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| :---: | :---: |
| Quarter-finals |  | | Transnational |
| :---: |
| Qualification | \right\rvert\,



Alvise Ferri FIGB (Federazione Italiana Gioco Bridge) board member, Benito Garozzo, Barry Rigal
In the Bermuda Bowl all four teams that are leading, USA I \& II, Netherlands and France have scored 100 or more IMPs, but apart from Sweden who trail by 47, the matches remain close. In the Venice Cup, of the leading teams only China are yet to reach a century, and Indonesia \& Poland are tied, a fine effort by the latter who trailed by 44 after 16 deals. Israel are only 13 clear of Sweden, while England lead Russia by 35. In the d'Orsi Trophy France, USA I and Sweden have decent leads, but USA 2 trail Japan by 20 IMPs.

The Prize Giving \& Closing Ceremony of the 2017 World Bridge Championships will take place on Saturday 26 August. It is open to all players competing in the Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup, d'Orsi Trophy and Funbridge Transnational Teams. It will be held here at the Cité Centre De Congrés, the exact time and venue to be announced once the number attending is known.
In order to get a ticket you must register at the Hospitality desk by the main entrance no later than 25 August.
No ticket - no entry!


## Bermuda Bowl

|  |  | P | I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | T |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FRANCE |  | 39 | 42 | 21 |  |  |  | 102 |
|  | CHINA |  | 52 | 15 | 20 |  |  |  | 87 |
|  |  | P | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | T |
|  | NETHERLANDS | 6 | 35 | 39 | 21 |  |  |  | 101 |
|  | NEW ZEALAND |  | 21 | 46 | 24 |  |  |  | 91 |

FRANCE Thomas BESSIS, Francois COMBESCURE, Cedric LORENZINI, Jean-Christophe QUANTIN, Jerome ROMBAUT, Frederic VOLCKER, Lionel SEBBANE captain
CHINA Yunlong CHEN, Jianming DAI, Jianwei LI, Lixin YANG, Bangxiang ZHANG, Jie ZHAO, Jihong HU captain, Gang CHEN coach
NETHERLANDS Simon DE WIJS, Bob DRIJVER, Bauke MULLER, Bart NAB, Berend VAN DEN BOS, Joris VAN LANKVELD, Wubbo DE BOER captain, Ton BAKKEREN coach
NEW ZEALAND Ashley BACH, Matthew BROWN, Michael CORNELL, Geir-Olav TISLEVOLL,
 Michael WARE, Michael WHIBLEY, Derek EVENNETT captain


SWEDEN $\quad$ Fredrik NYSTROM, Mikael RIMSTEDT, Ola RIMSTEDT, Johan SYLVAN, Johan UPMARK, Frederic WRANG, Per Gunnar ELIASSON captain, Jan LAGERMAN coach
USA2 Martin FLEISHER, Joe GRUE, Chip MARTEL, Brad MOSS, Jacek PSZCZOLA, Michael ROSENBERG, Jan MARTEL captain
USAI Ralph KATZ, Robert LEVIN, Jeff MECKSTROTH, Nick NICKELL, Eric RODWELL,
$\square$

BULGARIA Victor ARONOV, Diana DAMIANOVA, Georgi KARAKOLEV,Vladimir MIHOV, Ivan NANEV, Julian STEFANOV,Victor ARONOV captain, MARTA NIKOLOVA coach

|  |  | P | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | T |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SWEDEN |  | 43 | 37 | 11 |  |  |  | 91 |
| \# | USA2 | 41 |  | 51 | 43 |  | 135 |  |  |
|  |  | P | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | T |
| \% | USAI |  | 36 | 34 | 49 |  |  |  | 119 |
| BULGARIA |  |  | 72 | 12 | 11 |  |  |  | 95 |



## Venice Cup

|  | P | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | T |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SWEDEN |  | 26 | 48 | 23 |  |  |  | 97 |
|  | ISRAEL |  | 30 | 34 | 43 |  |  | 107 |  |


|  | P | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | T |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RUSSIA |  | 21 | 24 | 53 |  |  |  | 98 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ENGLAND |  | 43 | 58 | 32 |  |  | 133 |  |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

SWEDEN Pia ANDERSSON, Kathrine BERTHEAU, Ida GRONKVIST, Emma OVELIUS, Cecilia RIMSTEDT, Sandra RIMSTEDT, Kenneth BORIN captain, Carina WADEMARK coach
ISRAEL Adi ASULIN, Hila LEVI, Michal NOSACKI, Nathalie SAADA, Dana TAL, Noga TAL, Joseph
RUSSIA Victoria GROMOVA, Anna GULEVICH, Elena KHONICHEVA, Tatiana PONOMAREVA, Diana RAKHMANI, Maria YAKOVLEVA, Tatiana DIKHNOVA captain
ENGLAND Sally BROCK, Fiona BROWN, Catherine DRAPER, Sandra PENFOLD, Nevena SENIOR,
 Nicola SMITH, Derek PATTERSON captain, David BURN coach
INDONESIA Rury ANDHANI, Lusje Olha BOJOH, Suci Amita DEWI, Kristina Wahyu MURNIATI, Conny SUMAMPOUW, Julita Grace TUEJE, Hendra RAILIS captain, Bill MONDIGIR coach
POLAND Cathy BALDYSZ, Zofia BALDYSZ, Katarzyna DUFRAT, Natalia GAWEL,Aleksandra JAROSZ, Justyna ZMUDA, Miroslaw CICHOCKI captain

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

CHINA Yan HUANG, Yan LIU, Yan LU, Qi SHEN, Nan WANG, Wen Fei WANG, Jianxin WANG captain, Xiaojing WANG coach
NETHERLANDS Carla ARNOLDS, Merel BRUIJNSTEEN, Laura DEKKERS, Magdalena TICHA, Wietske VAN ZWOL, Martine VERBEEK, Alex VAN REENEN captain, Hans KELDER coach

|  |  | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | INDONESIA |  | 62 | 12 | 27 |  |  |  | 101 |
|  | POLAND |  | 18 | 47 | 38 |  |  |  | 103 |
| $*:$ | CHINA | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |
|  | NETHERLANDS | 70 | 5 | 13 |  |  | 88 |  |  |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

## d'Orsi Trophy

|  |  | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | USA2 |  | 34 | 17 | 45 |  |  |  | 96 |
|  | JAPAN |  | 25 | 37 | 54 |  |  |  | 116 |


|  |  |
| :--- | :--- |
|  |  |

USA2 Michael BECKER, David BERKOWITZ,Allan GRAVES, Neil SILVERMAN, Alan SONTAG, Jeff WOLFSON, Steve GARNER captain
JAPAN Tadashi IMAKURA, Masayuki INO, Kyoko OHNO, Akito OMASA, Akihiko YAMADA, Kazuhiko YAMADA, Hiroaki MIURA captain
AUSTRALIA Terry BROWN, Peter Walter BUCHEN, Pauline GUMBY,Avi KANETKAR, Warren LAZER, Bruce NEILL, George BILSKI captain, LALITA KANETKAR coach
SWEDEN Mats AXDORPH, Christer BJARING, Sven-Ake BJERREGARD, Bengt-Erik EFRAIMSSON Anders MORATH, Johnny OSTBERG, Tommy GULLBERG captain, Carina WADEMARK coach
ITALY Andrea BURATTI,Amedeo COMELLA, Giuseppe FAILLA, Aldo MINA, Ruggero PULGA, Stefano SABBATINI, Pierfrancesco PAROLARO captain
USAI Dennis CLERKIN, Jerry CLERKIN, Marc JACOBUS, Mike LEVINE, Mike PASSELL, Eddie WOLD,
FRANCE Nicholas DECHELETTE, Pierre-Yves GUILLAUMIN, Georges IONTZEFF, Jean-Jacques PALAU, Nicholas DECHELETTE, Pierre-Yves GUILLAUMIN, George
Pierre SCHMIDT, Philippe TOFFIER, Eric GAUTRET captain
INDIA Ramawatar AGRAWAL, Subhash DHAKRAS, Dipak PODDAR, Keshav Sakharam SAMANT, Jitendra SOLANI, Ramamurthy SRIDHARAN, Dipak PODDAR captain, Anal SHAH coach

|  | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ITALY |  | 42 | 14 | 20 |  |  |  | 76 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | P | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | T |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FRANCE |  | 81 | 10 | 13 |  |  | 104 |
|  | INDIA | 20 | 26 | 34 |  |  | 80 |  |

$\square$

## World Championship Book 2017- Lyon

The official book of these championships should be ready around the end of February 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.
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 25 Euros, or 30 US\$, including i postage (surface mail).
Alternatively, you can pay the same prices via Paypal to Brian Senior at bsenior@hotmail.com, which is also an option for a limited period after the end of the championships.

| VuGraph SCHEDULE |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11:00 The VuGraph Theatre is located in the Auditorium Pasteur14:30 17:20 |  |  |  |  |  |
| USAI-BULGARIE (BB) | VG/BBOI | SWEDEN-USA2 (BB) | VG/BBOI |  | VG/BBOI |
| USA2-JAPAN (OT) | BBO 2 | USAI-BULGARIA (BB) | BBO 2 |  | BBO 2 |
| NETH.-NEW ZEALAND (BB) | BBO 3 | NETH.-NEW ZEALAND (BB) | BBO 3 |  | BBO 3 |
| INDONESIA -POLAND (VC) | BBO 4 | AUSTRALIA-SWEDEN (OT) | BBO 4 |  | BBO 4 |
| SWEDEN-ISRAEL (VC) | BBO 5/FB | FRANCE-CHINA (BB) | BBO 5/ FB |  | Funbridge |
| SWEDEN-USA2 (BB) | BBO 6/FB | FRANCE-INDIA (OT) | BBO $6 / \mathrm{FB}$ |  | Funbridge |
| ITALY-USAI (OT) | BBO 7/ FB | SWEDEN-ISRAEL (VC) | BBO 7/ FB |  | Funbridge |
| FRANCE-CHINA (BB) | BBO 8/ OG | CHINA-NETHERLANDS (VC) | BBO 8/ OG |  | BBO 8/ OG |
| courtesy of | $0$ | ACAEx <br> FUNBRIDGE | aso 貯 |  |  |

## Le (bon) coin francophone

Jean-Paul Meyer

## En vertu des pouvoirs qui lui sont conférés....

Et suivant la formule consacrée, José Damiani a remis au Président de la Fédération Française Patrick Grenthe les insignes de Chevalier dans l’ordre du Mérite National qui lui avaient été décernés sur proposition du Ministre des Sports du gouvernement français.. La cérémonie s'est déroulée à l'abbaye de Collonges où étaient réunis environ 150 amis du récipiendaire. Ce dernier, en remerciement,


L'accolade de José Damiani et Patrick Grenthe évoqua les diverses étapes depuis ce soir de 2013 où il avait appris que la candidature de Lyon 2017 avait été retenue.

## Michael Cornell condamné à dormir à la

## belle étoile ?

Michael est membre de l'équipe Néo-Zélandaise dans la Bermuda Bowl. On se souvient que le titre mondial lui avait finalement été attribué à Wroclaw en 2016 après qu'ait été découverte une erreur dans le score de la paire affichée à la première place. Il avait demandé au Bulletin, il y a trois jours, d'écrire qu'il souhaitait céder sa chambre, pensant que son équipe n'avait plus aucune chance de qualification...Ainsi fut fait. Parfait! Pensez-vous. A cela près que la Nouvelle Zélande arrachait sur le fil sa place en quart de finale. ne soyez donc pas étonné de voir un bridgeur, cette nuit, dans un sac de couchage dans le Parc de la Tête d'Or.

