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Issue No. 7

# A Golden First for Turkey 



Rossen Gunev, Dessy Popova, Tezcan Sen, Emine Kondakci Sen, Joanna Neve, Jean-François Allix
Turkey's Emine Kondakci Sen \& Tezcan Sen are the new European Open Mixed Pairs Champions, the first ever gold secured by a Turkish pair in the European Open Championships. They held off a determined challenge from the holders of the title Bulgaria's Dessy Popova \& Rossen Gunev, who could not quite achieve a golden double. Third place was taken by France's Joanna Neve \& Jean-François Allix.

Final B was won by Poland's Ewa Miszewska \& Stanislaw Zakrzewski.


## What's in a Number?

by Mark Horton

The first session of the final of the European Open Mixed Pairs Team Championship was notable for the number of seven card suits that made an appearance, to the extent that I tried to discover if, like Triskaidekaphobia (fear of the number 13), there was a word that represented this. My research (with some assistance from the assembled multitude in the Bulletin room) revealed that while plenty of people are afraid of the number 8 (octophobia), apparently no one is afraid of seven. Barry Rigal thought it might be Heptophobia, but all I could come up with was Haptophobia (the fear of being touched). Tacchi though it might be the fear of being touched seven times.

Still, I suspect by now you would like to see something of the play, so if you're sitting comfortably l'll begin.


West's opening bid looks the normal action, but the same can hardly be said of South's double. Five Hearts was hopeless. After cashing two spades West switched to his diamond and declarer had to lose two more tricks, -200 .

## Closed Room

| West <br> Allix | North <br> Hauge | East <br> Neve | South <br> Vist |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Pass |
| $4 \mathbf{2}$ | All Pass | Pass | Pass |

North cashed the ace of diamonds and accurately switched to a trump. Declarer won in hand and tried a heart to the king and ace.A second trump meant declarer
had to go two down, - 100 . First blood to Hauge to the tune of 7 IMPs.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/WVul.

- J 4
© A 964
$\diamond 94$
- J 9875
- K 75

๑ 753
$\diamond$ K 1082

- 1043

- 3

Q QJ 10
$\diamond$ QJ 763

* A Q 62
- AQ109862
-K 82
$\diamond$ A 5
\% K
Open Room

| West <br> Gunev | North <br> Mauberquez | East <br> Popova | South <br> Reess |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2 \diamond^{*}$ | Pass | $2 \mathbf{N}^{*}$ |
| Pass | $2 N T$ | Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{3}$ |
| Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{~ A l l ~ P a s s ~}$ |  |  |
| Pass |  |  |  |

Anyone who always found the killing lead at this game would win every prize the game has to offer.
When West led a 'safe' trump, declarer was not slow to

take advantage, winning with dummy's jack, crossing to the ace of spades and then ducking a heart to East. When she regained the lead with the ace of diamonds she played three rounds of hearts, correctly playing for the drop despite the restricted choice implications, discarding her diamond loser, +420 .

| Closed Room <br> West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allix | Hauge | Neve | Vist |
| Pass | INT | Dble | IQ |
| All Pass |  |  | $4 \uparrow$ |

West led the three of hearts and declarer won in dummy and tried the jack of spades. West won and returned a spade and in the fullness of time declarer had to lose a trick in each of the other suits, -50 giving Neve 10 IMPs.

Board 4. Dealer West. All Vul.

$$
\text { \& K } 82
$$

ค 108
$\diamond 32$
\& AKQ973

| -10543 | N | - 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢A5 32 |  | $\bigcirc$ KQ9764 |
| $\checkmark$ A Q 5 |  | $\diamond$ KJ 1096 |
| - 42 | S | -6 |
|  | - A Q J 76 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ J |  |
|  | $\checkmark 874$ |  |
|  | - J1085 |  |

Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gunev | Mauberquez | Popova | Reess |
| Pass | 19 | 28 | 24 |
| 2NT* | 49 | 58 | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All Pass |  |

## 2NT Heart support

An effective auction by East/West produced a bonus when North decided to double. Declarer quickly claimed I I tricks, +850.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allix | Hauge | Neve | Vist |
| Pass | 19 | 3 | Dble* |
| $4 \checkmark$ | All Pass |  |  |

I have never been an admirer of the style that requires South to double with this type of hand. The upshot was that East/West were left in peace to record +650 . That was still 5 IMPs to Hauge, back in the lead.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

- 53

คA976
$\diamond 53$
\& Q 9764


Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gunev | Mauberquez | Popova | Reess |
|  | Pass | 29* | 3 |
| $4 \bigcirc$ | Pass | Pass | 49 |
| Pass | 5 | Pass | Pass |
| 5 | Dble | All Pass |  |

## 2\% Precision

## I 5th Bridgefestival

Welcome to Sweden and the 15th Bridgefestival. With the Chairman's cup and many side events (single sessions) the festival is one of the biggest in the world with almost good pairs over 10 days.
The event will be held at Orebro Sweden from 24th July - 2nd August. Free entry for all national teams—check www.svenskbridge.se


For more information contact Micke Melander at mmc@svenskbridge.se

As Oscar Wilde might have put it, 'To double 5 \$ once is unfortunate, to do so twice looks like carelessness.' Declarer ruffed the second round of diamonds and set about the trump suit. North took the ace on the second round and switched to a spade. Declarer won in hand, drew the outstanding trumps and played a club to the jack for +650 .

