 | UTNER B - ANGEBRANDT D |
| 9 | MECKSTROTH S - TUNCOK C |
| IO SCHIPPERS-BOSKLOPPER E - STIENEN R |  |
| II SYRAKOPOULOU C - LIOSSIS G |  |
| I2 BOBKO I - BOBKO A |  |
| I3 HAMMOND N - WEINGER L |  |
| I4 ARLINGHAUS G - SCHWEDING U |  |
| I5 | RETEK G - RETEK M |


| RUS-RUS | 61.13 |
| :--- | :--- |
| RUS-RUS | 60.39 |
| POL-POL | 59.41 |
| FRA-FRA | 58.64 |
| FRA-FRA | 55.43 |
| ITA-ITA | 54.70 |
| POL-POL | 54.61 |
| AUT-AUT | 54.60 |
| USA-USA | 53.99 |
| NED-NED | 53.78 |
| GRE-GRE | 53.45 |
| POL-POL | 52.91 |
| USA-USA | 51.77 |
| GER-GER | 51.13 |
| CAN-CAN | 50.85 |

## Decision of the WBG Championship Committee

At the start of segment 5 of the Open Teams Championship, on Sunday September 12, 2016, the Spanish team refused to start the match in a timely manner.
They had raised the issue of whether an American pair's agreements for third seat opening was properly disclosed. There was no allegation of unethical behavior.

The Spanish team wanted a ruling on this complaint before they would begin the match. The director found there was insufficient evidence presented to require any change by the Americans. The Spanish were directed to start the match. They were warned that a late arrival penalty could be imposed. They refused to start play at this time. When the match finally started, a 32 IMPs penalty was imposed, based on the actual start time of the match.
This decision was reviewed by the WBG Championship Committee, which changed the penalty to a IO-IMP procedural penalty, since the teams were all present 45 minutes prior to the starting time. The procedural penalty was imposed because the Spanish team refused to obey the tournament director's order to start play.

## BBO and OURGAME SCHEDULE

BBO I = VuGraph, BBO 8 is also OURGAME

|  | $\mathbf{1 0 : 3 0}$ | BBO l |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| O | Spain v Monaco | BBO 2 |
| W | China v USA | BBO 3 |
| W | France v Scotland | BBO 4 |
| S | USA v Denmark | BBO 5 |
| S | France v Chinese Taipei | BBO 6 |
| M | Netherlands v Bulgaria | BBO 7 |
| M | USA v Russia | BBO 8 |
| O | Poland v Netherlands |  |
|  | $\mathbf{1 4 : 0 0}$ and $\mathbf{1 7 : 0 0}$ |  |

All Semi-final matches will be shown.
BBO I and BBO 8 to be decided.

联
OURGAME

## Team Photos

A reminder for the teams in the Mixed and Senior semi-finals that the team photos
will be taken as follows

## Senior:

Thursday 13.35
Denmark, Chinese
Taipei and France

## Mixed:

Thursday 16.35
Netherlands and Bulgaria

The Assembly Point will be outside the main entrance.

## Booking for Lyon 2017

Special rates ( BB ) have been negotiated, This is the first list of Hotels, all near the Cité internationale
Delegations have a top priority for booking « two weeks » until November

Contacts on the WBF' website or christine.francin@web.ffbridge.net Relais Château Villa Florentine 5* Hôtels on site
Marriott 4* Crowne Plaza $4^{*}$
Hôtels at a walking distance: Hôtel des Congrès 3*
Hôtel Ibis Palais des Congrès Caluire 3* Hotels close to the railway-station:

Radisson Blu Hotel Lyon 4* Mama Shelter 4*
Hôtel Ibis Gare La Part-Dieu 3*
Hôtel lbis Part-Dieu Les Halles 3* with shuttle: Hôtel Metropole 4*

## By Ram Soffer

## Netherlands v England

The Netherlands started this match strongly, leading by 42 after two sessions. England pulled back 16 during the third session, and their comeback continued right into the fourth session.
Curiously, most of the important swings during this session had a common theme: the different methods used by the various pairs for opening at the two-level.
Both English pairs use special methods for non-vulnerable weak two openings. In particular, Gold-Bakhshi open $2 \diamond$ with 4-8 HCP at least $4-4$ in the majors (while their vulnerable $2 \triangleleft$ opening is strong).
Both tables did particularly well to stay out of a hopeless slam on the first deal. It was bid at almost every other table.


Normal bidding to 3NT, South accepting the invitation with 13 HCP plus three ten spots. A heart lead would have put a premature end to declarer's hopes, but Nab was facing a silent partner, so he led his long suit. Robson won the $\diamond Q$ and dropped the $\diamond 10$ from hand, while East followed with the $\diamond 5$. Was this count or attitude? When Robson cleared the clubs by playing the A and another, Nab had a problem. When he played another diamond, England had +630 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bakhshi | Bas Drijver | Gold | Brink |
|  |  | $2 \diamond$ | Dble |
| $3 \diamond$ | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Gold-Bakhshi had an early opportunity to use their toy, as East opened the bidding with 5 HCP and 5-4 in the majors. Perhaps North's 3NT call was ill-advised and he should
have been content with a small plus score, but the damage was done earlier - after East's preemptive opening it is practically impossible for N/S to bid and make a game.
Needless to say, East led a heart, and shortly afterwards he was registering +200 .
In the very next deal, the difference between the teams' bidding methods was more subtle.

Board 19. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

- 3

ค J 85
$\diamond A K 962$
\& J 1087

$\bigcirc$ AQ4 32
$\diamond$ J 87
26532

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nab | Forrester | Bob Drijver | Robson |
|  |  |  | $2 \checkmark$ |
| 24 | 5\% | 54 | All Pass |

Robson-Forrester's 2 $8 / 2$ openings are normal weak twos when vulnerable, but two-suited (five of the major plus at least four in a minor) when not vulnerable. This particular $2 \rrbracket$ was of the second variety. Forrester recognized a double fit and expected his opponents to make 44, so he bravely bid 5\% (pass or correct) - saving in advance. This was pressure bidding at its best. Bob Drijver bid 54, as he had no earlier opportunity to support his partner. Had Forrester allowed his opponents to bid 4s


Tony Forrester, England
and later saved, he might have been doubled for -500 or 800. He actually did much better when his opponents made the last guess and lost three top tricks - England +100.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bakhshi | Bas Drijver | Gold | Brink <br> 2 |
| 2 | $4 \rrbracket$ | 4 | All Pass |

Brink-Drijver employ 5+-card weak twos at any vulnerability. For all North knew, his partner's shape might have been 5-3-3-2. Thus a save over 4s was not feasible. England +620 - a highly deserved swing of 12 IMPs. All of a sudden, Netherlands' comfortable lead evaporated and the match was tied.
The following six boards even gave England a narrow lead, but then came a hand which they couldn't open at the twolevel, but the Dutch could.

|  | 26. Dealer Ea | All Vul. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | வ 7432 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 10 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A J |  |
|  | - K Q 109 |  |
| - K Q J 5 | N | - 86 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 92 |  | PJ5 3 |
| $\checkmark$ K 4 | W E | $\checkmark$ Q 109873 |
| -8432 | S | - $\mathrm{A}^{6}$ |
|  | - A 109 |  |
|  | ¢K8764 |  |
|  | $\diamond 652$ |  |
|  | - 17 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Forrester | Bob Drijver | Robson |
|  |  | 20 | Pass |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | $2 N T$ | Pass | 3NT |

## All Pass

For Nab-Drijver, the $2 \boldsymbol{2 e}$ opening is either weak in diamonds or strong (a strong diamond hand opens $2 \diamond$ ). Their bidding subsided in $2 \diamond$, which was tough for North to handle. Forrester had no comfortable call. He chose 2NT, but this failed when partner raised and the defenders attacked diamonds for an easy +200 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bakhshi | Bas Drijver | Gold | Brink |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| Pass | 1\% | $1 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Rdbl | 14 | $2 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Pass | 28 | All Pass |  |

At this table, East passed as dealer, and events developed slowly. North-South had plenty of time to explore at a low level, and they elected to play $2 \checkmark$. After some struggle, Drijver barely made the contract and the Netherlands regained the lead, but not for long. On the next board they were hit by another two-suited $2 \checkmark$ opening.