## De bien jeunes épouses

Depuis quelques mois l'administration française a pour consigne d'éviter le terme «Mademoiselle» dans les papiers officiels. La FFB semble appliquer la consigne à la lettre. Du coup, on constate que toutes les joueuses participant aux épreuves scolaires voient leur nom précédé de «Mme». On peut s'étonner quand on sait que ces tournois sont ouverts au moins de 13 ans.

## Malheurs.... aux gagnants.

Une malédiction semble s'être abattue sur les gagnants des 42 èmes championnats du Monde - édition 2015 en Inde. Voyez plutôt : les vainqueurs de la Bermuda Bowl, la Pologne ne réussirent pas à se qualifier pour Lyon lors des championnats d’Europe de Budapest. La France remporta la Venice Cup mais, ici, à Lyon ne put franchir le cap de la poule qualificative.
Restait le Trophée d’Orsi, l'épreuve senior, propriété des Etats-Unis, qui voient ses deux équipes en quart de finale. Cependant si on examine la composition des équipes on constate que celle tenante du titre a échoué dès les épreuves de sélection américaines.

## L'homme de l'(90è) année

Lors de l’assemblée générale annuelle de l'IBPA, l'association internationale des journalistes de bridge a nommé Benito Garozzo, homme de l'année, après une carrière étincelante de quelques 60 ans. Le génial nonagénaire italien nous a déclaré «Cela me console un peu, car c'est la première Bermuda Bowl que je quitte sans une médaille !»


Benito Garozzo

## Bilan des poules éliminatoires.

Par pays
100 \% de réussite pour la Suède qui qualifie ses trois équipes
Les USA qualifient 4 équipes mais en avaient présenté 6 initialement.
La Chine et la France tirent leur épingle du jeu avec deux équipes qui poursuivent leur route.

## Par continent

Joli score pour l'Europe : 6 pays qualifiés sur 8 engagés en Venice Cup.
4 sur 7 en Bermuda Bowl et un résultat moindre pour le Trophée d'Orsi 3 sur 7.
Au total un résultat de 13 sur 22, mieux que l'Amérique du Nord (4 sur 9).

## Le championnat des ordinateurs

Selon la terminologie adoptée à tort en anglais, pour ce qui est une compétition entre programmes pour jouer au bridge.
Cette épreuve, dirigée par AI Levy, se déroule au même étage que le Vu-graph.
Elle a réuni 7 logiciels qui disputent une poule qui se terminera ce soir pour déterminer les quatre demi-finalistes. Les spectateurs sont les bienvenus. Wbridge d'Yves Costel défend les couleurs de la France

## Guy Dupont commente une donne pour vous :

## Sécurité onéreuse

Au dix-neuvième tour du Round Robin de la Venice Cup, la France était opposée aux Pays-Bas, deux équipes qui, aux yeux des observateurs patentés, pouvaient légitimement envisager de se retrouver en finale... Mais, comme on le sait, la France, tenante du titre, est restée engluée aux portes de la qualification pour la phase finale.

Un délicat problème de déclarant, pour amateurs de maniements, sur la donne 8. Prenez place en Est (Ouest donneur, personne vulnérable) :

| - R 43 |  | N |  | - A 85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ AD 108 |  |  |  | ¢ V 964 |
| $\diamond$ V6 |  | O | E | $\diamond$ R 75 |
| - D 643 |  | S |  | \& A 105 |
| 0 | $\mathbf{N}$ |  | E | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| Cronier | Arnolds |  | Willard | Verbeek |
| 18 | Passe |  | 18 | Passe |
| 28 | Passe |  | 2 SA* | Passe |
| 38 | Passe |  | 48 | (Fin) |

Sud entame du 10 de Carreau, pour le Valet et l'As de Nord, qui insiste à Carreau, pour votre Roi. Vous laissez filer le 9 de Cœur. Il tient. Sur le Valet qui suit, tout le monde fournit petit. Terminez!
La déclarante a éliminé le dernier atout, avant de s'attaquer aux Trèfles, couleur où il lui fallait réaliser deux levées - notant que sur un partage 3-3, les deux levées auraient été au rendez-vous quel que soit le maniement. Faute de communications suffisantes, elle décida de jouer Trèfle pour l'As, puis Trèfle pour la Dame, pour gagner sur la place du Roi, et, à défaut, en trouvant le Valet sec ou second en Sud. Mais ce n'était pas le jour et elle chuta.

- V962
$\bigcirc 73$
$\diamond$ A 83
- RV82


Pour débroussailler notre colline, rien de tel que de consulter la Bible, en l'occurrence le Dictionnaire des maniements de couleurs, de Roudinesco. Celui-ci nous enseigne que dans cette position, si l'on dispose de toutes les communications voulues, le maniement optimum consiste à jouer un petit Trèfle sous l'As, vers la Dame, et si elle perd au Roi, à rejouer un petit Trèfle pour le 10. Résultat des courses : 26,5 \% de chances de réaliser trois levées, plus 59,4 \% d'en assurer deux. Mais oublions-le. D'une part, parce qu'on n'a pas besoin de faire trois levées, et de l'autre, parce que sa mise en place serait ici dangereuse, en raison de la fragilité des communications.
Retrouvons Roudi. Si on doit se contenter de deux levées de Trèfle, il existe ce qu'en bon chef comptable il appelle une «sécurité onéreuse», consistant à tirer d'abord l'As, avant de remonter au mort pour attaquer vers le 10, et enfin, si nécessaire, à terminer par petit vers la Dame. Avec $89 \%$ de chances à la clé !
Est-elle ici envisageable ? Oui, avec une infime restriction: après deux tours de Cœur, alors qu'on est en main au Valet, il convient d'encaisser l'As de Trèfle, pour ménager les communications. Le risque de se faire couper par Sud est mini-minime (pratiquement guère plus de $1 \%$ ). Après l'As de Trèfle, on élimine alors le dernier atout, et on poursuit par Trèfle vers le 10. Le tour est joué ! La seule position des honneurs adverses pour vous faire chuter serait de trouver le Valet second en Sud et le Roi quatrième en Nord. Toutes les autres combinaisons sont favorables.



With three round-robin matches still to be played, Monaco were just out of the top 8 places that would qualify for the knock-out stage. How would they fare against Brazil, who were 10 VPs or so behind them? We began with a slam deal:

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Thoma | Helness | Ravenna | Helgemo |
| - | Pass | 14 | Pass |
| 28 | Pass | 4 | Pass |
| 5\% | Pass | 5 | Pass |
| $6 \%$ | Pass | 68 | All Pass |

West's 6\%, a grand slam try, was seemingly ambitious facing a diamond void. North led his singleton spade against $6 \triangleright$ and Thoma won with dummy's ace. It was now his task to set up the diamond suit. He continued with a club ruff,


Pablo Ravenna, Brazil
diamond ruffed with the $\vee 4$, club ruff, diamond ruffed with the 86 , club ruff and a third round of diamonds. The $\diamond 10$ and $\diamond J$ had already appeared from South. Should declarer ruff with the $\vee A$ or the $\vee I O$ ?
When Thoma called for the $\vee 10$, South overruffed and returned a trump. That was one down. The winning line was to ruff with the $\vee \mathrm{A}$, draw trumps in two rounds and give up a diamond trick.
Sadly, at the other table, neither the bidding nor the play were recorded. Martens made $6 \bigcirc$ on the East cards for a I4-IMP swing to Monaco.
Next we had a bidding board:
Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Thoma | Helness | Ravenna | Helgemo |
| - | - | Pass | 14 |
| $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass | $4 \Phi$ |
| Dble | Pass | Pass | Pass |

What do you make of West's double? It's unlikely that he is doubling for penalties merely because of a large pointcount or an unexpected trump trick. Perhaps it should be read as an Action Double. In other words, he is showing a hand with great playing strength in clubs and asking partner to judge whether to defend or to advance to $5 \boldsymbol{2}$.
With no defence at all, East might well have decided to bid $5 \%$, which would be only 300 down against a making vulnerable game. When he chose to pass, West cashed his three aces and the Monaco pair scored +790 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Chagas | Martens | Villas-Boas |
| - | - | Pass | 1 |
| 20 | 2 | Pass | 4 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Again West began by cashing his three aces and declarer claimed +620 at the next trick.

West's double at the other table had been very enterprising, as I see it. East's decision not to bid 5\% meant that Brazil lost 4 IMPs instead of gaining 8.
There was another 'double swing' (going minus instead of plus) on the next deal

Board 3. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- 96
$\checkmark$ AKJ 983
$\diamond 72$
\& J 102
\& K 107543
$\checkmark$ Q 6
$\diamond 63$
986


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Thoma | Helness | Ravenna | Helgemo |
| - | - | - | 19 |
| Pass | 3 | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Helgemo/Helness do not play a INT response as forcing. To avoid missing games on responding hands such as North held here, they play invitational jump responses. Helgemo chose to raise to $4 \oslash$ and the $\diamond K$ was led. How would you play the hand?
Helness won with dummy's $\diamond A$ and finessed the $\vee J$ successfully. He continued with the two top trumps, discovering that he had a trump loser. What now? By playing on clubs, you can almost guarantee the contract. (lt seems to me that you would go down only when East had started with a singleton club and could ruff the second


Tor Helness, Monaco
round and lead a spade to set up partner's $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ before the \%A had been knocked out.)
Helness chose to finesse the $\leq \mathrm{Q}$ instead. When this failed, he had a loser in every suit. and was one down.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Chagas | Martens | Villas-Boas |
| - | - | Pass | 19 |
| Pass | INT | $2 \diamond$ | 39 |
| Pass | $3 \vee$ | All Pass |  |

Villas-Boas faced a similar situation to Helgemo and chose not to raise. Chagas played on clubs instead of spades, disposing of his spade loser, and soon claimed +170 . Going one down in $4 \checkmark$ had lost 6 IMPs instead of gaining 6.
Next we will take a look at a grand slam that proved too difficult to reach:

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- 104
$\checkmark$ AKQJ 6
$\diamond 642$
\& K 72

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \wedge Q 87 \\
& \diamond 10954 \\
& \diamond \text { Q J } \\
& \& A 943
\end{aligned}
$$


$\checkmark 8732$
$\diamond 1053$
\& Q J 1065
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Thoma | Helness | Ravenna | Helgemo |
| - | $1 \$$ | Dble | $2 \vee$ |
| Dble | Pass | 64 | All Pass |

I have every sympathy for Ravenna's leap on the second round. Even if you have some auction where Exclusion Blackwood in hearts becomes possible, how would you find out about the diamond situation? At least he avoided any possible disagreement as to whether 3s would be forcing after the Responsive Double!
Closed Room

| West | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Chagas |
| - | 18 |
| 49 | Pass |
| $6 \mathbf{4}$ | All Pass |


| East | South |
| :--- | :--- |
| Martens | Villas-Boas |
| $3 \mathbf{2 0}^{*}$ | 3 |
| 58 | Pass |

Martens began with an overcall that showed specifically spades and diamonds. He continued with a cue-bid of 58 to inform partner that he did not hold the sA. Although Multon's hand was not particularly splendid, he might well have bid $6 \%$ on the way to $64.6 \diamond$ by Martens would conceivably have edged them towards the big prize.

Let me see how many Bermuda Bowl pairs managed to reach 74. Only four pairs bid 74, with the remaining pairs all in 64. The one successful auction that I managed to see involved East bidding an Exclusion Blackwood $5 \vee$ over a free 3s raise and then guessing that there would be no diamond losers. Not an easy hand to bid.

## Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.

\& 63

- A 98
$\diamond$ KQ 932
\& 1084


## , A Q 8752 <br> $\checkmark$ K 4 <br> $\diamond$ J 106 <br> \& 2


$\bigcirc Q 110752$
$\diamond A 5$
2K 75
Open Room

| West | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| Thoma | Helness |
| - | Pass |
| 19 | $2 \varnothing$ |
| $3 \Phi$ | All Pass |


| East | South |
| :--- | :--- |
| Ravenna | Helgemo |
| Pass | 18 |
| 2 | 38 |

At his second turn, Helness bid just $2 \boxtimes$. This seems enough, particularly when this pair sometimes open I 8 on a four-card suit. Helgemo bid a non-invitational 3 and N/S then sold out to West's 3s.
Helness led a trump to the jack, king and ace. The e Q was run to the king and Helgemo returned the $\diamond 5$ to partner's queen, winning the diamond return. A heart switch gave the defenders two tricks in that suit, followed by the $\diamond \mathrm{K}$ for two down and +200 to N/S.

## Closed Room

| West | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Chagas |
| - | Pass |
| Is | $2 \boldsymbol{*}^{*}$ |
| All Pass |  |


| East | South |
| :--- | :--- |
| Martens | Villas-Boas |
| Pass | $1 \varnothing$ |
| Pass | $4 \oslash$ |



Chagas bid the North hand more strongly, despite facing a non-vulnerable opening in third seat. When the $\diamond J$ was led,Villas-Boas scored eleven red-suit tricks and added the eK for +480 and 7 IMPs.
We will end with a five-level battle of the red suits:
Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- KJ 6

คAKJ642
$\diamond J$
5 83


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Thoma | Helness | Ravenna | Helgemo |
| $1 \diamond$ | $I \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| $5 \diamond$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

Helness led the $\odot \mathrm{K}$ and the defenders scored a trick in each side suit. That was one down for +100 . There were three top tricks to be lost in $5 \vee$, so North seemed to have judged the bidding well.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Multon | Chagas | Martens | Villas-Boas |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ | $4 \diamond$ |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass | 5 |

All Pass
Look now at the East hand.What opening lead should you choose?
A diamond lead is unattractive, since it may well be ruffed. Martens reached for his singleton spade and Chagas claimed 12 tricks. I can see the attraction of leading a spade against a contract of $4 \checkmark$. Partner might win with the ace, give you a spade ruff and (if dummy has a diamond void, for example) you could then attempt to cross to partner's K for a second ruff.Against $5 \triangleleft$ it may be a better idea to lead the sA. When dummy goes down with the s A and partner encourages clubs, you can take the first three tricks. So, Monaco lost II IMPs when they might have gained 5.
The final score was 28-25 to Monaco, 10.91-9.09 in VPs. This was not as big a win as they would have liked in their eventually unsuccessful quest to reach the eight qualification places.
Gabriel Chagas, famous for his lightning-fast play, will be happy to note that his table completed 16 boards in just one hour and six minutes!

Krzysztof Martens, Monaco


At the start of the penultimate round, Italy and New Zealand were in 10th and IIth place respectively, at the respectable distance of 16 and 19 VPs behind Egypt, the no. 8 at the time. So to have any chance at all, however remote, of making it into the top eight in the end, either team would definitely need a good win.
On the opening board of the set, Italy made a firm first step towards a possible big win:

Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.

$$
\text { ゅ J } 54
$$

คA 974
$\diamond 10642$
2 84
上A986

- K 865
$\diamond$ J 95
\% 12

$\bigcirc$ Q 103
$\diamond$ AK Q 87
Q 73
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Garozzo | Tislevoll | Masoero | Ware |
| - | Pass | 1\% | $1 \diamond$ |
| 2\%* | $2 \diamond$ | $3{ }^{*}$ | Pass |
| 38 | Pass | 34 | Pass |
| 49 | All Pass |  |  |

After the nebulous $1 \otimes$ opening and the $\mid \diamond$ overcall, Garozzo could show his majors by bidding $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ and 44 was then reached in a logical way. After two rounds of diamonds, Masoero found an almost trivial way to make the contract. He ruffed in hand and played three rounds of clubs, ruffing the third with dummy's nine. North overruffed with the jack but had no good defence as the remaining $N / S$ trumps now were $2-2$. Discarding instead of overruffing would make declarer's life almost too easy but a diamond return would be ruffed by declarer in hand and two top trumps would then draw the outstanding trumps. Dummy's 4 A would take the game-going trick after the ensuing club procession. Italy +420 .
In the replay, the Italians found a more testing defence.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M. Brown | Di Franco | Whibley | Manno |
| - | Pass | 18 | $1 \diamond$ |
| Dble* | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble* | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 4 | All Pass |  |  |

West's first double showed hearts but his second double made it clear that his hand had more to offer. North led a diamond, which was won by South with his ace. The heart continuation now gave declarer a nasty guess. When he called for dummy's king, Di Franco won the ace and returned the suit...
Another diamond then settled the issue as there was no way for declarer to draw trumps, establish the clubs and enjoy them too without losing another trick. Italy +50 and 10 IMPs to open their account.
On the next board, New Zealand recouped 6 IMPs when the Italian E/W pair overbid to a thin game that stood no chance on the actual layout and this was board 19:

Board 19. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- J 1062
- K 54
$\diamond 2$
2 Q 10854

| N | ¢K 75 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J 109 |
| W E | $\checkmark 108763$ |
| S | ¢96 |
| ¢ 94 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A 762 |  |
| $\diamond$ Q 54 |  |
| \& AK 32 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Garozzo | Tislevoll | Masoero | Ware |
| - | - | - |  |
| Dble | IS | Pass | INT | All Pass

When Garozzo led three rounds of diamonds, Ware winning his queen in the 3 rd round, the chance of beating


Michael Ware, New Zealand
the contract had gone, as Ware simply went on to cash his top tricks. New Zealand +120 . To beat the contract, West has to find the switch to a low spade at trick two. Would the $\diamond 8$ (or the $\diamond 10$, at the cost of a diamond trick) by East have sent the message?
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M. Brown | Di Franco | Whibley | Manno |
| - | - | - | I \$ |
| Dble | Pass | $I \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dble | $3 \diamond$ | All Pass |

When North did not bid over West's double, E/W immediately hit upon their diamond fit. Whibley made his contract easily enough when he finessed the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ through the opening bidder. Just made, New Zealand +1IO and 6 more IMPs to them to take over the lead: I2-I0.
A small partscore swing and a useful sacrifice had given Italy a 24-14 lead when this board came up:

Board 27. Dealer South. None Vul.

| West | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| Garozzo | Tislevoll |
| - | - |
| $1 \diamond$ | IS |
| $\mathbf{4} \varnothing$ | Pass |
| 5 | All Pass |



Over North's very aggressive overcall, East's $2 \triangleleft$ showed hearts. When Ware could join in the spade fun, the Italians simply did not have enough room to fully explore their combined values. West's club control remained undisclosed so East did not want to venture a slam. Italy +480 .
In the other room, the New Zealanders were given more room and they immediately made good use of it:
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| M. Brown | Di Franco | Whibley | Manno |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \checkmark$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | 2 NT* $^{*}$ | Pass |
| $4 \dot{*}$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{\wedge}^{*}$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond *$ | Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |

2NT was a general relay agreeing hearts, 4e was a splinter and 44 was RKCB. Two key cards then were enough for East to bid the slam with confidence. New Zealand +980 and II IMPs to them to regain the lead: 2524.

With just 2 boards to play, the score stood at 27-24, a close result that would not boost either team's hopes of qualification.
This was the penultimate board:
Board 3I. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

## - 3

© AK 73
$\diamond$ K 63
\& 10752

| N |  | - K 10872 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 82 |
|  | E | $\checkmark$ A Q 4 |
| S |  | \& K 4 |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Garozzo | Tislevoll | Masoero | Ware |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \mathbf{2}$ | IS | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

Perfect defence can put this contract three down: $\triangle A K$ and a ruff, followed by a club to North's ace and a spade through. South can then exit in clubs and when North gets his $\diamond K$ he can play a heart for partner to ruff with his $\$ \mathbf{j}$. The defence will get five spades, two hearts and a trick in either minor.
When South led the Q to partner's ace and exited with $\Phi$ Q after winning his $\$ 9$ on partner's return of his trump, he had avoided the trump endplay at the cost of an undertrick. New Zealand only +300 .
Not that this mattered very much as in the replay, the Italians did not realise they were in a good contract at a certain moment:

Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M. Brown | Di Franco | Whibley | Manno |
| - | - | - | 15 |
| Pass | 2\% | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 3s | Pass | 3NT |
| Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass | 4NT |
| Pass | 5\% | All Pass |  |

Both South's heart splinter and his 3NT bid might have been taken as warning signs by North but when he did not, the pair was overboard. With the spades 5-2 and the $\diamond A$ wrongly placed for declarer, $5 \diamond$ had no reasonable play. Down two, New Zealand another +200 and just II IMPs to them rather than 12 - the amount if is doubled had gone down three.


Michael Wibley, New Zealand

So New Zealand led by 14 , still not the big win they might have been hoping for. However, they got one more chance on the last board of the match and took it:
As you can easily see, $4 \Phi$ in E/W cannot be made as there are four inescapable losers because the diamonds don't break 3-3. 3NT would be even worse because the defenders have seven tricks from the top and the privilege of being on lead first.
There is one defensive card, however, that would do East as declarer a tremendous favour in 4s and even in 3NT: the $\diamond$ J. With no information available from the bidding, one cannot even blame South for finding the lead of the $\diamond$ J; it happened at more than one table.

Board 32. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

|  | ¢ 73 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 106 |  |
|  | $\diamond 72$ |  |
|  | ¢K 8764 |  |
| ¢K1094 | N | ¢ A Q J 5 |
| $\bigcirc 85$ |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 974 |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 865 |  | $\diamond$ K 9 |
| 2 105 | S | ¢ Q 93 |
|  | ¢ 862 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J 32 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ JIO 43 |  |
|  | \% A J 2 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Garozzo | Tislevoll | Masoero | Ware |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \$$ | Pass |
| $1 \diamond$ | $1 \$$ | Pass | Pass |
| $1 \$$ | Pass | 2 | All Pass |

North led a top heart and shifted to a diamond, which did not give anything away. Italy +140 for an overtrick in what looked very much like a flat board..
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M. Brown | Di Franco | Whibley | Manno |
| Pass | Pass | 1980 | Pass |
| 18* | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 34 | Pass | 4. | All Pass |

The transfer response of $\mathbf{I} \vee$ had made East the declarer so South led the $\diamond$ J...
Win the king, draw two rounds of trumps and run the $\diamond 9$ for ten tricks, New Zealand +620 and 10 IMPs more to win the match 48-24 or $15.74-4.26 \mathrm{VPs}$ Italy thus were out of contention with only one more match to play but the New Zealanders had risen to 9th, still nearly 6 VPs behind Egypt. They would need another good win and some help from outside as well...
When it turned out, after the last match, that they had got both, they were the 8th team to qualify. They would meet the Netherlands in the quarterfinals.