## Closed Room

| West <br> Allix | North <br> Hauge | East <br> Neve | South <br> Vist |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | 12 | $1 \diamond$ |
| 18 | Pass | 19 | 3 |
| $4 \vee$ | All Pass |  |  |

What can one say of South's overcall of One Diamond? It was very sound - but several levels too low. Of course, even if South had bid a direct Five Diamonds West would have bid Five Hearts, but then North would have been less inclined to reproduce the double made in the other room. Declarer did not take the club finesse and when the queen failed to oblige he was +420 to lose 6 IMPs.


Although the rationale behind North's jump to Four Hearts escapes me, he was rewarded for his enterprise by a suitable dummy, and there was no defence, declarer relying on the spade finesse and the 3-3 break to get rid of his losing club, +420.

## Closed Room

| West <br> Allix | North <br> Hauge | East <br> Neve | South <br> Vist |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \diamond$ |  | Pass | 19 |
| $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |  |

## All Pass

West cashed two diamonds and then switched to a trump for the ten, queen and ace. Declarer played a heart and when the king appeared she ducked. West played another spade so declarer won in dummy and played a club. Had she ducked that to West, she would have had the chance to execute a squeeze against East, but she put up the ace and had to go one down, -50 handing Neve 10 IMPs and once again the lead changed hands.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { A } 1098 \\
& \& \text { A } 1074 \\
& \diamond \text { K } 65 \\
& 85
\end{aligned}
$$


¢ K J
$\bigcirc$ K 9
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ JIO 832
\& Q 109
Q Q 752
Q Q 32
$\diamond 94$
K K J 7
Open Room

| West <br> Gunev | North <br> Mauberquez | East <br> Popova | South <br> Reess |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $\mathbf{I} \diamond *$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{I} \diamond$ | Pass | $\mathbf{2} \diamond$ | Pass |
| $\mathbf{3} \diamond$ | All Pass |  |  |

I $\diamond \quad$ Precision
South's spade lead solved one problem for declarer, but when North switched to the four of hearts she played low


Gunn Vist, Norway
and South won with the queen. Declarer took the spade return with the king and played the king of hearts. North took the ace and played a third spade, ruffed by declarer, who took a losing diamond finesse. North won and made a fatal mistake by playing a heart. With South out of trumps declarer could dispose of her losing clubs and claim +ll0.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allix | Hauge | Neve | Vist |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{Q}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{S}$ | All Pass |  |

The modern style of opening light paid a modest dividend as it kept East/West out of the auction. West led the six of hearts and East won with the king and switched to the ten of clubs. Declarer got that suit wrong, putting up the king and losing to the ace. West switched to the ace of diamonds and a diamond and declarer won in dummy and played ace of spades and a spade. That matched the +110 achieved in the other room, 6 IMPs to Hauge, who regained the lead.


North led the three of spades and declarer put in the queen, losing to the king. South switched to a trump and now declarer was helpless, inevitably finishing a trick short. The winning line as the cards lie is to go up with the ace of spades and cross ruff. You end up with eight trump tricks and two black aces.

## Closed Room

| West <br> Allix | North <br> Hauge | East <br> Neve | South <br> Vist |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 |  |  | Pass |
| 48 | Pass | 18 | Pass |

East's pass looks cautious until you realise that with
around 18+ points, four hearts a modest club suit and a balanced hand the French style is to rebid 3NT. Here West was showing an unbalanced hand and East's club void was not good news.
As the play unfolded declarer was on the way to making Four Hearts, but then it became apparent that the dealing machine had fouled the board.
That was a little unlucky for Neve, and after a series of quiet deals they missed a good opportunity at the end of the set.

Board I6. Dealer West. E/W Vul.


North led the three of hearts and declarer won in dummy and played a spade to the queen. When that held he played the jack of spades and North won and played another heart. Declarer took dummy's king, pitching a diamond, and played a diamond to the king. That guess cost the contract, one down, - I00.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allix | Hauge | Neve | Vist |
| $1 \$$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Pass |
| $2 \diamond$ | Pass | $4 \boldsymbol{e}$ | All Pass |

Here declarer won the heart lead and immediately played a diamond to the jack. North took the ace. When North continued with a heart declarer tried dummy's jack and ruffed when South played the queen. He cashed the king of diamonds, ruffed a diamond, discarded a diamond on the king of hearts and then played a spade to the jack. North took the ace and forced declarer with a heart. Declarer took two more trump tricks, but North, who's last three cards were the $\$ 10,810$ and $\diamond 10$ achieved a minor jackpot coup for down one, +50 .
If declarer had simply played on trumps after ruffing the second heart he would surely have made the contract. That missed opportunity meant that Hauge would start the second set with a narrow lead.

# Mixed Teams Final, second segment Neve v Hauge 

by Jos Jacobs

After 16 of the 48 boards, Hauge led Neve 3I-26 so the match looked very much open at that stage.
In fact, after the third board, we had a new leader, be it not for the expected reason.
As long as South does not lead $\%$ and get a club ruff, ten tricks are always there in 44x provided you believe what you are getting to see.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/WVul.
¢ 63
$\bigcirc$ Q
$\diamond$ AKJ843
\& AK 76

| $\begin{aligned} & 102 \\ & 89 \end{aligned}$ | N |  | - AKQ 984 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 87 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \diamond 1097 \\ +Q 95 \end{array}$ | 52 W | E |  |
|  | S |  | -1082 |
| -1075 |  |  |  |
| Q J1065432 |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ Q |  |  |  |
| \& 13 |  |  |  |
| Open Room |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Gunev | Mauberquez | Popova | Reess |
|  |  |  | 3 O |
| Pass | $4 \stackrel{ }{ }$ | 4. | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All pass |  |

Here, South led the $\diamond \mathrm{Q}$ and East ruffed. Now, if you

J.Allix, V. Reess, E. Mauberquez, J. Neve Neve Team
cash $\vee$ A the queen appears - very much a singleton on the bidding. So you would to proceed now to ruff a heart high, draw trumps and rely on the being with South. You already are exempt from the running stage of the pairs' event so an overtrick is maybe juicy but not essential.