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.


As mentioned above, Robson's $2 \triangleleft$ opening showed 5+ hearts and 4+ in a minor with 5-10 HCP (it appears the extra diamond length compensated for some missing points). Forrester's $3 \triangleleft$ was invitational in hearts. The English pair seemed on the way to the best contract of $4 \checkmark$ when their opponents intervened and reached 4e. No problem: Forrester had an easy penalty double.
Robson led the 5 and Forrester thought hard. He knew that his partner had at most one spade. Was it possible that he opened with a I-5-6-I distribution? Eventually, Forrester decided to trust his partner (always the best advice) and give a club ruff, which was the only way to ensure down two. The defence still had one sure trick to come in each suit - England +300 .

| West <br> Bakhshi | North <br> Bas Drijver | East | Gold |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | | South |
| :--- |
| Brink |
| Pass | 3NT $\quad$ All Pass | 3N |
| :--- |

$3 \triangleleft$ looks a poor choice, but a one-suited $2 \checkmark$ opening would not have been descriptive. Apparently, passing is no longer considered an option at these levels when you have a weak, distributional hand at non-vulnerable.
North bid a normal 3NT, missing the 9-card heart fit. Gold led a spade, and after winning two spade tricks the defence found the lethal club switch. The contract drifted three down, England +150 .
On the next board, Gold-Bakhshi's $2 \triangleleft$ opening reappeared (4-4 majors), and they bought the contract for 24, down two when their opponents could make either 3NT or 5\%. Fortunately for the Dutch, Forrester-Robson stopped short of game and the damage was restricted to 2 IMPs.
Two boards before the end of the session, the score was 91-9I, so the following board determined which team would be leading at the lunch break.Amazingly, the dreaded $2 \diamond$ opening showed up yet again!

Board 3I. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

| $\begin{aligned} & 762 \\ & 8 \text { A } 986 \\ & \diamond 4 \\ & \& K 1042 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \& K 943 \\ & \& K J 543 \\ & \diamond 75 \\ & \& Q 3 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Q QJ 105 |
|  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 2 |
|  |  |  | $\diamond$ A 10932 |
|  |  |  | - A 7 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \qquad A 8 \\ & \& 107 \\ & \diamond K \text { Q } 86 \\ & \& 9865 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Bakhshi | Bas Drijver | Gold | Brink |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 2 - | Pass | 2. | Dble |
| Pass | 3\% | 31 | Pass |
| Pass | 4* | All Pa |  |

Despite having opening values and a spade fit, Gold didn't invite game or enquire about his partner's hand with 2NT. He just bid 2s to play and then competed to 3s. Eventually, Bas Drijver bought the contract in $4 \%$, but East-West defended accurately and didn't allow him to make it England +100.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Forrester | Bob Drijver | Robson <br> I |
|  |  |  | Pble |
| I $\$$ | INT | Dble | Pass |
| $2 \Phi$ | Pass | $4 \Phi$ | All Pass |

Robson opened $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ on a IO-count, and West overcalled. East's double of INT was probably for takeout (though he wouldn't have complained if his partner left it for penalties). When West showed four spades as well, Bob Drijver took a more optimistic view than his English counterpart and raised 2s to game.
Nab's problem was how to make this game, and he needed some help from his formidable opponents. Declarer won the diamond lead in dummy and continued with $\triangle Q$, North ducking. The next round of hearts was won by Forrester's ace.
It appeared as though declarer wished to discard one of dummy's club losers on a heart, but even that would not have landed his contract because dummy's diamond losers were too many to handle. Forrester should have continued with a passive trump (or heart), when all of declarer's attempts would have come short of ten tricks.
After long thought, he persuaded himself to play a club, and the rest was straightforward: 2 Q , heart ruff with $\$ \mathrm{Q}$, $\Delta$ taken by South's ace, $\diamond K$, and $\diamond 8$ ruffed by the 9 . After declarer drew the remaining trumps, his hand was high.
At last, one of England's two-level opening bids didn't bring the desired result. At the end of this session the Netherlands led 99-91, and in the next session they moved into a dominant position by trouncing England 60-2.

## ZZZ TOP <br> By Mark Horton

Potential slam deals always attract a lot of attention. As the last session of the quarter-finals got under way, this deal flashed up onto the screen.

Board 19. Dealer South. EW Vul.

- AKJ 98
$\stackrel{\text { - }}{ }$
$\diamond 87654$
\& AKJ

| ¢ 542 | N | ¢ 76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ 6 | W E | $\bigcirc$ K Q 8542 |
| $\diamond$ A 93 |  | $\checkmark$ J 102 |
| \& 10942 | S | + 85 |
|  | - Q 103 |  |
|  | ¢ 10973 |  |
|  | $\diamond \mathrm{KQ}$ |  |
|  | Q Q 763 |  |

Barry Rigal opined that although you could make 64, noone would reach it, mine being the lone dissenting voice.As the results flashed up onto the screens it appeared that Barry's prognostication would be vindicated. The last scores to be entered were from the match between Poland and Sweden. In the Open Room Gawrys/Klukowski bid I © -24-4s and declarer played safe, taking eleven tricks for +450 .
In the Closed Room Nystom/Upmark were employing their relay system, which uses zz evaluation points which emphasize the value of aces and kings. This is especially important for slam bidding.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kalita | Nystrom | Nowosadzki | Upmark |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1** | Pass | 1 \% $^{*}$ |
| Pass | INT* | Pass | 2** |
| Pass | $2 \diamond *$ | Pass | 2®* |
| Pass | 30* | Pass | $3{ }^{*}$ |
| Pass | 34* | Pass | 4** |
| Pass | $4 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | 6 |

## All Pass

1\% $16+$ unbalanced or 17+ balanced
I/ Game forcing, 4-6(7)zz, no shortness (zzA=3,K=2, Q=I)
INT 5+ unbal. or $5+\downarrow$, no shortness (not 5(332) 9-I3zz
Systems Guru AI Hollander believes that 20 initiated a series of relays that established that North was 5-0-5-3 with $9-13$ zz points.
Declarer won the club lead with the ace and played a diamond for the two, queen and ace. He ruffed West's ace of hearts, played a diamond to the king, a spade to the ace, ruffed a diamond with the queen of spades and claimed, +980 and II IMPs.

## Hotel Chinzanso Tokyo
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## USA v Australia

declarer still had no path to nine tricks and in fact went two down, -200 after declarer established a long diamond for the defence.
In the other room, the USA went one down in $3 \bigcirc$ after the defence opened the club suit with declarer picking the layout.
The interesting play that took place was in a match where South declared 3NT on a diamond lead. The best play would be to win the $\diamond Q$ perhaps dropping the ten from hand, play a spade to hand and run the 2 Q , losing the second round to the ej. It certainly wouldn't be obvious to East that a heart switch would be superior to simply continuing diamonds.
That was 6 IMPs to Australia, now USA 84 - AUST 80.
Australia were leading 93-86, when Board 22, came along.
Board 22. Dealer East. E/WVul.

|  | - K 10873 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 9843$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 4$ |  |
|  | * 1062 |  |
| - AJ 4 | N | ¢ Q 95 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 65 |  | $\bigcirc$ AK 7 |
| $\checkmark$ AJ 1086 |  | $\diamond$ K Q 952 |
| * J 9 | S | \& 84 |
|  | - 62 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1102$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 73$ |  |
|  | \& AKQ 753 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lavings | Meckstroth | Krochmalik | Mahmood |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | 2\% |
| 3\% | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| $3 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Martel | Klinger | Hamman | Haughie |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | 2\% |
| 3\% | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |  |  |