Brian Senior

Going into the final round of qualifying in the Venice Cup, England were safely into the knockouts but a good win might move them into the top three, where they would get some rights as regards the choice of opposition in the quarter-finals. Poland, however, were anything but safe. They lay eighth but were only 7.76 VPs ahead of ninth-placed USAI, who had a relatively easy final match - at least on paper - against 16th-placed Brazil. It was possible that Poland could lose the match and still qualify, but to be certain they needed to score 12.25 VPs .
The match began with a series of flat boards with very little scope for swings - just what the Poles wanted. After four flat boards things got even better for Poland.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- Q 109
-K 10872
$\diamond$ K 865
\& 3

$$
\text { AKJ } 74
$$

$\& A$
$\diamond A 107$
$\bullet K Q 54$


Q QJ 64
$\diamond$ Q 42
\& 10876

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Draper | Zmuda | Smith | Dufrat |
| - | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jarosz | Brown | Gawel | Brock |
| - | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 120 | 18 | Pass | 38 |
| 34 | Pass | 4 | All Pass |

For Poland, Aleksandra Jarosz opened a Polish ie and Fiona Brown overcalled, raised pre-emptively to the three level by Sally Brock. Jarosz judged to show her five-card major now rather than make a take-out double, and Natalia Gawel had an easy raise to game. After a heart lead to the jack and ace, Jarosz lost a spade and a diamond; II tricks for +450 .
The West hand is a little less easy for standard bidders, not good enough for 2s, a bit heavy for 1 . Still, the latter would be my choice as I positively hate 2NT openings containing a singleton - if there is a trump fit, this always hugely undervalues the hand. For England, Catherine Draper saw 2NT as the least of evils and Nicola Smith, with a weak four-card major and no shortage, had a routine
raise to 3 NT. Justyna Zmuda's equally routine heart lead meant that Draper was a swift one down for -50 and II IMPs to Poland.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

- Q 3

Q Q 1097
$\diamond$ K 109764

- 2

West
Draper
- 

is
34

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Jarosz | Brown | Gawel | Brock |
| - | - | - | 12 |
| Pass | $1\rangle$ | Pass | $1 \$$ |
| IS | 20 | 2 | 30 |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Katarzyna Dufrat opened is as South, three-way, any 18+, natural with five-plus clubs and $15+\mathrm{HCP}$, or a weak no trump, II-I4. Draper overcalled and Zmuda made a negative double. Smith's four-card spade raise looked quite normal but took her side a level too high (the Poles were, of course, making at least nine tricks in a diamond contract, so it was unlikely that E/W could have gone plus anyway). Zmuda led a club but Dufrat switched to a heart at trick two so there was no ruff. As against that, the heart trick was established and the defence had five winners for down one and -100 .
In the other room, Brock opened le, two-plus cards, and after a pass from Jarosz, Brown made a transfer response of $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ to show four or more hearts. Brock's rebid showed two or three hearts, normally in a weak no trump type, and now Jarosz made a delayed overcall. Now it looks as though Brown was trying to puppet to $2 \triangleleft$ but Brock read 2. as natural. Whatever the cause of the problem, the bottom line was that, instead of making a diamond partscore, the English pair found themselves in the slightly silly contract of $3 \boldsymbol{2}$. Jarosz led the jack of spades to the queen and king. Gawel cashed the ace of spades then
switched to the jack of clubs. Brock ducked that and now Gawel switched to hearts, Jarosz winning the ace and returning a spade, allowing Brock a cheap ruff in hand. She continued with the ace of clubs, followed by king of hearts and a heart to the queen, ruffed. Back came the ten of clubs to the king. Brock played on diamonds now and just lost one more trump for down two and -200; 7 IMPs to Poland, who led by 17-0.
The next deal saw England get on the scoreboard for the first time.

## Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

|  | ¢ A 6 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ QJ 109 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 975 |  |  |
|  | \& A 86 |  |  |
| - Q 952 | W E |  | \& KJIO 873 |
| คK862 |  |  | $\bigcirc$ A 5 |
| $\checkmark$ J 6 |  |  | $\diamond$ Q 42 |
| 9942 |  |  | \& K 10 |
|  | Q 4 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 743$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A 1083 |  |  |
|  | \&QJ753 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Draper | Zmuda | Smith | Dufrat |
| Pass | 1\% | 19 | Pass |
| 3s | All Pass |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jarosz | Brown | Gawel | Brock |
| Pass | 1\% | 14 | Dble |
| 24 | Dble | 31 | 4\% |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Zmuda opened a Polish club and Smith overcalled, Draper raising aggressively to 3 s which bought the contract. With the A A onside there were nine easy tricks for +140 .


Fiona Brown, England

Brown opened a two-plus card 19 and Gawel also overcalled. Brock made a negative double and Jarosz made only a simple spade raise. Brown made a support double and, when Gawel now competed with 34, Brock in turn competed with $4 \%$. Gawel led the jack of spades, Brown winning the ace and ruffing her other spade then taking the club finesse. The $\diamond Q$ lost to the king and Gawel returned ace and another heart, collecting her ruff a moment later. However, she was now endplayed and her diamond return picked up that suit for declarer without loss. The contract was down one for -50 but 3 IMPs to England; 3-I7.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.
و 8732
$\triangleright$ KJIO
$\diamond 92$
\& K Q 74


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Draper | Zmuda | Smith | Dufrat |
| - | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 3\% | Pass | 38 | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jarosz | Brown | Gawel | Brock |
| - | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 2NT | 3\% | $3 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |  |  |

Facing a five-card major opening, is the West hand worth a raise to game or only an invitational raise to three? Invitation, said Draper, and bid a Bergen-style 3\% then accepted her partner's sign-off. It isn't clear what Jarosz intended, as her 2NT response showed either an invitational hand with three or more hearts or a weak game-force. When Brown put in a rather daring leaddirecting bid on a four-card suit, Gawel made a game try and Jarosz accepted - or had she always planned to go on to game, as I suspect many would have made a game raise?
With no lead-directing bid from partner, Dufrat kicked off with a diamond to the nine and ten and Smith gave up a club, the ten losing to the queen. Back came a diamond so Smith won the ace and continued with the $\diamond \mathcal{K}$, pitching dummy's $\$$. The diamond was ruffed by Zmuda, who led a spade to dummy's ace. Smith cashed the $\vee A$, ruffed a club, ruffed a diamond, and ruffed another club when Zmuda did not over-ruff. She continued the crossruff and came to ten tricks for +170 .
Brown's lead-directer duly saw Brock lead the ace of clubs. On sight of dummy she switched to a spade and

Gawel rose with the ace and led the jack of diamonds, rising with the ace when there was neither a cover nor a flicker on her right. She continued with king and a third diamond, ruffing in hope of bringing down queen to three. Brown over-ruffed and returned a spade to her partner's king and, with the $\vee \mathrm{K}$ still to come, that was down one for -IOO and 7 IMPs to England; I0-I9.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- J65
$\triangle$ AKQ6
$\diamond 3$
-207543
- K 984
- J 4
$\diamond$ J 9842
\& A 6

- 3

81098732
$\diamond$ AQ 106
\& K 2

- A Q 1072
$\bigcirc 5$
$\diamond K 75$
* QJ 98

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Draper | Zmuda | Smith | Dufrat |
| - | - | $2 \curvearrowright$ | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jarosz | Brown | Gawel | Brock |
| - | - | $2 \diamond$ | $2 \uparrow$ |
| Pass | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | $3 \uparrow$ |

All Pass
Smith opened a natural constructive weak two bid and Dufrat overcalled. Zmuda had three-card support, 10 HCP and a ruffing value, so raised to game. Draper led the jack of hearts to dummy's ace. Dufrat cashed a second heart for


Katarzyna Dufrat, Poland
a diamond discard then ran the jack of spades, Draper winning the king and returning the nine. Dufrat won the spade and led a diamond to Smith's ace. A heart through now promoted an extra defensive trump trick, and there were also two clubs to be lost so the contract was down two for -200.
Gawel opened a multi $2 \diamond$ and Brock overcalled. Brown saw that almost all her high card values were in the opposition suit and might not be as valuable as they would have been elsewhere, so she only invited game via a 38 cuebid and respected Brock's sign-off.The opening lead was again the $\oslash$ J. Brock won the ace and led a low spade to her queen, Jarosz winning the king and returning a spade to dummy's jack. Brock played a club, Gawel rising with the king and returning a heart. Brock discarded a diamond from hand, won in dummy and played a second club to the queen and ace. Jarosz returned a trump, so Brock could draw those and cash the clubs and 8 K for ten tricks, all her diamonds going away. That was worth +170 and 9 IMPs to England, levelling the match at I9-19.

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

- J 10872

8 -
$\diamond 10432$
\& J 1097
49
QQ965
$\diamond$ AKQ8
$\rightarrow 6543$

-AKQ6543
$\bigcirc$ AJ
J 95
-
-K 1087432
$\diamond 76$
2 AK 82

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Draper | Zmuda | Smith | Dufrat |
| - | - | - | 18 |
| Pass | 14 | Pass | 20 |
| Pass | Pass | 2. | 3 |
| Pass | 49 | All Pass |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jarosz | Brown | Gawel | Brock |
| - | - | - | 48 |
| Pass | Pass | $4{ }^{4}$ | Dble |

All Pass
Brock opened the South hand with $4 \nabla$ then doubled the 44 overcall to show good defence in context of the opening bid. Brown had a heart void so had to hope that her partner would turn up with two winners to go with her likely two trump tricks. Brock started with the 8 K and switched to a heart. It didn't matter, with only one club standing up and declarer in a position to get rid of the heart loser anyway on the fourth diamond, there was no way to prevent ten tricks; +590.
Dufrat opened at the one level and Zmuda responded Is.

Smith could, presumably, have overcalled a natural 24, but preferred to see what happened so passed. When Dufrat's 2 rebid came back to her, Smith balanced with 24 and Dufrat showed her extra heart length, Zmuda giving preference to $4 \%$. The English pair had a combined 28 HCP , were cold for 49 despite the five-zero trump split, and defended $4{ }^{2}$ undoubled. It looks as though someone needed to do more at some point. Four Clubs drifted three off for -l 50 but +10 IMPs to Poland, who were back in front at 29-19.

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

| - A 87 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 64 |  |
| $\diamond$ Q9 72 |  |
| - A Q J |  |
| N | - KJ10963 |
|  | $\bigcirc 10$ |
| W E | $\checkmark 1064$ |
| S | - K 102 |
| - Q 4 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ AK 93 |  |
| $\diamond$ J 3 |  |
| *97543 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Draper | Zmuda | Smith | Dufrat |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | INT | $2 \diamond$ | Dble |
| Rdbl | Pass | 24. | 3s |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jarosz | Brown | Gawel | Brock |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | INT | $2 \diamond$ | Dble |
| 24 | Pass | Pass | 3s |
| Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |

Both Norths declared 3NT. Gawel led the six of diamonds against Brown, Jarosz winning the king and ace then returning a third diamond. Brown got that wrong, putting in the nine and losing to the ten while pitching a club from the dummy. Gawel returned a heart to dummy's ace and Brown took the club finesse, losing to the king. Back came a club. Brown won that, but had only eight tricks so was down one for -100 . That early club discard had proved to be fatal as if declarer had instead pitched a heart she would have had four clubs, three hearts, a spade and a diamond nine in all.
Smith led the two of clubs round to declarer's jack. Zmuda led a diamond to the jack and king and Draper returned a spade. Zmuda ducked this to Smith's king and back came a second spade to the queen. Zmuda took the losing club finesse, won the spade return and crossed to dummy to cash the clubs. The last club squeezed Draper in the red suits for the overtrick; +630 and I 2 IMPs to Poland; 4।-22.

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.