However, declarer went on to cash the $\triangle K$ which, to her disgust (if not surprise), was ruffed by North, who returned a trump, declarer's $\$ 8$ being allowed to win the trick. Next, declarer ruffed a heart with dummy's jack and crossed to hand with a low diamond, ruffed with the nine...but this time South overruffed with the ten she had held back before and led her last trump. With a heart and two clubs still to lose, declarer thus had managed to go down two. Neve +500.

Closed Room

| West <br> Allix | North <br> Sælensminde | East <br> Neve | South <br> Malinowski |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | $1 \diamond$ | Dble | 18 |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | $4 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | All pass |  |

This might have been a huge swing to Neve had Mrs Neve brought home the same contract. Her job was much more difficult as there had been no adverse pre-empt to guide her. She too ruffed the diamond lead and cashed the $\triangle A$ but her next (good) move was to try a low heart. When she ruffed it with dummy's low trump, North could overruff and play a trump. Dummy won and played a diamond ruffed high, trumps were drawn and two clubs conceded with the help of the finesse of the jack. Down one, +200 to Hauge but still 7 IMPs to Neve to take the lead: 35-3I.

Two boards later, it was Hauge's turn to score:
Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
¢ 1087
$\vee$ J 4
$\diamond K 2$
AJ 10865
4 A9532
$\bigcirc$ A Q 8
$\diamond$ A 106
93

\& K Q 6
คK 10962
$\diamond 9874$
49

- 14
$\bigcirc 753$
$\diamond$ QJ 53
\& K Q 42

Open Room

| West <br> Gunev | North <br> Mauberquez | East <br> Popova | South <br> Reess |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| INT | Pass | $2 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $2 \&$ | Pass | $3 \triangleleft$ | Pass |
| $3 \triangleleft$ | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | All pass |

"What's the problem?" one would say. 24 showed a fivecard suit but the heart fit had been established already. Hauge +450 .

| Closed Room |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
| Allix | Sælensminde | Neve | Malinowski |
|  | Pass | Pass | Pass |
| 14 | 2\% | 24 | 36 |
| $3{ }^{1}$ | All pass |  |  |

The problems for E/W arose when North overcalled 2e and South raised. Apparently, E/W had no clear agreement over the meaning of their subsequent possible actions. To me , 3 would be merely competitive, whereas any other action would at least be forward-going. But, indeed was West worth any more than 3s here? Twelve tricks, Neve +230 but 6 IMPs to Hauge, who thus took over the lead, never to lose it again...

Some very quiet boards came next (i.e. even quieter than the ones I showed you) on which Hauge extended their lead by no less than 3 IMPs. Then came an interesting partscore problem:

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- 109

Q Q 1093
$\triangleleft$ A 108

- 10874

| - 652 | N | - AJ843 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 84$ |  | PK65 |
| $\checkmark 532$ | W E | $\diamond$ Q 97 |
| \& A QJ 53 | S | \& K 6 |

©AJ72
$\diamond$ KJ64
\& 92
Open Room

| West <br> Guner | North <br> Mauberquez | East <br> Popova | South <br> Reess |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INT | Pass | 19 | Pass |
| $\mathbf{2 Q}$ | All pass |  | Pass |

On this auction, the meaning of 2 is unclear. It can be a weak but proper raise with three trumps but this is by no means certain. That's why South did not balance, I assume.

Not that it mattered, for 2 is a long way from being a successful contract. South led a diamond (best lead) but North returned a trump (the 10) rather than a (any?) red card. Popova cleverly ducked 10 and played her jack on the trump continuation. South won the queen and exited with her last trump but now declarer all of a sudden could enjoy the clubs to make her contract. Hauge +llo.

Closed Room

| West Allix | North Sælensminde | East <br> Neve | South Malinowski |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 12 | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 38 | All pass |  |

After this start of the auction, a balancing action feels automatic, so N/S duly reached their heart partscore, easily making 10 tricks for another +170 to Hauge. The swing: 7 IMPs to them.

The next four boards produced three more small swings to Hauge who thus, after 14 boards, were leading the "board - a - match" contest by 8 boards to 2 at this point, with four pushes.

The only double-figure swing of the segment came on board 15 and this one, too, went to Hauge:

Board I5. Dealer South. N/S Vul.

- 1098
-A 97
$\diamond$ A 10
\& K 8742


Open Room

| West <br> Gunev | North <br> Mauberquez | East <br> Popova | South <br> Reess |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3e | $3 \diamond$ | Pass | 3NT |
| All pass |  |  |  |

30 showed the pointed two-suiter but $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{S}$ arrived in the proper contract when North showed his good hand with a club fit and South concluded the auction with a logical 3NT rebid.

West made the interesting lead of a low heart, immedi-
ately won by dummy's ace. A club to the jack came next (good news, bad news), followed by a heart to the nine and queen. East continued with the QK which declarer won immediately to knock out the remaining heart honours. East, in with the $\vee \mathrm{K}$, cashed the $\stackrel{1}{\mathrm{~J}}$ and exited with her last heart. At this point, declarer has a complete count of the hand: West started with two hearts and no clubs so he must be 5-6 as East showed two spades already.