In the closed room Martel, West for USA, seemed intent on reaching game opposite his partner's 3+ $1 \diamond$ opening. Without any movement by Hamman towards 3NT, this left $5 \diamond$ as the only viable option. On a good day and based on the bidding, South might have held $\$ \mathrm{Kx}$, but not today and that was down one.
In the open room, Lavings heard partner eerily silent after North's double of his 3 cue-bid, which perhaps prompted
him to take a conservative view and bid just $3 \triangleleft$. He surmised that they would have two club losers and holding the rest together for no losers did seem somewhere in the distance. +130 and $+100,6$ IMPs to Australia with the score now USA 84 - Australia 99.
Two flat boards followed, and then came board 25, where Zia had an opportunity to pick up a load of IMPs.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- Q 92

982
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ J
\& Q 8543

- J 1073
$\bigcirc$ Q 107
$\triangleleft$ A 652
- 12

- AK 85
$\bigcirc K J$
743
\& K 1096
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Lavings | Meckstroth | Krochmalik | Mahmood |
|  |  | 18 | Dble |
| 28 | 32 | Pass | 3NT |

All Pass
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Martel | Klinger | Hamman <br> Haughie |  |
| $2 \diamond$ | 38 | Dble |  |

It's always dangerous to make a whisper opposite Zia as he will never die wondering if game or slam is possible as if to prove the theory he arrived in 3NT with a combined 21 count on this hand. West led the $\vee 7$, won by East, who, with the suit now blocked, continued with the 84 . Declarer won the king and laid down the 2 K . East won that and continued with the $\vee 3$. This is an interesting discussion point. You have opened $I \triangleleft$ showing a five-card suit and both you and your partner know that the heart suit is blocked - should the card you play now be suit preference, does the $\vee 3$ call for the lower suit? The consensus of those who were asked about this suggests that it is the proper treatment.
In any event, this was not clear to West, who instead elected to play the $\mathbf{~} \int$ ! Zia could now have won in hand and finessed dummy's $\$ 9$ to make nine tricks. Instead he chose to back his assessment that the spades were breaking and proceeded to go one down for a push.
Board 26 again demonstrated the need for some level of conservatism when vulnerable.

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.


In the closed room, Klinger scored +90 in $2 \%$. Passing twice and backing in with $3 \triangleleft$ vulnerable is questionable at best and -500 at worst after the defence found their heart ruff. A loss of $91 M P s$. USA 93 - Australia 99
The lead changed hands on board 27 when USA stole the contract in both rooms.


Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Martel | Klinger | Hamman | Haughie <br> Pass |
| Pass | INT | $2 \diamond$ | $2 N T$ |
| Dble | $3 \&$ | Pass | $3 \triangleleft$ |

Zia's decision to pre-empt proved the difference on this deal. After partner showed values over his $3 \triangleleft$ preempt, it was easy to bid $4 \oslash$, assuming they had a playable spot other than 3NT.
When Haughie elected not to preempt, certainly not something one could have strong feelings about, E/W were given an opportunity to show the possibility of playing in a black suit. Plus 420 in hearts and -50 in spades meant another 9-IMP swing for USA, now ahead 102-99.
The set ended with the Americans ahead 106-103


Jeff Meckstroth, USA

## Robot Round Robin Round Up <br> By AI Levy

The robot championship round robin to determine the four semi-final qualifiers went down to the last deal. In the final round, with Bridge Baron taking 20 VPs against Meadowlark Bridge and Micro Bridge narrowly defeating Wbridge5, the top three qualifiers were guaranteed (Wbridge5, Micro Bridge and Bridge Baron). The Xinrui Shark Bridge and Q-Plus Bridge - RoboBridge matches would determine the last qualifying position. Xinrui started the round I4.3 VPs ahead of Shark Bridge and 12.5 VPs ahead of Q-Plus Bridge. Q-Plus Bridge needed to win by at least 37 IMPs to have a chance, and was up by 37 IMPs with one board remaining, but RoboBridge made 3NT on the last board to win 5 IMPs and end Q-Plus Bridge's chances of qualifying. In the other match, Shark Bridge did win by 55 IMPs, in large part due to board IO, and qualified fourth.
Shark Bridge picked up 18 IMPs on board I0, a deal that was played well at both tables. Shark Bridge's declarer play was truly double-dummy, as it is a challenge for less-thanexpert players to make the contract seeing all the cards! Now there's a challenge.

Dealer East. Both Vul.

- 10876
$\bigcirc 10743$
$\diamond 84$
-932
, -
$\bigcirc$ K Q 92
$\diamond$ K 1073
\& A Q 854
 © Q J
คJ865
$\diamond A J 92$
\& KJ 10
- AK95432
$\stackrel{\wedge}{ }$ A
$\diamond$ Q 65
\& 76

At one table

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Xinrui | Shark | Xinrui | Shark |
| $6 \diamond$ |  | $1 \diamond$ | 4 |

Declarer misguessed the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$, playing South for short diamonds, for down I, -I00.
At the other table

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shark | Xinrui | Shark | Xinrui |
|  |  | I $\diamond$ | 15 |
| Dble | Pass | 2 | 4 |
| 4NT | Pass | 50* | Pass |
| 68 | All Pass |  |  |

5\% I keycard
The lead of the ace of spades, ruffed in dummy, was followed by the king of hearts. South persisted with the king of spades, ruffed in dummy. The queen of hearts was cashed, giving declarer the bad news about the trump suit. Declarer now cashed three rounds of clubs and the ace of diamonds. A low diamond to the ten held the trick and declarer now claimed.
Note that the diamonds must be played before running the clubs or North will discard a diamond on the fourth club, and the play must specifically consist of the diamond ace and low to the ten, so that if North ruffs the fourth club, the king of diamonds is still an entry to the fifth club.

## L-OL

# $14^{\mathrm{man}}$ <br> HCL International Bridge Championship 

## DATE:

October 19-23, 2016
VENUE:
JW Marriott Hotel
New Delhi Aerocity


Asset Area 4 - Hospitality District, Delhi Aerocity, New Delhi 110037, India. Phone: +91-11-4521 2121
www.marriott.com/hotels/travel/delap-jw-marriott-hotel-new-delhi-aerocity/


## Open Teams QF - S5 <br> New Zealand v Spain <br> England v Netherlands

By Jos Jacobs

Immediately at the start of segment 5, a board came up on which the double-figure swings we had been waiting for during the morning segment might easily occur. Such a board happened to be the first of a series of entertaining deals on which either side would have its fair share of luck.
As you can see, the outcome of $6 \checkmark$ depends mainly on declarer's view in the trump suit, the percentage play, of course, being a trump to west's ten.


For Spain, Wasik started his part of the auction with a $2 \%$ general GF relay. The rest was natural. Declarer won the spade lead in dummy, crossed in clubs and led a trump according to the percentage play. When West's ten lost to the queen, he was quickly one down. New Zealand +50 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | G Goded |
|  | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 40 | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |

2NT was invitational or better in hearts; 3\% showed a minimum. This explains West's lack of further interest. Right they were, when the percentage play in trumps resulted in +450 and II IMPs to New Zealand.
A few boards later, there was another slam hand.

Though the trumps are $4-1,6 \%$ can be made if declarer manages to ruff two hearts in the East hand.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wasik | Bach | Knap | Cornell |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 6\% | All Pass |

Spain got to the slam in a nice, natural auction. North led a diamond to declarer's king and declarer immediately ruffed a heart. His next move was a low spade. South went up with his ace and returned a trump to North's jack and dummy's king. When he next cashed the 210 , it turned out that he could no longer make the contract for lack of communications. He cannot both ruff another heart and enjoy the winning diamonds. One down, New Zealand +50.
Double-dummy, there are various ways to make the contract, depending, of course, on the lead but mainly on the fact that diamonds are 3-3. It also helps to assume that North's $\mathcal{1}$ is a true singleton - but why would you?

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | G Goded |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 18 | Pass | $1{ }_{1}$ | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | 4\% | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 49 | Pass | 5\% | All Pass |

An entirely natural auction that came to rest at the proper moment. New Zealand another +400 and another 10 IMPs. They had nearly halved the deficit in just two boards.