- 1085
$\bigcirc 982$
$\diamond 10$

2. 1098764

| , K | N | 4 A Q 932 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AKQJ 5 |  | $\bigcirc 43$ |
| $\checkmark$ AJ 53 | W E | $\checkmark$ Q 962 |
| - Q 53 | S | - A |
|  | - 764 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1076$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 874 |  |
|  | - KJ2 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Draper | Zmuda | Smith | Dufrat |
| 18 | Pass | 15 | Pass |
| 2\% | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $3 \checkmark$ | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 4 | Pass | 4NT | Pass |
| 5 | Pass | $6 \diamond$ | All Pass |
| West | North | East | South |
| Jarosz | Brown | Gawel | Brock |
| 190 | 3\% | 30 | 4\% |
| 4 | Pass | 5\% | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | 6\% | Pass |
| 68 | All Pass |  |  |

There are 13 tricks available in no trump or either major, though a club lead takes the entry away from the long spade hand so declarer needs some good fortune to come to 13 tricks.
Jarosz opened with a Polish $1 \%$ and Brown made a preemptive 3\% overcall and Brock raised to $4 \boldsymbol{\%}$. Jarosz' free $4 \checkmark$ bid showed the strong artificial type of $1 \%$ opening and Gawel twice cuebid before settling for $6 \vee$. Brown led the


Justyna Zmuda, Poland
ten of diamonds, covered all around, so Jarosz could draw trumps, cash the $\Phi \mathrm{K}$ and cross to dummy to cash the spades; + 1460
Draper opened I $\vee$ and Smith responded IS.Two Clubs was Gazzilli, natural or any $16+$, and $2 \triangleleft$ showed game values facing the strong variety. Three Diamonds was natural and strong, and when Smith now showed her diamond support they got locked into the poorest of the possible trump suits. However, Smith used RKCB, discovered a key card was missing, and stopped in the small slam. The lead was a heart. Smith won and cashed the ace of diamonds then the king of spades before leading a second diamond to the queen. Dufrat ducked that so Smith cashed a top spade for a club discard then went back to diamonds, leading low towards dummy's jack. Dufrat won the king and returned a diamond but Smith had a club entry to the spades so could claim the rest for +1370 but 3 IMPs to Poland.
The final score was 44-22 in favour of Poland, converting to $15.38-4.62 \mathrm{VPs}$. As USAI had only managed a modest win over Brazil, Poland had qualified in some comfort. They finished the round robin in eighth place while England qualified sixth.

## When The Lightning Struck <br> Micke Melander

There are times in bridge when you realize that you could have done far better than you did, but you can't work out why until it is too late. Sometimes it may take hours or a sleepless night when you are trying to work it out. Here comes a board from Sweden v Brazil in the Seniors (RI7).
You are declaring 4s from North and East kicks off with the jack of diamonds. How to get ten tricks after you ruff the opening lead and play the king of spades that holds, all following:


2* Precision style

Anders Morath ruffed the opening lead with the eight of spades and called for the king of spades, which held. At this point he concluded that West probably had AKQ of diamonds and therefore East the two aces in the majors. He also strongly believed trumps to be 3-I and called for the ace, king and queen of clubs. When West discarded on the third round the main question arrived - how to play then to avoid three losers in hearts and a trump? Morath pitched a diamond then played a trump hoping to be able to play hearts from his hand for only two losers. When that wasn't the case he was one down.
The full deal looked like this:
Board I4. Dealer East. None Vul.
\& Q J 9743
คK 64
$\diamond 85$
9. 97


He later confessed that when the lightning struck he realized that he had all the essential information needed to make the contract. He should have pitched a heart instead of a diamond! Then ruff a club high, if East overruffs he will be in control - since he must return his last trump, and if he discards and the trump holds the trick, you simply ruff your diamond to repeat a high ruff in clubs before pulling East's last trumps.
It was even worse, Morath revealed, since he told me he knew that East had both aces in the majors and the jack of diamonds, so he could also be pretty sure that West held the queen of hearts because East had passed in first seat. So he could even have played the jack of hearts and just run it if West wouldn't cover...
The board delivered 8 IMPs to Brazil when the Swedes sacrificed for -300 at the other table in Five Diamonds doubled.

## Dealing machines and cards

The Duplimates used for the duplication during the championship are sold for EUR 1999.You are advised to order I early as the number of machines is limited. Contact I Jannerstens at Forum 4 (just outside the playing room), or I drop a line to per@jannersten.com.
The (new) cards that you play with (if you I participate) will be sold after usage for EUR 180 per 240 decks. The (new) cards used during the
 I European Championships in Montecatini are available for instant delivery for EUR 165 per 240 decks. Other quantities on request in the bookstall.

## Bermuda Bowl RR - R2I

## Shoot Out For The Final Berth

At the start of the final round of the Bermuda Bowl there were three teams involved in the fight for the final qualifying spot. Egypt were in the box seat as they occupied the eighth place with 212.89 VPs (excuse the decimal points, but they are necessary) New Zealand were nearly four VPs behind with 207.05 closely followed by Monaco trailing by a further half a VP. Most pundits had expected Monaco to qualify and this was their final hope.
I shall not discuss too many deals but relate the story of the ebb and flow of the scores board by board. Egypt were appearing on BBO, as were Monaco. As New Zealand was in between them and an obvious candidate for a qualifying berth I expected to find them on BBO as well, thus simplifying my task. However they were not, thus my coverage of the New Zealanders play is strictly limited.
On Board I Egypt gave up 5 IMPs by over extending into a heart game whilst Bulgaria stopped at the three-level. Netherlands and Monaco similarly overbid, but New Zealand stayed safely in the part-score as did Brazil but inexplicably they failed by two tricks to give 6 IMPs to New Zealand. So now the VP position was:
Board I: Egypt 222.4I, Monaco 216.46, New Zealand 218.81

The second board saw Egypt claim back 2 IMPs, Monaco gain 5 and New Zealand a single IMP:
Board 2: Egypt 22I.98, Monaco 217.94, New Zealand 219.08

Egypt now had a cushion of less than 3 IMPs.
Board 3. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- Q J 42
$\bigcirc$ Q 1054
$\diamond \mathrm{K}$
\& A Q 107

4 10853
$\bigcirc 32$
$\diamond$ J 1075
5 J 64


Monaco and Netherlands both bid to Four Hearts from the South hand and received the lead of the $\diamond$ J. Muller perforce won with the king and played the ten of trumps, East hopped up with his king and led a small spade on which declarer immediately played the ace. Later when he played towards the $\uparrow \mathrm{QJ}$ he found the unwelcome news that the king was on his right and now his contract failed by one trick. In the other room after winning with the $\Delta \mathrm{K}$ again a high heart from dummy was played and taken by the king, here East continued with a diamond which declarer won. He continued with trumps, again taken by East, who
persisted with diamonds on which declarer discarded a second club. The final trump was drawn and the club finesse tried and failed but the spade king was well-placed and thus the contract came in for 10 IMPs to Monaco.
In Egypt vs. Bulgaria, the latter team bid and made Four Hearts whilst in the Open Room there was an entirely different auction:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aronov | El Ahmady | Damyanova | Sadek |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| Pass | 10 | Dble | Rdbl |
| Pass | Pass | $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

North's le might be only three clubs. After East's shapely Double there was potential for a bad outcome, however on this occasion fortune favoured the brave as the defence dropped an expensive potential trick and only defeated the contract by one trick and that was 6 IMPs to Bulgaria. Now the scores were:
Board 3: Egypt 220.34, Monaco 220.43, New Zealand 219.08

Monaco had now assumed the lead by 0.09 VPs - not quite safe but it looked as though the momentum was with them.
On Board 4 Bulgaria took another IMP from Egypt and likewise Netherlands from Monaco whilst New Zealand had a flat board.
Board 4: Egypt 220.09, Monaco 220.21, New Zealand 219.08

Only I IMP separated the three teams and so onto Board 5. Both Monaco and New Zealand had flat boards but Egypt gained II IMPs when they correctly stayed in game and made eleven tricks while their opponents bid a hopeless slam when trumps split 3-1 with the queen offside. They made the same eleven tricks and gave II IMPs to Egypt.


Waleed El Ahmady, Egypt

Board 5: Egypt 223.20, Monaco 220.2I, New Zealand 218.81

This gave Egypt back the lead by 3 IMPs.
The next board was flat for Monaco and Egypt but New Zealand gained 6 IMPs when their opponents bid on to a no hope game - as I mentioned before there is no BBO record of New Zealand so I cannot tell you much about the auction or play.
Board 6: Egypt 223.2, Monaco 220.2I, New Zealand 220.33

## Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul.

$$
\perp \text { Q } 3
$$


$\diamond$ K 109764

- 2
- J 10865
©AJ 84
$\diamond$ Q 3
* Q 6


AK 42
© 63
$\diamond \mathrm{J} 2$
\& 10987

- 97
© K 52
$\checkmark$ A 85
* AK 543


## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | De Wijs | Helness | Muller |
| - | - | - | INT |
| $2 e^{*}$ | $3 e^{*}$ | 4 | All Pass |

Muller bid a strong no-trump and Helgemo showed the majors and Helness closed the auction with a bid of Four Spades. After the lead of the ace and king of clubs a third round ensured a trump trick and along with two diamonds and a heart at the finish meant a three trick defeat.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Multon | Drijver | Martens |
| - | - | - | INT |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \diamond^{*}$ |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All Pass |  |

Martens/Multon play a weak no-trump non-vulnerable otherwise strong. I do not know if Martens misremembered or revalued his hand thanks to the fifth club - I suspect the latter. No matter which, once the level of INT had been passed they were heading for a minus score. West was not troubled to find a spade lead and that was a quick two down. This gave Netherlands II IMPs. New Zealand lost an overtrick IMP as did Egypt.
Board 7: Egypt 222.89, Monaco 217.37, New Zealand 220.09

In two boards Monaco went from eighth position to tenth but the difference was less than 3 VPs .
The next board was a part-score battle where Monaco won 5 IMPs, New Zealand lost 3 and Egypt gained 5.
Board 8: Egypt 224.37, Monaco 218.75, New Zealand 219.34

New Zealand had now fallen 5 VPs behind the leaders.
Board 9. Dealer North. E/WVul.

- 8732
- KJIO
$\diamond 92$
\& K Q 74

| - AJ | N | - Q 104 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PA652 |  | $\bigcirc$ Q 9743 |
| $\diamond{ }^{\text {J }} 5$ | W E | $\checkmark$ AK 108 |
| 9) 10863 | S | - 5 |
|  | - K 965 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 8$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 7643 |  |
|  | - A92 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Helgemo | De Wijs | Helness | Muller |
| - | $I N T^{*}$ | All Pass |  |

INT 9-II
After Monaco found no way into the auction De Wijs drifted peacefully three off, but only in 50's.
Closed Room

| West | North |
| :--- | :--- |
| Nab | Multon |
| - | Pass |
| $2 N^{*}$ | Pass |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | All Pass |


| East | South |
| :--- | :--- |
| Drijver | Martens |
| 18 | Dble |
| $\mathbf{3 6}$ | Pass |

Here North did not have an opening bid in his system so the way was open for East to open a modest One Heart and with four-card support and a couple of aces West was not going to stay out of game. Declarer was not unduly troubled after the lead of a small diamond was won by dummy's jack. And so II IMPs to Netherlands - a body blow to Monaco's hopes, I7 IMPs out in three boards.
New Zealand had a flat board with both teams bidding and making the heart game. Egypt had a let off when in the closed room the auction consisted of four green cards but in the open room the Bulgarians reached the heart game. South got off to a good start when he led a spade rather than diamond. Declarer tried the jack, which held and ducked a club to South who continued with spades. Declarer now cashed the ace of trumps and embarked on a crossruff but came unstuck when North overruffed the third round of diamonds and cashed the king of trumps leaving declarer with a loser in hand. Can you see how declarer could have overcome this problem? Simply by not cashing the ace of hearts before starting on his crossruff. I will leave you to work out why.
Board 9: Egypt 225.18, Monaco 215.55, New Zealand 219.34

This left Monaco with a mountain to climb, while New Zealand needed some big swings if they were to overcome their 6 VP deficit.