So all looks set for an endplay but it won't work because East still holds the 2 109. If East splits her equals in the first round of the suit, it's a different story...

Anyway, one down it was: Hauge +100 .
Closed Room

| West | North | East | South <br> Allix |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sælensminde | Neve | Malinowski |  |
|  |  |  | 19 |
| Pass | $2 \mathbf{2}$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | $3 N T$ | All pass |  |

No endplay or whatever was required here. West did not show his two-suiter, which looks a wise decision in the long run. However, he led 4th best from his longest and strongest which is generally considered equally wise, but not this time. It presented declarer with a useful tempo and an early ninth trick. Hauge +600 and 12 more IMPs to end the segment $38-10$ and to lead 69-36 with 16 boards to go.

This meant that Neve would have to do very well in the final segment to have any chance of winning the match. This was the first board of that segment:

Board I. Dealer North. None Vul.


To many of us, 3s would be forcing, leaving partner a
choice between 3NT and 49. Mauberquez, though, took the remarkable decision to pass 3d, with his subminimum opening bid. The contract went one down, Hauge +50 , but it remained to be seen what the other able would do.

## Closed Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sælensminde | Allix | Malinowski | Neve |
|  | Pass | 18 | Pass |
| 19 | Pass | 2 | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 31 | Pass |
| 3NT | All pass |  |  |

Well, the other table did not produce anything special and the breaks were friendly enough for declarer to easily make his game for another +430 and 10 IMPs to Hauge. North led a low club to South's ace and when South continued the 9 rather than the 2 , all problems were over for declarer. Hauge were leading now by over 40 and had no trouble in carrying home the advantage. Congratulations to them on winning the Open European Mixed teams Championship!

## Championship Diary



A journalist submitted an article to the Bulletin. Tacchi checked it and observed, 'After reading this, every time I put pen to paper I'll think I'm Shakespeare.'

Walking back to the office I was accosted by a new arrival, Patrick Jourdain. Shaking him warmly by the hand I remarked, 'Just when I thought things couldn't possibly get any worse.'

We were trying to establish when the World Championships were held in Lille. Someone suggested they took place before the European Championships in Malta. I remarked that although I couldn't be sure of the date I was married at the time.
'Doesn't narrow it down much' was Tacchi's observation.

Maureen Dennison came in the office to deliver her latest offering. 'I want to give someone my hand.' 'In marriage?' we enquired.

Just to show that Professor Baldi is not the only one to produce errors in a calculation program, the new program used at Herman's club in Antwerp yesterday showed the winners with a score of 6.56568987 I 34554 EI 60 , which is about the number of possible combinations of three decks of cards.

## INTERVIEV GIANARRIGO RONA, PRESIDENT OF THE EBL

by David Stern

Having participated in bridge tournaments for more than forty years it never ceases to amaze me how little I know about many of the people I have met countless times. Being curious by nature I have, during the past few years, combined my journalistic efforts with my curiosity to interview various people.
I first met Gianarrigo at the ill-fated First Open European Championships in Menton. At the time I was very vocal in expressing my disappointment with the quality of the venue and the fact that it was $32^{\circ}$ in the playing area at 20:00. When I met with Gianarrigo I explained that the fact that nobody had apologised to the players after six days was as much an irritation as the actual conditions. He then promptly issued an apology, some temporary air-conditioning was introduced so much was forgiven. In fairness the weather was exceptionally unseasonal and I understand that the town of Menton was recently flooded which I guess would have been much worse..
He very kindly invited me in 2005 to the next staging of the Open Championships to show how the EBL could in fact run a world class tournament - and world class it was. So started my friendship with Gianarrigo, which led to an invitation to be a journalist here in Sanremo and at which I have been able to secure an interview.
Gianariggo (to save my fingers I will now simply refer to him as "GR") was born in 1940 during the war in Pavia, approximately 35 km from Milan. From the age of 14 until 26 he was a star basketballer playing in Italy's highest league. He attributes his lifelong interest in sport to this early success.
After graduating from the University of Pavia, he became the third generation to join the family law firm which specialised in commercial and family law - not criminal, he states pointedly. He has been married twice, for the moment anyway, he says, with a daughter and son from his first marriage. His son and two nephews now form the fourth generation to run the family law practice.
It was during these years at university that he started playing bridge. He continued playing bridge successfully after he finished his basketball career in 1966 where he achieved the highest ranking available in Italy. In 1978 he basically gave up competitive bridge after being voted to the Board of the Italian Bridge Federation as well as Chairman