Halfway through the set, we saw, to use the classic euphemism, a Spanish "indiscretion."

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { J } 105 \\
& \text { \& K } 85 \\
& \diamond \text { Q } 1085 \\
& \text { K } 32
\end{aligned}
$$

| -932 | N | , AQ876 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 7643$ |  | $\bigcirc 12$ |
| $\diamond$ AK 3 | W E | จJ72 |
| - QJ9 | S | - A 65 |
|  | - K 4 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 109 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 964$ |  |
|  | -10874 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik | Bach | Knap | Cornell |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \mathbf{Q}$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{2 s}$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{~ A l l ~ P a s s ~}$ |  |

In an uncontested auction, Spain reached 2 by East, just made for + I IO.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | G Goded |
| Pass | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| $2 \&$ | Pass | $2 \&$ | Dble |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Dble | $3 \%$ |
| Dble | 3 | Pass | $3 \varnothing$ |

## Dble All Pass

After the New Zealand Drury-type auction, South thought he had to do something. When the opponents quickly told him that he had chosen the wrong moment, there was no (2NT-scrambling) way back..The NZ doubling


Sjoert Brink, The Netherlands


Michael Cornell, New Zealand
rhythm ended at the level of $3 \vee$. New Zealand, on the obvious trump lead, +500 and 9 more IMPs back to them to trail by only 23 now.
Talking about indiscretions: here is one from the Netherlands v. England match:

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

- 164
$\bigcirc 73$
$\diamond 732$
\& AKQ 32
¢ 873
- J 1092
$\diamond$ A 94
\& J 75

© A 10
คA854
$\diamond$ KJ 865
\& 108
© K Q 952
$\triangleright$ KQ 6
$\diamond$ Q 10
964

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Robson | Bas Drijver | Forrester | Brink |
|  | INT | $2 \diamond$ | 24 |
| Dble | 3\% | 4\% | Pass |
| $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |

## All Pass

Forrester could hardly afford to pass North's IO-I3 NT. $2 \diamond$ showed the suit and a major so Robson had an easy double to show some useful fit. Maybe, his hand was lacking a few HCP, but that's another story. On the actual rather unpleasant layout, declarer went down four when he finessed the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ in the end. Clubs were led, North cashing two rounds before shifting to a spade, ducked to South who returned the suit. Declarer won and led a low trump to Brink's queen. Spade back, ruffed in hand, followed by $\vee A$ and the diamond finesse. South won, cashed the 9 K and as

East was out of trumps now, the defence could cash one more club as well.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Hinden | Muller | Osborne |
|  | Pass | $1 \diamond$ | $1 \stackrel{4}{4}$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \uparrow$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

No opening bid by North in the other room, where the English N/S ended in 2s for +140 but a I4-IMP loss.
More IMPs to the Netherlands on the next board, on which it was all about the right lead:

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

|  | - Q 764 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢J5 3 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 9653 |  |  |
|  | 92 |  |  |
| Q 182 | N |  | - K 953 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 4$ |  | E | $\bigcirc$ Q 87 |
| $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ Q | W |  | $\checkmark$ J 1042 |
| 2 AK | 64 |  | \% J 5 |
|  | - A 10 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 10962 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond 87$ |  |  |
|  | 29873 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Wasik | Bach | Knap | Cornell |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |

On this auction, North had a natural diamond lead, so declarer could win and continue the suit to ensure his nine tricks as he will always make a heart trick as well. It all ended with an overtrick, so Spain chalked up +630 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | G Goded |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 10 | Pass | I 8 | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

In the other room, the transfer gadget wrongsided the contract, as with East the declarer, South had an equally natural, but killing, heart lead. Spain another +200 and I3 IMPs to them.
In the Netherlands v. England match, the same swing occurred:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| De Wijs | Hinden | Muller <br> Pass | Osborne <br> Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |

West's 2NT showed a balanced 20-21; 3\% was puppet Stayman and $3 \bigcirc$ denied any majors.

When Frances Hinden led a natural diamond, De Wijs quickly had nine tricks for +600 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Robson | Bas Drijver | Forrester | Brink |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 1\% | Pass | 18 | Dble |
| Redbl | 2 | Pass | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |  |  |

The transfer at the one-level enabled South to show the suit by doubling. When Bas Drijver easily found the right lead of partner's suit, down two was the inevitable outcome. Another +200 to the Netherlands and 13 more IMPs.
Back to Spain-New Zealand.
Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

| - Q 94 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ K 9 |  |
| $\diamond 974$ |  |
| Q Q 987 |  |
| N | ¢ K 2 |
|  | $\bigcirc 10876$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 863 |
| S | ¢ A 64 |
| ¢ A 83 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AJ 52 |  |
| $\diamond$ J 52 |  |
| 91053 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik | Bach | Knap | Cornell <br> Pass |
| Is | Pass | INT | All Pass |

When South made the unlucky choice of a low heart to partner's king, upon which North returned the suit to dummy's queen, the club shift came too late. One overtrick as declarer could easily establish his spades now, Spain +120 .
West

Brown $\quad$\begin{tabular}{l}
North <br>
Sabate

$\quad$

East <br>
Whibley

 

South <br>
G Goded <br>
Pass
\end{tabular}

South hit upon the fine lead of the 10 , which put the defence one tempo ahead. When declarer failed to first cash his diamond winners, but tried to first establish spades instead, he actually went down three when he threw a heart from dummy on the run of North's clubs. Spain another +150 and 7 IMPs.
On the penultimate board, there was another "indiscretion."

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- J 102
$\bigcirc 1096532$
$\diamond 1065$
- 7
$\perp$ A
$\checkmark$ AK J 74
$\diamond$ AJ 3
\& A 1084

| N | ¢ 87543 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 8 |
| W E | $\diamond$ K 87 |
| S | \& KJ9 |
| , K Q 96 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ - |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q 942 |  |
| \& Q 6532 |  |
| rth East | South |
| Knap | Cornell |
|  | Pass |
| 19 | Pass |
| 3NT | All Pass |

The normal contract and a slightly under-par result of ten tricks on a spade lead: +430 to Spain.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | G Goded <br> Pass |
| I $\varangle$ | Pass | IS | Dble |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Once again, Gonzalo Goded chose a bad moment for his double on a passed hand. On perfect defence, $2 \diamond$ might have gone for 2000 had West played a top heart after the defence had cashed three rounds of trumps. At the table, New Zealand thus had to content themselves with just 1400 for a swing of 14 IMPs rather than 17.
They handed back half this swing on the last board of the session.


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wasik | Bach | Knap | Cornell |
| Pass | $1 \&$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \&$ | Pass | $3 \triangleleft$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

As it remained unclear what the club situation was, the 26 HCP game was missed. Ten tricks, New Zealand +130.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Brown | Sabate | Whibley | G Goded |
| Pass | I $\vee$ | Pass | $2 \triangleleft$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

A classic auction to a 3NT contract that made easily enough when the red suits behaved just enough, even on a club lead by East. Spain +430 and 7 IMPs back to them.
With 16 boards to go, the score stood at I52-II3 to Spain.

## WBF Director of Sponsorship and WBF Youth Development Coordinator

The WBF is very pleased to announce the following appointments:

Lindsey Weinger as WBF Director of Sponsorship


Lindsey Weinger, new WBF Director of Sponsorship

Gilad Ofir as WBF Youth Development Coordinator


Gilad Ofir, new WBF Youth Development Coordinator in action

## Open Teams QF - S6 <br> Poland v Sweden

By Ram Soffer

The replay of last year's Bermuda Bowl final was a tight match from start to finish. Sweden took an early lead, but Poland erased it during the third session, and by the end of the fifth session the hosts built up a significant, but by no means impregnable, lead of 15 IMPs.
That number increased during the first two boards of the final session because of unforced errors by Sweden. First, Johan Upmark took several wrong views in a INT contract and went one down instead of making it with an overtrick (at the other room Klukowski just made $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ ). Then Frederic Wrang held

```
M K62
& K 8 4
A A
2 KJIO964
```

He opened $\mid \boldsymbol{\mu}$, and his partner responded $\| \diamond$, a transfer to hearts. This $14-\mathrm{HCP}$ hand is slightly weakened by the stiff $\diamond \mathrm{A}$, but Wrang bid $3 \%$, and his partner went on to a poor 3NT contract that failed by two tricks. At the other table, Nowosadzki chose the standard rebid of 20 and played there - just making.
The third board gave Sweden new hopes, as NystromUpmark were able to use their relay system to good effect to reach a slam not bid at the other table. That was an important II-IMP swing to Sweden, and there was more good news for them two board later.