This was followed by 6 IMPs for both New Zealand and Egypt when they rested in a part-score and the opponents failed in game but Monaco had a flat board.
Board 10: Egypt 226.64, Monaco 215.55, New Zealand 220.8

Board II. Dealer South. None Vul.

- J 10872
$8-$
$\diamond 10432$
\& J 1097

| 4 9 | N | , AKQ6543 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| QQ965 |  | $\bigcirc$ AJ |
| $\checkmark$ AKQ 8 | W E | $\diamond 195$ |
| +6543 | S | $\stackrel{Q}{4}$ |
|  | , - |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 1087 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 76$ |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Aronov | El Ahmady | Damyanova | Sadek |
| - | - | - | $I \boxtimes$ |
| Pass | Pass | 49 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

With North holding three or more diamonds the contract was not in danger, so +590 to Bulgaria.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Heshmat | Karakolev | Pascal | Mihov |
| - | - | - | $1 \varangle$ |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $2 \&$ | $3 \nabla^{*}$ |
| Pass | Pass | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $6 \diamond$ | Dble |

All Pass
There is a reason why normally one does not overcall on a four-card suit and this deal is a fine example. When the dust settled it was 800 in the out column and 16 IMPs away.
Monaco had another flat board whereas New Zealand gave away 5 IMPs when they also doubled the Four Spades contract and Brazil were streetwise enough not to double.
Board II: Egypt 222.28, Monaco 2I5.55, New Zealand 219.6

Egypt had lost nearly half their lead.
On the following board Egypt had a bidding upset when the auction went $1 \stackrel{1}{2}-I \diamond$ - Pass - I the is bidder, had a fourteen count. In the other room they bid and made 3NT so another ten IMPs were haemorrhaged (spell checkers are so useful) while New Zealand gained a game swing when they also bid and made 3NT in their room while no game was forthcoming in the other so II IMPs. Monaco continued on their series of flat boards.
Board 12: Egypt 219.6I, Monaco 215.55, New Zealand

Suddenly a new leader! Would it continue for the next four boards?
After the excitement of the previous deals Monaco and New Zealand had flat boards but Egypt gave up an overtrick IMP.
Board 13: Egypt 219.37, Monaco 215.55, New Zealand 222.05

Egypt continued their bad run when they conceded one more undertrick in a doubled game contract and lost 5 IMPs. Monaco and New Zealand again had flat boards - but better than losing IMPs.
Board 14: Egypt 218.29, Monaco 215.55, New Zealand 222.05

Monaco suffered a mortal blow when they did not bid and make 3NT as did the other five pairs, which was eleven IMPs out.
Board 15: Egypt 218.29, Monaco 2I2.7I, New Zealand 222.05

This effectively took Monaco out of the equation.
Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.
4 1085
$\bigcirc 982$
$\diamond 10$
\& 1098764

| ¢ K | N | ¢ A Q J 932 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ AKQ J 5 |  | $\bigcirc 43$ |
| $\diamond$ AJ 53 | W E | $\diamond$ Q 962 |
| \% Q 53 | S | 2 A |
|  | ¢ 764 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 1076$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K 874 |  |
|  | \& KJ2 |  |

Just when nerves were probably jangling, The Great Shuffler throws in a grand slam.
Monaco bid to 7NT and after a club lead needed the spades to break 3-3 or a fortuitous diamond position, whilst in the other room Seven Spades was reached and so a flat board. Egypt only got as far as Six Spades and must have expected to lose IMPs and the final qualifying place. However they had a reprieve as the Bulgarians only bid 3NT. I suspect East was tired after along match and even longer qualifying escapade as after the auction $1 \vee-15-$ 3NT his bid was Pass. So a possible big loss was 12 IMPs in.
It now all hung on the result from the New Zealanders yes a real 'last board' thriller. The official scorecard shows both teams bid to Six Diamonds, as I have no play record I can only surmise as to the play but New Zealand brought home the contract whereas their opponents were not successful. This meant 16 IMPs to New Zealand.
Board 16: Egypt 22I.13, Monaco 212.7I, New Zealand 224.64

So New Zealand took the final qualifying place. On every board the VP scores changed and the lead went back and forth several times. I suspect there were some jangled nerves at the end, some disappointments and some very happy faces.

## David Bird

There was no shortage of interesting action in the opening segment of this quarter-final between two wellfancied teams. Let's see some action.

Board 4. Dealer West. Both Vul.

- J 8654
$\bigcirc$ K J
$\diamond 10763$
\& 52
4 K 1097
-A983
$\diamond$ KJ 2
\& Q

- 1054
$\diamond$ Q 84
a AK 94
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pszczola | O.Rimstedt | Rosenberg | M.Rimstedt |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 28 | Pass | 2NT* | Pass |
| $3{ }^{*}$ | Pass | 38 | Pass |
| 34* | Pass | $4{ }^{4}$ | All Pass |

Mikael Rimstedt led the $\mathcal{L A}$, requesting a (reverse) attitude signal. It was a good deal for reverse signals because North's 2 was unambiguously encouraging. Rosenberg did what he could to disguise the position by following with the 8 but South continued with king and another club, North overruffing the 89 with the 8 J . South could not thereafter be deprived of a further trump trick.
Rosenberg won the diamond return in dummy and crossed to the A to take his only chance: the PQ , hoping to pin an original $\vee J-10$ with North. The $\vee \mathrm{Q}$ lost to North's $Q K$ and a subsequent finesse of the 88 succeeded. That was one down and 100 to N/S.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nyström | Moss | Upmark | Grue |
| $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \varnothing$ | Pass |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $3 \otimes$ | Pass |
| $4 \diamond$ | Il Pass |  |  |

The play began in identical fashion, with three rounds of clubs again promoting a trump trick. Upmark opted not to finesse the $\vee 8$ on the third round and lost an extra trump trick for two down and 3 IMPs away.
It was not so automatic to beat $4 \checkmark$ on this deal. In all three of the other quarter-finals one E/W pair made +620 for a double-figure IMP swing their way.
The next board was a borderline slam, with Lady Luck
attending to pronounce which side should pick up the IMPs.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- K 10743
$\bigcirc 6$
$\diamond A 9864$
* Q 2
- 2
- J 98732

QJ 52
63

Q QJ5 Q Q 105
$\diamond$ K 3

- 」 9754
- A 986
- AK 4
$\diamond 107$
\& AK 108
Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pszczola | O.Rimstedt | Rosenberg | M.Rimstedt |
| - | Pass | Pass | $\mathbf{2} \diamond *$ |
| $\mathbf{2} \oslash$ | $\mathbf{3} \diamond^{*}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $4 \diamond$ |

All Pass
The $2 \triangleleft$ opening showed 18 - 19 points and North's $3 \triangleleft$ was a transfer into West's suit, showing $5+$ spades. Declarer won the 89 lead and played two top trumps, happy to see $Q \mathrm{QJx}$ in a defender's hand. If West's singleton trump had been the Q or a declarer in would follow Restricted Choice in that suit and make the slam.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nyström | Moss | Upmark | Grue |
| - | Pass | Pass | $1 \&$ |
| 3 | $3 \&$ | $4 \vee$ | $4 N T$ |
| Pass | $5 \diamond$ | Pass | $5 \$$ |
| Pass | $6 \$$ | All Pass |  |

Grue and Moss play Precision when non-vulnerable, two-over-one when vulnerable. Whether there was any confusion over the meaning of 4 NT , I could not tell you. Moss clearly did not take it as RKCB but may have changed his mind over 54. (Before they make a long-distance call to their lawyers, may I make it clear that such world-class players will clearly know their system better than some humble bridge writer.)
The unhelpful trump position meant a swing of 13 IMPs to Sweden.
Our next deal features a borderline game. Will Lady Luck take the opportunity to even out the luck between these two teams? Let's see.

Board 7. Dealer South. Both Vul.

- K Q 6

คAJ42
$\diamond 964$
\& K Q 3

| $\pm 1$ | N | ¢ A 952 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 953 | W E | $\bigcirc 108$ |
| $\diamond$ A Q J 532 | W E | $\checkmark \mathrm{K} 8$ |
| \% J 9 | S | 9107652 |
|  | ¢ 108743 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K 76 |  |
|  | $\diamond 107$ |  |
|  | \& A 84 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pszczola | O.Rimstedt | Rosenberg | M.Rimstedt |
| - | - | - | Pass |
| I $\diamond$ | Dble | Pass | $2 \Phi$ |
| Pass | $3 Q$ | All Pass |  |

It was suggested that the 24 response showed five spades. That seems a strange idea to me. What is South meant to bid with 9 -10 points and four spades? Be that as it may, North's raise to 34 ended the auction. There were three top losers, so you would need to pick up the trumps for one loser to make game in spades. You might also need the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$ onside.
Mikael Rimstedt won the club lead and played a trump to the jack, queen and ace. East switched to the $\forall K$, the defenders playing three rounds of the suit. Declarer ruffed, finessed the $\varnothing$ J successfully and picked up the remaining trumps for an unwanted +170 . Would they bid game at the other table?
Closed Room


Fredrik Nyström, Sweden

No half measures for Moss. Grue won the heart lead with the king and scored the same 10 tricks as at the other table. With 10 IMPs awarded to USA-2, Lady Luck nodded her head contentedly and retired from the scene.
Are you sitting comfortably, ready for what was the board of the match by a good margin?

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.

- J 43

คA964
$\diamond 98$
\& A 975

\& K 75

| N | ¢ K 75 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W E | $\bigcirc 1072$ |
| W E | $\checkmark 6542$ |
| S | \& 862 |
| ¢ A 8 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ K Q J 853 |  |
| $\diamond$ J 103 |  |
| \& Q 10 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pszczola | O.Rimstedt | Rosenberg | M.Rimstedt |
| 1t | Pass | INT | 2 |
| Dble | 24 | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | $4 \bigcirc$ All |  |  |

Pszczola cashed two top diamonds and switched to the \&10. Would you have done the same? Mikael Rimstedt covered with dummy's jack, drawing the king and ace. West now held the sole guards in both spades and clubs.
Rimstedt played the king and ace of trumps, ruffed his diamond loser with the $\vee \mathbf{A}$ and ran the remaining trumps. To retain his eK-J, West must reduce to just one other card. If this is the $\$ 9$, he will be thrown in with a spade to lead from the 2 K . Pszczola discarded the 99 in the hope that East held the $\$ 8$. Declarer then scored the $\$ 8$ for his tenth trick and +620 .
After two rounds of diamonds, West needed to switch specifically to the queen of spades, so that East would be able to guard the suit with his king.
We were eager to see what would happen at the other table. Perhaps E/W would sacrifice in spades, as happened at both tables of the France-China match.
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nyström | Moss | Upmark | Grue |
| Is | Pass | $2 Q$ | $3 \odot$ |
| Dble | $3 Q$ | Pass | $4 \odot$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

No, they ended in the heart game once again. What further splendours awaited us?
Nyström led the $\diamond A$, his partner signalling with the $\diamond 6$, Realizing that he would have to switch to spades anyway, if he cashed another diamond next, Nyström switched brilliantly to the $\Phi 9$ at trick 2 ! When Grue allowed this to
win, West cashed the $\diamond Q$ and played the $\mathbf{~} 6$, drawing the 4 , 7 and ace.
Not overjoyed at this sharp defence, Grue tried the 2 Q from hand. It was covered by the king and ace and he then surrendered a trick to the \%. That was one down and Sweden collected what might be described as the most well deserved 12 IMPs in history!
One further big swing awaited us:
Board 14. Dealer East. None Vul.