of the Tournament Committee. In 1986 he was elected President until earlier this year. In 1995 he took a place on the council of the European Bridge Union rising to Treasurer in 1997 and President in 1999, a position he still holds today.
The EBL comprises 48 countries with only two not participating. With 450,000 registered players (and the number could be understated), although 20 countries have fewer than 1,000 registered players. GR is proud to note that 35,000 to 40,000 are under the age of 26 - an impressive statistic.
I know that some players have little regard for bridge administrators but it is important to note that most administrators are unpaid, and while they receive airfares and accommodation subsidies to attend tournaments, they often work 12 hours a day every day of the tournament - something many of us would not commit to without any payment whatsoever.
His biggest issue with bridge in Europe and also further afield is that NBO (National Bridge Organisations) attend conferences full of enthusiasm and make undertaking regarding the promotion of the game but often leave with little or no activity taking place thereafter. The EBL conducts Directors/Teachers and Administrator workshops in alternate years providing substantial subsidies to ensure strong participation. But GR sadly notes that only $50 \%$ of countries participate in this valuable undertaking.
His other concern is that many NBOs focus too heavily on the top $10 \%$ of players and don't understand their role to market and promote at all levels and provide programs to ensure the continuity of the game.
With Jose Damiani standing down, there is a a lot of politicking taking place for the job of President of the World Bridge Federation. The serious candidates are GR and John Wignall from New Zealand. The final vote will be held at the World Championships in San Paulo in September of this year. There are 17 votes, 5 from Europe, 5 from North America, One each from the other six bridge zones and one by the President of the WBF. To be voted into the position of President a candidate must obtain 13 votes, and if that does not happen the first Vice-President, GR, would become the President pro-tem until another vote 12 months later.
When asked of the future of bridge GR noted that "the
future of bridge is good but lies in the youth. We cannot allow the average age to rise every year. We must get bridge taught in schools and Universities. I don't believe that young people will play on an ongoing basis and there is a history of them giving it up after marriage and while they have young children, but there is strong evidence that they return to the game later in life. It is this link that we must establish."
He rejects the notion that bridge is an old person's game and feels that we need to do everything possible to 'debunk' this myth. "Bridge is like sport, it requires training, sacrifices, reflexes, focus, commitment, passion and many other efforts. Until we get our top players to understand this the game will be misunderstood, To improve you have to practice and work with your partner, be prepared to sacrifice ego and most importantly accept, without irrational reactions, that just like in life, it is normal to fail."
On a more positive note, he proudly notes that the Italian Education Ministry now accepts bridge as a curriculum subject providing teachers and school time for youth to learn bridge. If we were able to extend this around the world, the future of the game would be fantastic but it is hard to get a buy-in from educators despite it being well known that bridge improves social and cognitive skills.
Extending the need for youth bridge, the Italian Bridge Federation holds monthly bridge clinics throughout Italy providing teachers and funding for the program. The difficulty may be to ensure the continuity of the program given the current economic climate.
On the issue of sponsorship, GR notes that the global financial crisis has dried up sponsorship from the traditional sources: banks, insurance companies and finance houses. Only tennis and football have come out unscathed. He admits that bridge provides a very poor return on investment given the total lack of television coverage - something which poker enjoys in abundance.
He is surprised that many of the wealthy players who sponsor teams and individual bridge professionals do little if anything to sponsor the game (or, as he thinks of it, sport) and that some collective effort by many of these bridge sponsors could raise the profile of the game beyond its current low level.
GR hopes to improve the situation as a member of the Italian Olympic Federation. As an affiliated sport, bridge currently receives an annual subsidy of $€ 300,000$ but this could grow to $€ 2.0$ million if bridge were to become a fully recognised Olympic sport, something GR is working towards.
GR plays little bridge today and when he does it is generally a social outing. He does, however, maintain his interest by reading as many bridge magazines as he can get his hands on, something he believes is essential to maintain one's interest and skills. He also follows major tournaments online and while he believes online bridge is an excellent tool for training and practice he is not convinced about its security or that it is a good arena for competitive play. "Only at the table with the real pressures of opponents, partners, rules and regulations can you enjoy 'true' bridge."

## The Lead's the Thing

by Maureen Dennison

On this hand my partner, David Mossop, playing 3NT, earned a $95 \%$ score by winkling out that precious eleventh trick. It will surprise you when you find out the winning card.

Board 3. Dealer North. N/S Vul.

|  | - J 32 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 42 |  |
|  | $\diamond 987$ |  |
|  | - 」108 |  |
| - A 7 | N | - K984 |
| $\bigcirc$ A 103 |  | PJ986 |
| $\checkmark$ KQ 532 | W E | $\checkmark$ AJ 4 |
| - ${ }^{\text {a }} 5$ | S | -32 |
|  | - Q 1065 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 76$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 106$ |  |
|  | \& K Q 976 |  |

In spite of my 2estayman bid (which incidentally does not promise a major) North led $\vee 4$ run to PIO .

Five rounds of diamonds put the pressure on our opponents. North discarded f ] and a low spade squeezing his partner in both suits! South kept three spades discarding 5 , 86 and 2 , and dummy 23 . Next declarer led a low heart towards table, taken by North and poor South had to let go yet another club! Not reading the position and unwilling to give anything away, North exited with a heart to the ace and South was finished!

Yet another club had to be jettisoned. Reading the position correctly Mossop played 2 A and 2 to South and his extra overtrick was 5 ! There! Did you expect him to make two club tricks?

### 10.00/19.00 O/W/S Teams Registration

20.30 Open Teams Qualifying
20.30 Women Teams Qualifying
20.30 Senior Teams Qualifying

## Master \& Commander

A pun (or paronomasia) is a phrase that deliberately exploits confusion between similar-sounding words for humorous or rhetorical effect.