Board 2I. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- AK 7
$\vee$ J 32
$\diamond$ KQ 765
9 103
© Q 532
- AKQ 74
$\diamond$ A 43
-8

s 186
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond$ J 108
\& KJ9642
- 10985
$\diamond 92$
\& A Q 75

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sylvan | Gawrys | Wrang | Klukowski |
|  | I $\diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | INT | Passs | Pass |

Dble All Pass
Sylvan doubled for a heart lead, but after the first trick won by $\oslash \mathrm{Q}$ he changed tack and attacked spades. Gawrys ducked one and won the second round of spades. Had he seen his opponents' cards, he would have played a club to
the queen and a diamond back and made his contract easily thanks to the favourable layout in the minor suits. But this line could also backfire, so he was content with developing a heart trick. This line of play helped West developed his own long heart, so declarer lost four hearts, two spades and the $\diamond$ A. Sweden +200 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kalita | Nystrom | Nowosadzki | Upmark |
|  | I $\diamond$ | Pass | I $\varnothing$ |
| Pass | INT | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | Pass | $2 \mathbf{2 0}$ | Pass |
| $2 \otimes$ | All Pass |  |  |

Nowosadzki didn't sit for the double. He bid 20 and his partner became declarer in $2 \triangle$. Even though GIB would have commended their decision, at the table the Polish pair was unsuccessful.
North led 210 . South won his 2 Q and switched to $\diamond 9$. North won a diamond trick and switched to $\Phi A K$, followed by a third round of spades. Declarer led 2 K , ruffing out the 9 A and drew three rounds of trumps.All he had to do now was remove South's exit card with the $\diamond$ A before cashing $\stackrel{\mathrm{Q}}{\mathrm{Q}}$, and South would have been forced to give dummy a club trick. Kalita, however, didn't find this "stepping stone" play and went down one - 6 more IMPs to Sweden.
At this point the match was extremely close. The following deal was probably the decisive one.

Board 23. Dealer South. All Vul.

|  | - J 976 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PK84 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 964 |  |
|  | - A 3 |  |
| , A Q 103 | N | - 842 |
| QQ 752 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 93 |
| $\checkmark$ K 87 |  | $\checkmark 52$ |
| -95 | S | * 18742 |
|  | - K 5 |  |
|  | QJ 106 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ QJ 103 |  |
|  | - K Q 106 |  |


| West | North | East | South <br> Sylvan |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Gawrys | Wrang | Klukowski <br> 18 |  |
| Dble | Rdbl | Pass | Pass |
| I $\diamond$ | Dble | Rdbl | Pass |
| I $\diamond$ | Pass | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

West doubled somewhat aggressively. North redoubled, and East-West were on the run. However, neither Polish player was prepared to double $1 \vee$ with fewer than four
trumps, so Sweden escaped a severe penalty while NorthSouth reached their normal 3NT contract.
Sylvan led 85 (third best according to system). Wrang cleverly put the 89 , but Klukowski knew he didn't have the ®Q, so (after finessing diamonds successfully) he took the right view on the second round of hearts, reaching nine tricks.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kalita | Nystrom | Nowosadzki Upmark |  |
|  |  |  | I $\downarrow$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | Pass | Pass |
| I $\$$ | Pass | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Despite the different opening bid (North-South were playing a strong lopening), the bidding in the other room went along the same lines, but the lead was slightly different, as Kalita-Nowosadzki play attitude leads vs NT. So Kalita picked the $\vee 7$ to indicate a bad suit to his partner (and encourage spades). Upmark made a costly mistake by not covering this with dummy's $\vee 8$. East played low and the QIO won the trick. There followed four diamond tricks, and then declarer had to decide what to do. Declarer could still recover by attacking spades, but Upmark tried a heart to the king and it was all over for him.
Was he convinced what West led from $\vee A$ Q 9 7? If so, there was still no harm in covering the $\vee 7$ with the $\vee 8$. True, declarer preferred to win in hand in order to finesse diamonds immediately, but he could always get there with clubs.
There were still opportunities to close the gap, but Sweden kept missing them.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/WVul.

|  | - Q 109 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q Q J 43 |  |
|  | $\diamond 2$ |  |
|  | -KQJ92 |  |
| - A632 | N | - J 87 |
| $\bigcirc 7$ |  | ¢K109852 |
| $\diamond 19864$ |  | $\checkmark 107$ |
| -1053 | S | - 76 |
|  | - K 54 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 6 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AKQ 53 |  |
|  | \& $\mathrm{A}^{8} 4$ |  |

In the old days, having such a nice $20-\mathrm{HCP}$ hand opposite partner's opening bid meant that South would never stop below slam, but openings bids have become significantly lighter in the modern game, while systems have become more sophisticated and it's possible to find out when partner has a terrible hand plus a (partial) misfit. Two of the best pairs in the world decided to stop below slam with the North-South cards.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sylvan | Gawrys | Wrang | Klukowski |
|  | 2\% | Pass | 2 |
| Pass | 2 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 34 | Pass | 4\% |
| Pass | 5\% | All Pass |  |

2e was natural (II-I4) and $2 \diamond$ was a relay. Gawrys showed his distribution. Then Klukowski bid 4\%, agreeing the suit and asking for cuebids. Gawrys bid 5\%, showing the worst possible hand.
It took Klukowski a long thought before passing this. Eventually he decided to trust his partner, as the diamond singleton (inferred from the 3s bid) had already been bad news. Wrang led a trump. Gawrys drew trumps and made his contract without trying any finesses.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kalita | Nystrom | Nowosadzki | Upmark |

All Pass
After the ambiguous $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ opening, ranging from good 10 to bad $16, I \boxtimes$ was either natural or starting a relay with any strong hand. 2 showed four hearts with an unbalanced distribution. There followed five more asking bids by South. By the time the bidding reached 44, South must have known his partner's exact distribution as well as the fact that he had minimal values. One thing he couldn't find out about was the location of the $\vee \mathrm{J}$. Missing one ace and one king, slam was not a bargain for Upmark, and he signed off in 5\% when 6\% essentially depended on the heart finesse.
The Polish defence was very active: East leading a spade and West switching to hearts after winning the \$A. As a result Sweden won one consolation IMP for their efforts.
Sometimes that's the problem with sophisticated systems - you know too much about the hand for your own good. At one of the Seniors' tables, it took North-South four bids to reach slam by a somewhat primitive route: I - I - INT6NT.They registered +990.
One board later, the rigidity of the Swedish relay system consigned Nystrom-Upmark to a poor 3NT contract, going two down after the obvious club lead, while their Polish counterparts applied judgement to reach a much better 4s with a 5-2 fit. Luckily for Sweden, Klukowski was unable to read the complete distribution and he mistimed the play, going one down but still earning 3 IMPs for Poland.
At this point Sweden were 21 behind with 6 to go. They got 3 back on board 28, but the following deal assured Poland of victory:


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sylvan | Gawrys | Wrang | Klukowski |
|  |  | Pass | $1 \varangle$ |
| Dble | Rdbl | Pass | $2 \rrbracket$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Redouble showed I0+ HCP with penalty interest. South's $2 \checkmark$ showed a sub-par opening (with full values he was expected to pass). Gawrys had some working cards, but nothing special: balanced II with two low cards in his partner's suit. He respected Klukowski's show of weakness and passed. Simple and convincing.
In the other room, Nystrom gave it another try with 38 . Upmark accepted, but as long as West didn't cooperate by leading spades, he could only dream of ten tricks. East has a sure trump trick, and when he finally gets the lead, he is going to play a spade. In addition, one diamond trick had to be lost.
As expected, both declarers made nine tricks, and Poland's lead grew to 23. The final two boards didn't produce any swings. Thus the reigning champion, Sweden, went out of the competition despite showing high-level bridge and admirable fighting spirit, while the host nation prepared to meet the Netherlands in the semi-finals.