- 1092

คA3
$\diamond 73$

- Q 85432
- 186
- Q 109752
$\diamond 986$
* 



## Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pszczola | O.Rimstedt | Rosenberg | M.Rimstedt |
| - | - | $1 \$$ | I $\$$ |
| Pass | Pass | I | All Pass |

It doesn't look like a swing board to you? No, indeed. South led a trump, expecting dummy to be something like 3 -I in the black suits, but declarer emerged with seven tricks for +80 .
Perhaps (you never know) something more dramatic would happen at the other table.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Nyström | Moss | Upmark | Grue |
| - | - | 10 | 18 |
| Pass | $2 \boxtimes$ | Dble | Rdbl |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{E}$ | Dble | All Pass |

Make what you will of the raise to $2 \boxtimes$ on only two trumps. On the next round, Moss was faced with the unattractive prospect of partner being left in $2 \checkmark$ redoubled (probably two down on this lie). He rescued into 3\&, despite the fact that East had opened in that suit, and was promptly doubled.
Upmark's $\mathbf{~ K}$ won the first trick ( $\$ 6$ from partner) and he continued with the $\$ 3$. Moss won with dummy's ace and played the 99 to the jack, queen and king. A low spade to West's jack allowed a $\vee 2$ switch, ruffed with the $\%$. After the $\diamond A$ and the $₫ Q$, ruffed by declarer, East still had three trump tricks to come. It was four down for an 800 penalty and 12 IMPs to Sweden.
The first segment of this quarter-final ended with Sweden leading USA-2 by 43-4I. Plenty more excitement was doubtless still to come!

## BUTLER

## Bermuda Bowl

|  | Players | Butl |  | Country |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QUANTIN Jean-Christophe - LORENZINI Cedric | 0.88 | 223 | France |
| 2 | GRUE Joe - MOSS Brad | 0.86 | 256 | U.S.A. |
| 3 | MULLER Bauke - DEWIJS Simon | 0.71 | 224 | Netherlands |
| 4 | MECKSTROTH Jeff - RODWELL Eric | 0.67 | 272 | U.S.A. |
| 5 | YANG Lixin - DAI Jianming | 0.65 | 224 | China |
| 6 | ROMBAUT Jerome - COMBESCURE Francois | 0.62 | 224 | France |
| 7 | LEVIN Robert (Bobby) -WEINSTEIN Steve | 0.50 | 270 | U.S.A. |
| 8 | RIMSTEDT Mikael - RIMSTEDT Ola | 0.48 | 223 | Sweden |
| 9 | MANNO Andrea - DI FRANCO Massimiliano | 0.45 | 287 | Italy |
| 10 | HESHMAT Mohamed - PASCAL Bernard | 0.45 | 192 | Egypt |
| 11 | ARONOVVictor - DAMIANOVA Diana | 0.44 | 112 | Bulgaria |
| 12 | MUKHERJEE Sumit - MAJUMDER Debabrata | 0.40 | 272 | India |
| 13 | CHAGAS Gabriel -VILLAS-BOAS (Jr) Miguel | 0.39 | 288 | Brazil |
| 14 | VAN LANKVELD Joris -VAN DEN BOS Berend | 0.39 | 223 | Netherlands |
| 15 | MIHOVVladimir - KARAKOLEV Georgi | 0.39 | 288 | Bulgaria |
| 16 | LUCENA Carlos - PELLEGRINI Carlos | 0.38 | 288 | Argentina |
| 17 | NAB Bart - DRIJVER Bob | 0.33 | 224 | Netherlands |
| 18 | NYSTROM Fredrik - UPMARK Johan | 0.31 | 256 | Sweden |
| 19 | PSZCZOLA Jacek - ROSENBERG Michael | 0.30 | 223 | U.S.A. |
| 20 | NANEV Ivan - STEFANOV Julian | 0.27 | 271 | Bulgaria |
| 21 | VENKATARAMAN Kadayam Raman - GOELAshok Kumar | 0.26 | 160 | India |
| 22 | TISLEVOLL Geir-Olav -WARE Michael | 0.23 | 224 | New Zealand |
| 23 | HELNESS Tor - HELGEMO Geir | 0.20 | 272 | Monaco |
| 24 | TOBING Robert Parasian - ASBI Taufik Gautama | 0.20 | 223 | Indonesia |
| 25 | SADEK Tarek - ELAHMADYWaleed | 0.16 | 320 | Egypt |
| 26 | AUKEN Sabine -WELLAND Roy | 0.14 | 256 | Germany |
| 27 | LINDE Julius - SCHWERDT Christian | 0.13 | 224 | Germany |
| 28 | WHIBLEY Michael - BROWN Matthew | 0.12 | 224 | New Zealand |
| 29 | GILL Peter - PEAKEAndrew | 0.12 | 208 | Australia |
| 30 | GANDOGLIA Alessandro - DONATI Giovanni | 0.08 | 240 | Italy |
| 31 | CORNELL Michael - BACH Ashley | 0.08 | 224 | New Zealand |
| 32 | ZHAO Jie - CHENYunlong | 0.07 | 224 | China |
| 33 | SYLVAN Johan -WRANG Frederic | 0.06 | 192 | Sweden |
| 34 | POLESCHI Ricardo - ANGELERI Ricardo | 0.03 | 144 | Argentina |
| 35 | MARTENS Krzysztof -ALLAVENA Jean Charles | 0.03 | 112 | Monaco |
| 36 | BESSISThomas -VOLCKER Frederic | 0.00 | 224 | France |
| 37 | HOLLANDS Peter - MILL Justin | -0.06 | 240 | Australia |
| 38 | YEH Edward - CHEN Liu-Mou | -0.07 | 224 | Chinese Taipei |
| 39 | MATHIEU Philippe - SOUDAN Luc | -0.09 | 256 | Guadeloupe |
| 40 | RAVENNA Pablo - THOMA Marcos | -0.16 | 272 | Brazil |
| 41 | YANG David -YANG Sidney | -0.16 | 224 | Chinese Taipei |
| 42 | LASUT Henky - MANOPPO Eddy M F | -0.18 | 224 | Indonesia |
| 43 | CHUNG Jonky - LIU Herstein | -0.18 | 224 | Chinese Taipei |
| 44 | GOWER Craig - APTEKER Alon | -0.18 | 240 | South Africa |
| 45 | NICKELL Nick - KATZ Ralph | -0.22 | 128 | U.S.A. |
| 46 | THOMSON Matthew - BEAUCHAMP David | -0.22 | 224 | Australia |
| 47 | DONDE Bernard - STEPHENS Robert | -0.22 | 192 | South Africa |
| 48 | KARWUR Franky Steven - SACUL Denny | -0.28 | 222 | Indonesia |
| 49 | GERIN Dominique - PELLETIER Jean-Claude | -0.33 | 240 | Guadeloupe |
| 50 | DAGHER Hani - EL GEDDAWI Omar | -0.33 | 160 | Egypt |
| 51 | LI Jianwei - ZHANG Bangxiang | -0.36 | 224 | China |
| 52 | MARTEL Chip - FLEISHER Martin | -0.45 | 192 | U.S.A. |
| 53 | HERRERA Gonzalo - MARSHALL Gerry | -0.58 | 336 | Mexico |
| 54 | SRINIVASAN Sundarram - SRIDHARAN Padmanabhan | -0.58 | 240 | India |
| 55 | CAMBEROS Hector - MUZZIO Ernesto | -0.60 | 240 | Argentina |
| 56 | GAROZZO Benito - MASOERO Franco | -0.60 | 144 | Italy |
| 57 | HAEUSLER Helmut - REHDER Martin | -0.65 | 192 | Germany |
| 58 | MULTON Franck - ZIMMERMANN Pierre | -0.70 | 175 | Monaco |
| 59 | RAHMAN Md. Moshiur - AHASAN Md Rashedul | -0.73 | 192 | Bangladesh |
| 60 | ISPAHANI Mirza Sajid - KAMRUZZAMAN A H M | -0.81 | 224 | Bangladesh |
| 61 | HAQUE Shah Zia-ul - CHOWDHURY Mohammad Asifur Rahman | -0.84 | 224 | Bangladesh |
| 62 | REYGADAS Miguel - COHEN Alberto | -0.86 | 336 | Mexico |
| 63 | BONNET Philippe -ARAGONES Rene | -0.94 | 176 | Guadeloupe |
| 64 | EBER Neville - BOSENBERG Christopher Henry | -0.98 | 240 | South Africa |
| 65 | DE CARVALHO Leao Roberto Machado - DIAS Rafael | -1.21 | 112 | Brazil |