Just in case you are unfamiliar with the concept of a pun here are a couple of examples:

A man entered a local paper's pun contest. He sent in ten different puns, in the hope that at least one of the puns would win. Unfortunately, no pun in ten did.
Did you hear about the Buddhist who refused his dentist's novocaine during root canal work? He wanted to transcend dental medication.
In the classic adventure film Master \& Commander:The Far Side of the World the following exchange takes place at the dinner table between Capt.Jack Aubrey and the ships surgeon, Dr.Stephen Maturin.
Two weevils creep out from from the bread on a plate.
'You see those weevils, Stephen?' said Jack solemnly.
'I do.'
'Which would you choose?'
'There is not a scrap of difference. Arcades ambo. They are the same species of curculio, and there is nothing to choose between them.'
'But suppose you had to choose?'
'Then I should choose the right-hand weevil; it has a perceptible advantage in both length and breadth.'
'There I have you, ' cried Jack. 'You are bit - you are completely dished.
'Do you not know that in the service one must always choose the lesser of two weevils?'
Sometimes a defensive problem at the bridge table may require you to make just such a decision:

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- QJ 64

Q Q 87
$\checkmark$ AK 5

- 1072

You have the East hand and the bidding follows this course:

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | INT | Pass |
| Pass | Dble | Pass | Pass |
| $2 \mathbf{2 0}$ | Dble | Pass | $2 \varnothing$ |
| Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 N T$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

You lead the two of clubs and this is what you can see:


Partner covers the eight with the jack and declarer wins with the ace and plays a diamond. Rightly or wrongly (with some emphasis on the latter), you decide to go in with your king and play the ten of clubs, declarer winning with the king as partner follows with the four. You take the next diamond with the ace - not entirely happy to see partner follow with the jack. When you exit with the seven of clubs, partner plays the nine and declarer wins with the queen, cashes two diamonds ending in hand and exits with the three of clubs.
Partner's two discards have been the seven of spades and the six of hearts (reverse count), while you have discarded a spade. These cards remain:


It looks as if partner is 3-3-2-5, so you can be sure he is going to be able to cash two club tricks, which will give your side four tricks. You have to find two discards. If partner has the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ you can pitch two spades. If partner has the 8 K you can afford two hearts.
So, which of these is the lesser of two evils?
This was the full deal:

|  | - AK 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 53$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 10642$ |  |
|  | \& AKQ 3 |  |
| -1075 | N | Q QJ 6 |
| $\bigcirc$ KJ 6 |  | Q Q 87 |
| $\checkmark 13$ |  | $\checkmark$ AK 5 |
| - 19654 | S | - 1072 |
|  | - 982 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A 10942 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ Q 987 |  |
|  | - 8 |  |

In general terms a defender discards from the suit they are not interested in first, which suggests you should hang on to your spades. (Perhaps West should have discarded two spades rather than a spade and a heart.)
There is also the evidence that declarer has made no attempt to develop the heart suit, strongly suggesting that partner has something in that suit.
By now you may have guessed that East elected to discard two spades, so declarer was able to take three tricks in the suit and make his game.

## Fortune smiles - and frowns

Playing in pairs games can be enormously frustrating because of the element of luck. You can find yourself in the wrong place at the wrong time and get a zero through no fault of your own. At teams, if the opponents bid a slam that makes on slim values, at least you have the hope that your teammates will be equally aggressive. At pairs, it's just a horrible result.
On the other hand, luck can run your way - your system is ideal for the hands that come along, your "accidents" work in your favour, an opponent picks your table for a major mental lapse.
Brian Senior and Sandra Penfold sat down to play in the first semifinal round of the Mixed Pairs and started off very well.

Board I7. Dealer North. None Vul.


Double dummy, East/West can hold South to eight tricks: diamond to the ace, $\vee \mathrm{K}$ to the ace, ruffed, diamond to the queen, $\triangleright Q$ and a second heart ruff.
West led a club, however, and the defenders could take only three tricks. Plus 170 was worth 77 out of II8 matchpoints.
On the next deal, a different sequence of bids most likely would have affected the North/South matchpoints significantly.

## THE JOKE'S ON ME

In the Mixed Teams Semifinal Jeff Allerton of the Badger team had difficulty assessing one hand he removed from the board. His thirteen cards included a joker! The problem was easily solved. The TD established what card was missing and found a replacement.

Board I8. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

- K 10872
$\bigcirc 74$
$\diamond \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{Q}} 3$
\& 432

| ¢ 9 | N | ¢ 643 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 98 |  | QAJ106532 |
| $\diamond$ K 10976 | W E | $\diamond 1$ |
| - 4865 | S | Q 7 |
|  | - A Q J 5 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark 8542$ |  |
|  | - KJ 109 |  |


| West | North <br> Senior | East | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $4 『$ | Pass | 3 | Pass |

Senior had no difficulty hauling in II tricks after the opening lead of the $\vee \mathbf{A}$ and switch to the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$. He won the $\diamond \mathbf{Q}$, played three rounds of trumps, ending in hand, and played a club to dummy's 9 . West won the sA and returned a diamond, but Senior won and played another club. When the queen popped up, he could claim, discarding his losing diamond on a club and ruffing the losing heart.
He noted that had Penfold doubled $3 \checkmark$ directly instead of in the balancing seat, a push to $5 \triangleleft$ by West might have seemed more inviting. Asked if he would have pushed on to 54, Senior replied, "We'll never know."
Plus 650 was good for 102 matchpoints.
The next deal was poor when North/South missed a game that was bid by more than half of the field of 60 pairs, but they profited from some seemingly strange bidding on the next deal.

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.