## Senior and Mixed Teams QF - S6

By Jos Jacobs

At the start of the final 16 boards of the quarterfinals, Turkey were leading Denmark 155-147. The slim margin meant an interesting finish was in prospect.
After a quiet first seven boards, Denmark led by just 3 IMPs, scoring 13-2 on these boards. This was board 24:

Board 24. Dealer West. None Vul.

- 104
©J 1094
$\diamond$ AJ 107
\& KJIO

$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond 95$
89654

. 75
- A Q 873
$\diamond K$ Q 643
\& A
- A 92

○K 52
$\diamond 82$
\& Q 8732

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hansen | Ince | Schou | Kokten |
| $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{s}$ | All Pass |

Over partner's weak two, Schou thought he was worth a raise to game. Right he was, as even two rounds of trumps would not beat it, provided declarer starts by ruffing out the $『 \mathrm{~K}$ third with South.
On the actual $\vee \mathrm{J}$ lead, Hansen could ruff two clubs in dummy while taking care to avoid a trump promotion.. Denmark +420 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yildiz | P Schaltz | Karadeniz | D Schaltz |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \wedge$ | All Pass |

When Karadeniz took a more careful approach, Turkey had missed a reasonable game. Nine trick on the $\diamond$ A lead, Turkey +l40 but 7 IMPs to Denmark to increase their lead to 10.
On the next board, it looked as if both teams had ruined their chances.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/WVul.

|  | , Q 109 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q J 43 |  |
|  | $\diamond 2$ |  |
|  | 2 K Q J 92 |  |
| - A632 | N | ¢ J 87 |
| $\bigcirc 7$ |  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 109852$ |
| $\diamond$ J 9864 |  | $\diamond 107$ |
| \% 1053 | S | 9 76 |
|  | - K 54 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 6 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKQ 53 |  |
|  | - A 84 |  |

For Turkey, the declarer in 6NT did not manage to locate the $\$$ and thus had to go one off. This offered a great chance to the Danish N/S pair but they spoiled it by reaching 7\%, off an ace. So the board was a push, with both teams regretting their missed chance...
In the Netherlands v. China Mixed match, Richard

Ritmeijer showed the way:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hou | Ritmeijer | H Wang | Tichá |
|  | 18 | Pass | $1 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $1\rangle$ | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $5 N T$ |
| Pass | 6NT | All Pass |  |

Declarer won the $\diamond 10$ lead, crossed to his 2 K and led the $\bigcirc$ Q covered by king and ace. His next move was a spade to his queen and the $\$ 10$, ducked in dummy. When West had to win with his ace, declarer was home for a fine +990 and 14 IMPs when the Chinese declarer went down in the same contract.
On the next board, the Danes offered Turkey another big chance, and this time they accepted it.

Board 26. Dealer East. All Vul.


East made the excellent lead of the 0 . Declarer won dummy's ace and led a spade to his queen, which held the trick. When on the next spade, East once again played low, declarer suddenly was home. When the defence won their ace of trumps, they were able to cash a club trick but as the heart finesse was working for declarer, II tricks were secure.Turkey an unexpected but nevertheless useful +600 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yildiz | P Schaltz | Karadeniz | D Schaltz |
|  |  | Pass | 14 |
| Pass | INT | Pass | 2 2 |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | 32 |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Though South had shown a minimum hand (3e being a further relay), North had every reason to have a shot at 3NT, holding sort of an opening bid himself. When East led the 910 , declarer soon had to accept down two. Turkey another +200 and 13 IMPs to them, enough to regain the lead by 3 IMPs.

Turkey added 4 more IMPs on board 28 but then, the Danes struck back:

Board 29. Dealer North. All Vul.

- A 5
$\checkmark$ AQ 5
$\diamond$ J 632
\& 10743

| - J 107 | N | - 9862 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 84$ |  | $\bigcirc 107632$ |
| $\diamond$ K 1075 | W E | $\diamond$ A Q 8 |
| \& Q 95 | S | \% K |
|  | - K Q 43 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 19$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 94$ |  |

A1 A 862

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hansen | Ince | Schou | Kokten |
|  | Pass | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | All Pass |  |

As 2NT was natural and thus invitational, South saw no reason, holding a minimum himself as well, to bid on. On the actual layout, 3NT by North could not be beaten; Turkey +150.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Yildiz | PSchaltz | Karadeniz | D Schaltz |
|  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | $1\rangle$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 0}$ |
| Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

After an artificial; start to the auction ( $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ semi-balanced, $I \triangleleft$ relay and is showing a minimum) the rest was natural and forcing, so 3NT was duly reached. On a low heart lead to the jack, king and ace, declarer had no problems when the clubs behaved and the defence were not able to cash four diamond tricks. Denmark +630 and 10 IMPs to them to lead by 3 IMPs with three boards to go.
Board 30 was a push but this was board 31:
Board 3I. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- J 6
© K 3
$\diamond$ Q 186
A Q 863
- A Q 4

○J7654
$\diamond$ A 94
\& K 7


| West <br> Hansen | North | Ence | Schou |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$| South |
| :--- |
| Kokten |
| Pass |

When Kokten did not consider his hand worth an opening bid of $I \oslash$, it was West who immediately seized his chance to do so.As North had not taken action in spite of his obvious shortness in hearts, South decided to leave the opponents alone. Down three, Turkey +150 .

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yildiz | P Schaltz | Karadeniz | D Schaltz |
|  |  |  | 18 |
| INT | Dble | 28 | Dble |
| 2. | 34 | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

At the other table, Dorthe Schaltz could open $1 \vee$, according to the couple's methods, so Peter could enter the auction easily when West showed a sign of life. East ran to her suit in transfer fashion but Peter was not to be deterred, so the unbeatable 3NT was duly reached. Ten tricks when the club finesse worked for declarer, as expected, Denmark another +630 and 10 more IMPs to them.
The score in the match now stood at 187-I74 for Denmark. It was ultimately the final score as the Danes advanced to the semi-final.
In the Mixed Teams match between Germany and Bulgaria, Germany held a remarkably similar margin at I87173 with one board to go. As you are about to see, this lead did not hold up.

## Board 32. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

© KJIO 82
$\bigcirc 54$
$\diamond$ AKQ 3
92

| ¢ Q 53 | N | ¢ A 96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A 8 | W E | $\bigcirc$ K Q J IO 973 |
| $\checkmark 10982$ |  | $\diamond \mathrm{J}$ |
| 9 J 1084 | S | 2 K Q |
|  | - 74 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 62$ |  |
|  | $\diamond 7654$ |  |
|  | 2 A 7653 |  |

In the open room, the German East (Beatrix Wodniansky) played in $3 \vee$, making nine tricks for plus 140 . In the closed room, it was a different story.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aronov | Kondoch | Damianova | Vechiatto |
| Pass | $1 Q$ | $2 \varangle$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Rdbl | All Pass |

As we can see, declarer has nine easy tricks, no more and no less, barring misdefense ( $4 \checkmark$ was made by Chip Martel
in USA-Australia). At these two tables, the score thus amounted to +1240 to E/W. At the other table, the German East was in $3 \bigcirc$ making for plus 140, so Bulgaria gained I5 IMPs, enough to make them the winners at I88187.