## Venice Cup

|  | Players | Butl | Board | Country |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEKKERS Laura - BRUIJNSTEEN Merel | 0.88 | 224 | Netherlands |
| 2 | HUANG Yan -WANG Nan | 0.85 | 208 | China |
| 3 | PENFOLD Sandra - SENIOR Nevena | 0.83 | 208 | England |
| 4 | WANGWen Fei - SHEN (I) Qi | 0.79 | 224 | China |
| 5 | SUMAMPOUW Conny - ANDHANI Rury | 0.76 | 96 | Indonesia |
| 6 | OVELIUS Emma - RIMSTEDT Sandra | 0.74 | 240 | Sweden |
| 7 | ANDERSSON Pia - BERTHEAU Kathrine | 0.74 | 208 | Sweden |
| 8 | BOJOH Lusje Olha - TUEJE Julita Grace | 0.61 | 304 | Indonesia |
| 9 | GROMOVA Victoria - PONOMAREVA Tatiana | 0.61 | 224 | Russia |
| 10 | TAL Dana - TAL Noga | 0.56 | 272 | Israel |
| 11 | KHONICHEVA Elena - GULEVICH Anna | 0.53 | 224 | Russia |
| 12 | ZMUDA Justyna - DUFRAT Katarzyna | 0.52 | 272 | Poland |
| 13 | LEVI Hila -ASULINAdi | 0.52 | 240 | Israel |
| 14 | RIMSTEDT Cecilia - GRONKVIST Ida | 0.45 | 224 | Sweden |
| 15 | BROCK Sally - BROWN Fiona | 0.42 | 240 | England |
| 16 | PALMER Beth - SHI Sylvia | 0.40 | 288 | U.S.A. |
| 17 | YAKOVLEVA Maria - RAKHMANI Diana | 0.37 | 224 | Russia |
| 18 | TRAVIS Barbara - GINSBERG Candice | 0.32 | 240 | Australia |
| 19 | LUYan - LIUYan | 0.31 | 240 | China |
| 20 | ARNOLDS Carla -VERBEEK Martine | 0.26 | 224 | Netherlands |
| 21 | MANARA Gabriella - FERLAZZO Caterina | 0.26 | 224 | Italy |
| 22 | MOURGUES Jennifer - HUBERSCHWILLER Anne-Laure | 0.18 | 192 | France |
| 23 | VANUZZI Marilina - ROSEITAAnnalisa | 0.17 | 224 | Italy |
| 24 | MEYERS Jill - ZUR-CAMPANILE Migry | 0.17 | 272 | U.S.A. |
| 25 | WINESTOCK Sheri - JENKINS Bronia | 0.13 | 224 | U.S.A. |
| 26 | BALDYSZ Cathy - BALDYSZ Zofia | 0.13 | 208 | Poland |
| 27 | ZOCHOWSKA Joanna - REESSVanessa | 0.09 | 240 | France |
| 28 | HERRERA Florencia - ALEGRE Eleonora | 0.07 | 208 | Argentina |
| 29 | VAN ZWOLWietske - TICHA Magdalena | 0.05 | 224 | Netherlands |
| 30 | GAWEL Natalia - JAROSZAleksandra | 0.05 | 192 | Poland |
| 31 | VARGAS DEANDRADE Isabella - PAIN Leda | 0.04 | 224 | Brazil |
| 32 | NOSACKI Michal - SAADA Nathalie | 0.02 | 160 | Israel |
| 33 | BARONI Irene - GOLIN Cristina | 0.01 | 224 | Italy |
| 34 | DEWI Suci Amita - MURNIATI Kristina Wahyu | 0.01 | 272 | Indonesia |
| 35 | PREVIDE Maria Cecilia - ESPINOSA-PAZ Maria Jose | 0.00 | 224 | Argentina |
| 36 | WUYvonne - SO Ho-Yee | 0.00 | 240 | Chinese Taipei |
| 37 | SMITH Nicola - DRAPER Catherine | -0.02 | 224 | England |
| 38 | GARATEGUY Maria Del Rosario - IACAPRARO Maria Elen | 0.03 | 240 | Argentina |
| 39 | KHOURI Maud -WATTAR Nada | -0.08 | 320 | Egypt |
| 40 | HUMPHRIES Susan - JACOB Stephanie | -0.09 | 272 | New Zealand |
| 41 | KABBAJ Leila - NABIL Graziella | -0.10 | 224 | Morocco |
| 42 | CHENYin-Shou - LINYin-Yu | -0.12 | 224 | Chinese Taipei |
| 43 | GOLDBERG Connie - MOSS Sylvia | -0.15 | 240 | U.S.A. |
| 44 | DE MELLO Sylvia Figueira - CORREA Paula | -0.16 | 224 | Brazil |
| 45 | CRONIER Benedicte -WILLARD Sylvie | -0.17 | 240 | France |
| 46 | HOMSY Marguerite - AUDICHE Christina | -0.21 | 320 | Egypt |
| 47 | NISBET Pamela - BRYANT Brenda | -0.29 | 224 | Canada |
| 48 | LUSK Sue - BOURKE Margaret | -0.32 | 192 | Australia |
| 49 | MANDELOT Agota - NOGUEIRA Heloisa | -0.35 | 224 | Brazil |
| 50 | BOOKALLIL Marianne - TUTTY Jodi | -0.38 | 240 | Australia |
| 51 | CAPPELLETTI Shannon -WEINGOLD Joanne | -0.41 | 112 | U.S.A. |
| 52 | GIBBONS Jenna - GIBBONS Christine | -0.45 | 240 | New Zealand |
| 53 | KISLITSYNA Irina - DEYOUNG Bernace | -0.46 | 207 | U.S.A. |
| 54 | LUYi-Zu - LIUWen-Ling | -0.52 | 208 | Chinese Taipei |
| 55 | HACHIMI Hayet - HAMAMSI Rokia | -0.53 | 224 | Morocco |
| 56 | QASHUAzza - SAKET Randa | -0.55 | 240 | Jordan |
| 57 | VASANTH Sathyavathi - NAIDOO Bindiya | -0.59 | 224 | India |
| 58 | TEBER Samira - LAHLOU Fatim | -0.63 | 224 | Morocco |
| 59 | ABU JABER Aida - ABU JABER Yasmin | -0.70 | 256 | Jordan |
| 60 | CORNELLVivien - NEWTON Shirley | -0.73 | 160 | New Zealand |
| 61 | KARMARKAR Marianne - BAKERI Rupa | -0.79 | 224 | India |
| 62 | FOSTER Rhonda - MCDONALD Lorna | -0.88 | 240 | Canada |
| 63 | WYNSTON Linda -WOLPERT Hazel | -0.92 | 208 | Canada |
| 64 | SHAHVasanti - KSHIRSAGAR Alka | -0.93 | 223 | India |
| 65 | SAKET Huda - AL-TAHER Dimah | -1.90 | 176 | Jordan |

## d'Orsi Trophy

|  | Players | Butl |  | Country |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | WOLD Eddie - LEVINE Mike | 1.13 | 112 | U.S.A. |
| 2 | YEUNG Peter - LING Roger | 1.01 | 128 | China HKG |
| 3 | GRAVES Allan - BECKER Michael | 0.97 | 224 | U.S.A. |
| 4 | SONTAG Alan - BERKOWITZ David | 0.83 | 240 | U.S.A. |
| 5 | EFRAIMSSON Bengt-Erik - AXDORPH Mats | 0.77 | 256 | Sweden |
| 6 | BROWN Terry - BUCHEN PeterWalter | 0.72 | 224 | Australia |
| 7 | PULGA Ruggero - MINA Aldo | 0.67 | 224 | Italy |
| 8 | PASSELL Mike - JACOBUS Marc | 0.59 | 288 | U.S.A. |
| 9 | DECHELETTE Nicholas - IONTZEFF Georges | 0.54 | 224 | France |
| 10 | SRIDHARAN Ramamurthy - DHAKRAS Subhash | 0.52 | 240 | India |
| 11 | FAILLA Giuseppe - BURATTIAndrea | 0.49 | 224 | Italy |
| 12 | PALAU Jean-Jacques - GUILLAUMIN Pierre-Yves | 0.39 | 224 | France |
| 13 | OHNO Kyoko -YAMADAAkihiko | 0.38 | 208 | Japan |
| 14 | SHEN Mingkun - SHEN Xiaonong | 0.38 | 256 | China |
| 15 | KIRR Martin - ALTAY Andy | 0.36 | 176 | Canada |
| 16 | TOFFIER Philippe - SCHMIDT Pierre | 0.36 | 222 | France |
| 17 | INCE Mehmet Ali - KOKTEN Namik | 0.31 | 288 | Turkey |
| 18 | SILVERMAN Neil -WOLFSON Jeff | 0.27 | 207 | U.S.A. |
| 19 | SABBATINI Stefano - COMELLAAmedeo | 0.26 | 224 | Italy |
| 20 | NEILL Bruce - KANETKAR Avi | 0.24 | 224 | Australia |
| 21 | SUN Ming - ZHOU Jia Hong | 0.23 | 224 | China |
| 22 | AKSOY Ibrahim - SIRIKLIOGLU Mehmet | 0.23 | 208 | Turkey |
| 23 | KALISHAvi - PODGUR Leonid | 0.23 | 320 | Israel |
| 24 | KOWALSKI Apolinary - ROMANSKI Jacek | 0.18 | 287 | Poland |
| 25 | BJARING Christer - OSTBERG Johnny | 0.18 | 208 | Sweden |
| 26 | FRANZEL Robert - TERRANEO Sylvia | 0.15 | 143 | Austria |
| 27 | BARCELLOS Eduardo - MACHADO Mauricio | 0.13 | 224 | Brazil |
| 28 | FEICHTINGER Kurt -TERRANEO Franz | 0.13 | 240 | Austria |
| 29 | INO Masayuki - YAMADA Kazuhiko | 0.12 | 207 | Japan |
| 30 | LERNER Fred - SCHOENBORN Michael | 0.12 | 240 | Canada |
| 31 | GOWDY John -TURNER David | 0.10 | 256 | Canada |
| 32 | VILLEGAS Marcelo - FORNASARIWalter | 0.09 | 239 | Argentina |
| 33 | IMAKURA Tadashi - OMASA Akito | 0.09 | 192 | Japan |
| 34 | PODDAR Dipak - SOLANI Jitendra | 0.07 | 192 | India |
| 35 | SCANAVINO Eduardo - GUEGLIO jorge | 0.05 | 208 | Argentina |
| 36 | GUMBY Pauline - LAZER Warren | 0.03 | 224 | Australia |
| 37 | SAMANT Keshav Sakharam - AGRAWAL Ramawatar | 0.01 | 240 | India |
| 38 | LING Roger -TSE Edmund | 0.01 | 112 | China HKGg |
| 39 | ZEN Derek -WAN Siu-Kau Samuel | 0.01 | 336 | China HKG |
| 40 | YEUNG Peter -TSE Edmund | 0.00 | 96 | China HKG |
| 41 | CLERKIN Jerry - CLERKIN Dennis | -0.06 | 272 | U.S.A. |
| 42 | SCHWARTZAdrian - ZELIGMAN Shalom | -0.07 | 304 | Israel |
| 43 | MORATH Anders - BJERREGARD Sven-Ake | -0.09 | 208 | Sweden |
| 44 | HORSMAN Eileen - GROVER Bob | -0.12 | 224 | New Zealand |
| 45 | OBERMAIR Hubert - FUCIK Jan | -0.15 | 160 | Austria |
| 46 | MONSEGUR Martin Sila - MOONEY Guillermo | -0.16 | 224 | Argentina |
| 47 | TAO Jian Hua - LIN Rongqiang | -0.18 | 192 | China |
| 48 | RUSSYAN Jerzy - ZAREMBA Jerzy | -0.20 | 224 | Poland |
| 49 | MAKRAM Sameh -TANBOLI Mohamed | -0.25 | 224 | Egypt |
| 50 | KARADENIZ Mesut -YILDIZVeysel | -0.29 | 176 | Turkey |
| 51 | MAQBOOLAssad - BANDESHA Muhammad Ghalib Ali | -0.31 | 208 | Pakistan |
| 52 | KHALIL Izat - KHAN Safdar Mahmood | -0.33 | 224 | Pakistan |
| 53 | MAGALHAES Amilcar - NETO Joao da Silva | -0.34 | 224 | Brazil |
| 54 | MARKOWICZVictor - MOSZCZYNSKI Krzysztof | -0.44 | 160 | Poland |
| 55 | AMOEDO Rafael - ALOI Milton Luis | -0.55 | 224 | Brazil |
| 56 | BALKIN Diana - DRIVER Kathleen | -0.59 | 224 | South Africa |
| 57 | DORFAN Jackie - PIETERS Errol | -0.64 | 224 | South Africa |
| 58 | MAZHAR Masood - IBRAHIM Kamran | -0.70 | 240 | Pakistan |
| 59 | ASKALANI Amr El -WAHDAN Ashraf | -0.81 | 223 | Egypt |
| 60 | RUSSELL Douglas -ACKERLEY Chris | -0.84 | 224 | New Zealand |
| 61 | PIETERS Desiree - CHILD Christine | -0.85 | 224 | South Africa |
| 62 | THIRION Christiane - FABBRICATORE Sophie | -0.85 | 208 | Guadeloupe |
| 63 | KAMEL Mohsen Mohamed - AZIZAtef | -0.91 | 224 | Egypt |
| 64 | MONDOR Fred - MONDOR Francoise | -0.96 | 224 | Guadeloupe |
| 65 | STUCKEY Neil - PALMER Barry | -1.01 | 224 | New Zealand |
| 66 | CASSIN Jacqueline - BISTOQUET Chantal | -1.24 | 240 | Guadeloupe |

## IBPA Annual General Meeting

IBPA yesterday announced at its Annual General Meeting that it plans to stage its next year's awards presentation for bidding, play, defence and juniors at the Hainan Bridge Festival (HBF) in Sanya, China.
The IBPA award winners for 2018 will be invited to HBF to collect their prizes. They will receive free entry to the tournament together with subsidies for flight and hotel. Details will be announced as soon as they are finalized.

IBPA also announced that it plans to provide printed Daily Bulletins during the next European Championships in Ostend. Another reason to join IBPA!