- 1092
$\bigcirc$ Q J 73
$\diamond \mathrm{Q}$
2 AJ 952
- AKQ
$\bigcirc 10952$
$\diamond 74$
2 Q 743

$₫ 7$
A 864
$\checkmark$ KJ 86532
\& 6
, J86543
$\bigcirc \mathrm{K}$
$\diamond A 109$
\& K 108

| West | North <br> Senior | East | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $3 \Omega$ | $4 \diamond$ | Pass |
| $4 \Omega$ | Dble | All Pass |  |

The bidding may seem odd - bidding a four-card suit headed by the 10 at the four level - butWest accurately assessed what his partner held. If she could bid her obviously long diamond suit at the four level after passing, the reason she did not open in her long suit must be that she also held at least four hearts, making a preemptive diamond opening "flawed," at least for a disciplined player.
Nonetheless, Senior expressed his opinion of the bidding with the red card, and led the $\$ 10$. Declarer won and cashed a second high spade, discarding dummy's club. Now a diamond went to the queen, king and ace, and Senior ruffed the diamond return before exiting with a spade. West won in hand and advanced the PIO , but Senior was not tempted to split his honors - a good thing, because South produced the $\triangleleft \mathrm{K}$. Senior's two master hearts represented one down, plus 200 and 96 matchpoints.
This deal resulted in a near-zero, but it could have provided Senior and Penfold nearly all the matchpoints.

| Board 21. Dealer North. N/S Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 A Q 6 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc 10642$ |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ K Q 84 |  |  |  |
| \& A 10 |  |  |  |
| ¢ K J 87532 |  |  | 49 |
| $\bigcirc \mathrm{KJ} 8$ | W E |  | $\bigcirc$ A Q 3 |
| $\diamond 1093$ |  |  | $\diamond$ J 72 |
| \% - |  |  | * Q J 854 |
|  | ¢ 104 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 975$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A 6 |  |  |
|  | 2K97632 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Senior |  | Penfold |
|  | IV | Pass | 2 |
| 24 | Dble | Pass | 30 |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

Senior and Penfold play four-card majors, thus Senior's opening (he might also have opened $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ ). When West intervened over Penfold's heart raise with 24, double by agreement usually shows a relatively strong balanced hand - roughly equivalent to a strong INT opener.

On that basis, Penfold was not shy about introducing her six-card suit. East, with a bidding partner and five decent trumps, doubled after thinking about it for a few seconds.
West led the $\forall I 0$, taken by Penfold in hand with the ace. She played a low club to dummy, getting the news about the bad trump split, and played the $\$ 10$ to the jack and her king.
Despite the bad split, she could still make the contract by
the following line:
Play dummy's two high diamonds, discarding a spade, then ruff a diamond. Now a spade to the ace and a spade ruff would leave her on play with eight tricks in the bag. All she would have to do at that point would be to exit with a heart and wait for a trump trick that was sure to come.
Where she erred was in discarding a heart instead of a spade on the $\diamond$ Q. Now when she played a spade to the queen and tried to cash the ace, the trick was ruffed, and she was unable to get one more ruff herself. After the $\$ \mathrm{~A}$ was ruffed, the defenders cashed two hearts and played a third round, forcing her to ruff and leaving her in hand to lead from the 97 into the 2 . Minus 200 was good for only 13 matchpoints.
On the next deal, a bidding misunderstanding occurred, but Senior and Penfold came up smelling like roses.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.


Senior was much too strong to simply overcall 2 , so he started with a double. Over East's raise, Penfold bid 2NT for the minors, but Senior took it as natural, making $3>$ in his mind, at least - forcing. He was taken aback when Penfold passed, but he was happy at the end.
East led a spade to her partner's ace. A spade was continued to Senior's king. Needing to get to dummy for a heart finesse, he played a low club. East thought for several seconds, finally playing the 10 . Senior put up the queen, ruffed by West, who continued with a spade to take a trump out of dummy in case Senior had three honors in hearts. Senior pitched his low diamond, ruffing in dummy, then took the heart finesse and eventually conceded a trump trick to West and the K to East. Plus 140 was worth 99 matchpoints. North/South have lots of high-card points but no game is making, and only 14 of the 60 North/South pairs went plus on the board.
Several dull results followed, including the following, which nonetheless produced a fine score for Senior and Penfold.

| Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - A 4 |  |  |  |
| $\bigcirc$ A 109642 |  |  |  |
| $\diamond$ K 5 |  |  |  |
| * A Q J |  |  |  |
| ¢ K 1095 | $\text { Q U } 76$ |  |  |
| - K 87 | W E |  |  |
| $\diamond 94$ |  |  | Q 183 |
| 2K 1052 |  | ¢ 97 |  |
|  | - 832 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 153$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 10762$ |  |  |
|  | 9 643 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Senior |  | Penfold |
|  |  | $1 \diamond$ | Pass |
| 14 | Dble | 24 | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \bigcirc$ | All Pas |  |

Again, Senior had a strong hand that was suited to doubling and bidding the long suit, which he did at the three level.That ended the auction and left East/West with a very poor score.
Senior ducked the opening spade lead, won the continuation and cashed the $\nabla A$ and played the $\nabla 9$ from hand. West ducked, won the third round of hearts and pushed the $\triangleleft 9$ through declarer. Senior ruffed the third round of diamonds, but still had to lose a club for minus 100. That was worth 100 matchpoints to North/South and only 18 for East/West.
Were East/West at fault, or was it just bad luck? A principle of matchpoints is "protecting" your presumed plus score, particularly when the opponents are vulnerable. The law of total tricks says you should not bid to the three level with only eight trumps, but laws are made to be broken. For those who don't want to bid 34, double should be preferred to pass. A double of 38 might have worked out poorly, but another matchpoint principle is that if you never double the opponents in a maker you aren't doubling enough.
On the following deal, Penfold bid boldly and played accurately to scoop up nearly all the matchpoints.