In the Netherlands-China match, the Chinese East in the open room bid $4 \bigcirc$, going one down. When the auction and result in Bulgaria-Germany was duplicated in the Netherlands-China match, the gain was 16 IMPs, but it served only to increase the Dutch margin of victory.
One might thus say that it would be sufficient for Denmark to avoid playing a redoubled contract. As it happened, they all kept quiet in this match, as both Easts overcalled $2 \triangleleft$ and rebid $3 \checkmark$ when N/S reopened. They both played there for +140 and a push. So Denmark were through, I87-I74.
In USA-Australia, Martel made $4 \checkmark$ because of a slip by the defense. This was the auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hamman | Lavings | Martel | Krochmalik |
| Pass | IQ | Dble | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |

Robert Krochmalik started with the \$7: 3, 10, 9. Paul Lavings cashed a high diamond and could have defeated the contract by switching to a trump, which takes away a vital entry to dummy before clubs have been established and unblocked. When Lavings switched to a club, Martel took advantage of the mistake. South took the K with the ace and returned a diamond, ruffed by Martel, who cashed the $\% Q$ and played the $\vee Q$ to dummy's ace. He played the $\%$, which was ruffed by Lavings and overuffed with the 9 . Martel then played the $\vee 7$ to dummy's 8, pulling trumps, and could cash the 910 to discard his losing spade. Plus 620 meant I 2 IMPs to USA ( $4 \checkmark$ was one down at the other table), but USA still would have won if Martel had gone down.


Diana Damianova, Bulgaria

|  | Open Teams SF - SI |
| :---: | :---: |
| By Micke Melander | Poland v Netherlands |
|  |  |

Here come two non-trivial play problems from the first segment of the quarterfinals in Wroclaw, taken from the match between Poland and the Netherlands.

Problem I. Dealer East. E/WVul.

```
@ 742
\veeAK985
A J
&Q 10 3
```



```
\& K Q 108
\(\vee\) QJ 106
\(\diamond\) Q 1085
\& Q 103
```

For the first problem, you also need the bidding to give you some help.

| West | North | East <br> Pass | South <br> Pass |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| INT | $2 N T^{*}$ | Dble | $32 \boldsymbol{2 0}$ |
| Pass | Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \triangle$ | Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |

2NT was for the minors and you know that South prefers clubs instead of diamonds. How to play Four Hearts, when North led the five of spades and your queen holds the trick?

```
Problem 2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.
- A Q 832
คA95
\(\diamond A 5\)
\& A 107
, 106
- K 872
\(\diamond K\) Q 6
48632
```

The opponents didn't interfere. Plan your play in 3NT when West leads the four of clubs, you call for a low one and East wins the queen to return the two of diamonds.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.
வ 53
$\bigcirc 3$
$\diamond K 9762$
\& AK 972


Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nab | Jassem | B. Drijver | Mazurkiewicz |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| 18 | 2NT | 420 | 520 |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |
| Closed Room: |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Kalita | S Drijver | Nowosadzki | Brink |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| INT | 2NT | Dble | 38 |
| Pass | Pass | 3 | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 4 | All Pass |

Mazurkiewicz pre-empted immediately against the heart game in the Open Room. Nab saw no reason to be declaring at the five level, so he suggested defending. His double ended the auction. The king of hearts was led, followed by the ace and jack of diamonds. Declarer won with the king and called for a spade. East went up with the queen and declarer won the ace and put the jack of clubs on the table. West covered with the queen but when declarer couldn't get back to hand to repeat the club finesse, declarer was two off, for 300 to E/W.
In the closed room, Brink decided not to sacrifice against the heart game. It would have been interesting to see how declarer would have coped with a spade lead from North, ducked by South. Bas Drijver led the ace of clubs, no doubt wanting to see dummy before opening up another suit. At trick two he shifted to a trump. Declarer won, ruffed a club, played a diamond to the ace and ruffed his last club. He then pulled trumps and just exited with the jack of diamonds, North could win with the king but declarer could discard his spades on the good diamonds in dummy. A spade lead would have been interesting since declarer will win first trick in dummy, as South will duck (knowing North's distribution almost for sure). He has to pull one round of trumps (two can work but it's a very complicated route for success), ending in hand, to lead the club queen. If he does that, North will win with the king and may return his last spade through dummy. But declarer just covers and South will win; but now if he cashes the ace of spades, dummy's king will be good to pitch the losing diamond. If he returns a diamond declarer simply will get up with his ace to later set the diamonds for a spade discard, when South can't get in any longer. 8 IMPs to Poland.
So let's have a look at the second problem.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

|  | 4 A Q 832 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 95 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 5 |  |
|  | \& A 107 |  |
| $\pm 95$ | N | ¢ KJ7 7 |
| $\bigcirc$ QJ 64 |  | $\bigcirc 103$ |
| $\diamond 1074$ |  | $\diamond$ J 9832 |
| \&) 954 | S | ¢ K Q |
|  | ¢ 106 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 872$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K Q 6 |  |
|  | 28632 |  |

Open Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Jassem | B. Drijver | Mazurkiewicz |
| Pass | $1 \$$ | Pass | 18 |
| Pass | $1 \$$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 \Phi$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3 \$$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Closed Room:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kalita | S Drijver | Nowosadzki | Brink |
| Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 \diamond$ |
| Pass | $3 \bigcirc$ | Pass | 31 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

In the open room, Mazurkiewicz got the four of clubs lead and viewed the situation carefully. With seven sure winners, he needed to set up just two more tricks. Declarer went up with the ace of clubs played a heart to the king and put the ten of spades on the table. When West didn't cover he went up with the queen, and that lost to East's king.
East unblocked the king of clubs and exited safely with a diamond, which went to dummy's ace. With a double spade stopper with East and only one entry to dummy left it was now impossible for declarer to get the needed tricks from the spade suit, declarer tried to see if hearts were 3-3 but when that wasn't the case - two down!
Brink was up for the same task in the closed room. He also got the four of clubs opening lead, which went to the seven, queen and his three. Nowosadzki now shifted to a diamond, which declarer won in dummy. Brink apparently knew his suit combinations, calling for a low spade from dummy. That gives you three chances in four for getting three tricks from the suit and is superior to any other line of play. (At matchpoints, low to the eight is the best way to get four tricks from the suit). When the ten held, Brink just a played a spade towards dummy and covered what West played. East won with his king, and declarer had no problem entering dummy to set up the last spade for nine tricks and a very well deserved 13 IMPs to Netherlands.
Did you cash one trump before playing a club on the first board? Did you play a low spade to the ten? If so, congratulations! Well done indeed.

## Mike Joyce at the World Bridge Games



The WBF was pleased to welcome Mike Joyce - IOC Sports Coordinator Manager to Wroclaw at the 2016 World Bridge Games. He attended the WBF Congress and visited all the departments during the WBG 2016 in Wroclaw.
"It has been fantastic to see bridge in action over the past couple of days. I see many dedicated and professional people working hard to deliver a great event. The players seem very happy with the event and as I said, there is a real buzz! Thank you very much for your hospitality and welcome."

## WBF Committee of Honour



We are pleased to announce that at the meeting of the Executive Council, held on Tuesday 6th September, Mrs. Chen Zelan and Ms. Georgia Heth were elected to the WBF Committee of Honour.
They were presented with the WBF pins by Mr. Jose Damiani,WBF President Emeritus and Chairman of the Advisory Committee, during the President's Dinner of the 7th September.



On Wednesday morning, the Open series was down to the final four. This would mean that any team still playing could be sure of having to cope with strong opposition. This certainly applied for Spain, the only team in the Open series not mentioned by the cognoscenti on any of their lists of pre-tournament favourites, I would assume.
Well, let the cognoscenti dream on while we start concentrating on what actually happened in the opening segment of this long (96-board) semifinal.
Spain had taken an early lead (2-I) when this board arrived:

Board 4. Dealer West.All Vul.

|  | $\wedge$ Q |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 107$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ KJ10854 |  |
|  | 2 1652 |  |
| - 6543 | N | - K 1082 |
| $\bigcirc 964$ |  | $\bigcirc 18$ |
| $\checkmark$ A 7 | W E | $\checkmark$ Q 92 |
| 2K1083 | S | - A Q 74 |
|  | - AJ9 7 |  |
|  | $\triangle$ AKQ 532 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 63$ |  |
|  | -9 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | FGoded | Helness | Lantaron |
| Pass | Pass | 18 | 18 |
| Dble | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \&$ | $4 \nabla$ |

## All Pass

Once North could produce a noise, South had to bid game. A trump lead beats it out of hand as declarer cannot get to dummy in time to run the $\varphi \mathrm{Q}$ and ruff a spade later. When Helgemo led a club to Helness' ace, the latter did in fact return a trump but he chose the $\odot 8$ - enabling Lantaron to make the daring play of running this to dummy's ten. Once this came off, declarer could continue the $\varphi \mathrm{Q}$ from dummy, covered and won by the ace. He ruffed a spade, ruffed a club, drew trumps and played a diamond to dummy's king in the end for an overtrick as the defenders had discarded too many clubs. Spain a great +650 .
In the other room, the auction was short.

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| G Goded | Multon | Sabate | Martens |
| Pass | Pass | $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ | $1 \triangleright$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Nebulous diamond, strong overcall and the same II tricks on a favourable spade lead for declarer. Monaco +200 but 10 IMPs to Spain.

Two boards later, Spain found a fine sacrifice.
Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

- 53
$\checkmark 3$
$\diamond K 9762$
* AK 972

| ¢ 742 | N | ¢ K Q 108 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ AK9 85 | W E | $\bigcirc$ QJ 106 |
| $\diamond$ A J |  | $\diamond$ Q 1085 |
| \& Q 103 | S | \% 8 |
|  | ¢ AJ96 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 742$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 43$ |  |
|  | 2) 654 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | FGoded | Helness <br> Pass | Lantaron |
| INT | Pass | $3 \%$ | Pass |
| $4 \varnothing$ | $4 N T$ | Pass | $5 \%$ |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

Over INT, Federico Goded could not bid, but over $4 \checkmark$ he could and right he was! Even on a spade lead from North, $4 \checkmark$ is cold as North does not hold a third spade. If South wins the first spade trick, it's trivial and if South ducks, you draw trumps and play a club to North's ace. If he returns his second spade, South cannot cash two tricks in the suit and return a diamond to set up a trick for partner's king.
Five Clubs went the obvious two down, Monaco +300 .


Jordi Sabate, Spain

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| G Goded | Multon | Sabate | Martens |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| I 8 | 2NT | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| 48 | All Pass |  |  |

Multon, too, showed his minors but Martens was not interested. Spain +620 and 8 more IMPs to them.
With the score at 2I-3 to Spain, they avoided the 4s trap on board II.


As Federico Goded had refrained from sending out a club warning during the auction, the Monegasques reached 4s without any problems. Down two as there was nothing declarer could do against the actual distribution. Spain +100 .


Franck Multon, Monaco

With the clubs 6-I and North entryless, even the diamond lead did not do the defence any good. Declarer won in dummy, cashed the $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ and exited with the $\$ 9$ after the fall of the ten. South could win and return a club but declarer would always come to four spades, four diamonds and a heart for his contract. Spain another +400 and II more IMPs to them, to lead 32-3.
On the next board, Monaco finally hit back strongly.
Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- A Q 832

PA95
$\diamond A 5$

- A 107

45
QQJ 64
$\diamond 1074$
\& 1954

| N | ¢ KJ7 4 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 103$ |
| W E | $\diamond$ J 9832 |
| S | ¢ K Q |
| ¢ 106 |  |
| -K872 |  |
| $\checkmark$ K Q 6 |  |
| ¢ 8632 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | F Goded | Helness | Lantaron |
| Pass | Is | Pass | INT |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \stackrel{3}{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

On the lead of the 86 by West, declarer took East's ten with his king and played a spade to the queen and king. A diamond came back and declarer went on to establish spade tricks. When the suit broke 4-2, giving declarer three losers in it, he could no longer come to the required nine tricks. Monaco +l00.
In the replay, Gonzalo Goded led the $\varangle \mathbf{Q}$ against the same contract:

| West | North East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G Goded | Multon | Sabate | Martens |
| Pass | 19 | Pass | INT |
| Pass | 20 | Pass | $2 \diamond$ |
| Pass | 28 | Pass | 24 |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Martens won in hand, crossed to the $\vee \mathbf{A}$ felling East's ten and...led a low spade from dummy. When East played low, declarer's ten scored a surprise trick. When Martens led a spade to the ace he could then exit with a heart to establish the $\vee 8$ as his 9th trick: two spades, three hearts, three diamonds and eA. Monaco +600 and 12 IMPs back to them.
If East rises with his at trick 3, the outcome would have been the same. On any return, declarer would either run the $\$ 10$ from hand or play another low spade towards his ten.
After 16 boards, the score stood at $33-18$ to Spain.

## The Polish Corner

## CIEŻKA ORKAY

Mecz Polska－Holandia to prawdziwe zmagania tytanów． Wyrywanie punktów Holendrom to bardzo ciężka praca．Oto jedyny większy zysk pierwszej części meczu：

```
Rozd.6.WE po partii, rozd. E.
                $ 53
                \diamond
                            K9762
                                * AK972
Rozd．6．WE po partii，rozd．E．
```

- 742
- AK 985
$\diamond A W$
- D 103


4『 na WE można obłożyć，ale wymagałoby to czekania ze swoimi lewami－ N musiałby powstrzymać się przed ściągnięciem asa trefl，a wyjść $z$ dubla pik．Teraz $S$ musiałby przepuścić podłożoną figurę．Taka obrona jest dość abstrakcyjna，toteż nasi na WE po licytacji：

| West <br> Kalita | North <br> Drijver | East <br> Nowosadzki <br> South |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| IBA | 2BA | pas | pas |

2BA－młodsze
zapisali +620 ．$N$ ściągnął asa trefl，po czym zagrał $w$ atu．Teraz Jacek przebił dwa trefle，wracając asem karo，odatutował i oddał karo．
Na drugim stole Jassem－Mazurkiewicz zmontowali obronę：

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nab | Jassem | Drijver | Mazurkiewicz |
|  |  | pas |  |
| 18 | 2BA | $4{ }^{3}$ | 5\％ |
| ktr． | pas．．． |  |  |
| 2BA－ |  |  |  |

pięciu．Decyzja była właściwa，ale 5 zakończyło się wpadką jedynie bez dwóch，co dało nam 8 imp ．
Jakakolwiek próba wychylenia się w dwóch pierwszych segmentach kończyła się zwykle kiepsko．Oto przykład：

Rozd．22．WE po partii，rozd．E．


Jacek Kalita z kartą W dostał szansę wskazania wistu pikowego：

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kalita | De Wijs | Nowosadzki | Muller |
|  |  | pas | pas |
| pas | IBA | pas | 20 |
| pas | $2 \checkmark$ | pas | 31 |
| ktr． | 3BA | pas．．． |  |

Można się zastanawiać，czy kontra jest poprawna．．．Pewnie jeśli Michał miałby w pikach Dxx rozmowa byłaby inna．A tak？Nastąpił zdyscyplinowany atak w piki i kontrakt został zrealizowany z nadróbką．
Na drugim stole licytacja była prawie identyczna：

| West <br> Brink | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gawryś | Drijver | Klukowski |
|  |  | pas | pas |
| pas | IBA | pas | 240 |
| pas | $2 \checkmark$ | pas | $3{ }^{2}$ |
| ktr． | 3BA | ktr． | pas．．． |

3人－54 4ヘ（Smolen）
Drijver nie dość，że skontrował 3BA，to jeszcze nie wyszedł w piki，tylko zaatakował damą karo．As z ręki i król kier przepuszczony，po czym zabrakło jednego dojścia do impasu pik i bez jednej．II imp dla Holandii．
Miejmy nadzieję，że fart się odwróci！ ＂Służac życiu＂
staropolanka．
SoTrefl