Board I2. Dealer West. N/S Vul.


| West | North <br> Senior | East | South <br> Penfold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2 \diamond$ | Dble | Redble | $4 \checkmark$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

West's $2 \triangleleft$ was a weak two-bid in a major. Senior's double was explained as 12-15 balanced or a very strong hand. East's redouble told West to bid his suit.
Penfold bid what she thought she could make, and she was right. She took the opening club lead in hand with the king and played a heart to dummy's queen. East won the trump ace and put a low diamond on the table. Penfold went up with the ace and, eschewing the heart finesse, played the king from hand. When the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ fell, she was soon claiming plus 650 and 103 matchpoints, losing only a club and a heart.
The penultimate board was poor, but Senior and Penfold finished the session with a bang.

Board I4. Dealer East. None Vul.

|  | Q - |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ A Q J 943 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 422 |  |  |
|  | \& Q 74 |  |  |
| - A 542 | N |  | 83 |
| $\bigcirc 85$ |  |  |  |
| $\diamond 10$ |  |  | 65 |
| \& K 109865 |  |  | 2 AJ 3 |
|  | 4 K Q 976 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K IO2 |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 98 |  |  |
|  | ¢ 2 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Senior |  | Penfold |
|  |  | Pass | 19 |
| 2\% | 2 | Dble | $4 \bigcirc$ |
| Pass | Pass | Dble | All Pass |

East alerted West's 2 bid and, asked to explain, told Senior it was natural and forcing, an apparent confusion that no doubt influenced her decision to double $4 \checkmark$.
The contract can actually be defeated with the lead of the $\diamond A$, diamond ruff by West, club back to East and a second diamond ruff - which Senior might have viewed as an 'incroyable' series of events.
As it was, East started with the A , and now it was too late. East cashed the $\diamond A$ and gave her partner a ruff, but Senior ruffed when West tried to cash the 4 A and was soon claiming plus 590 , worth II7 out of II8 matchpoints.
The two finished the session at $53.00 \%$, good for 37 th in the field.

## Duplimate Discounts

The Duplimate dealing machines used at these championships will be sold at the end of the event with a $20 \%$ discount.Visit the Jannersten Bookshop on the first floor.

## Knockout punch

The U.S. Bridge Championship, which just concluded Monday night in White Plains NY, produced two teams for the Bermuda Bowl in Sao Paulo, Brazil, starting in late August.
The Steve Robinson squad earned the berth as USA I, defeating the Martin Fleisher team in the final. Fleisher still had another chance for a berth as USA 2, facing the Nick Nickell team, which they knocked out of the USA I competition. With 30 deals to go, Fleisher led 139-I23, then suffered a 42-3 defeat in set five. This deal was the first of the final set.


Rodwell's first bid was Precision. His second showed a balanced hand with 21-23 high-card points. Meckstroth showed his two suits and the heart game was reached.
Peter Weichsel cashed his three winners, and that was it for the defense. Plus 420 for the Nickell team, playing without Nick Nickell and Dick Freeman, the latter taking ill and having to leave the tournament (he is reported to have suffered pancreatitis, which is treatable).
At the other table, disaster struck.

| West <br> Rubin | North <br> Hamman | East <br> Granovetter | South <br> Zia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{Q}^{*}$ | 19 |
| Pass | $3 \boldsymbol{2}$ | $3 N T$ | $4 \boldsymbol{4}$ |
| 4NT | Pass | $5 \boldsymbol{e}$ | Dble |
| Redble | Pass | Pass (!) | Pass |

Rubin's 2NT obviously showed a two-suiter, but not necessarily the minors, and his redouble obviously was meant to convey that same message, although he no doubt wishes he had bid $3 \diamond$ instead to show the red suits.
At any rate, Granovetter obviously thought the redouble
was for business, and when dummy appeared, it was a clear violation of the David Burn rule, which states that when one plays a trump contract it is best to have more trumps than the opponents.
Zia cashed the top diamonds and switched to the 10 . Granovetter won the ${ }_{\mathrm{J}}^{\mathrm{J}}$ in hand, cashed his top clubs and three top hearts. His last trick was the Q after he had exited with the $\$ K$ from hand. Four down redoubled was minus 1600 , and combined with the minus 420 at the other table, Fleisher suffered a I9-IMP loss on that deal and a 53-27 defeat in the set. The final margin was 218-169 for Nickell.

The following is a report by P.O. Sundelin on another deal from the trials.

In the first meeting between Nickell and Fleisher at the USBC in New York, Fleisher had held on to win the first encounter (in the semifinals) by 7 IMPs after losing nearly all of their 90 -IMP lead in an impressive rally by Nickell.
In their second encounter, the match was still even when board 45 (of 90) came up:


After East passed, Meckstroth as South opened 1s and ended up in 4s after an uncontested auction. West led the $\diamond \mathrm{J}$.
How would you play?
Declarer won with dummy's ace and immediately played a club to his jack. The defence had time to establish their heart trick. Three club losers and one heart meant one down.
Kamil in South's seat at the other table passed, Zia as West opened I 8 . After two passes Kamil balanced with 24, raised to game by North.
Zia led a trump to declarer's ten.After another trump, Kamil showed us the light. He cashed his two diamond tricks, took the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ and exited with a low heart, endplaying whoever won the trick to give a sluff and ruff or help with the clubs.
It may have been easier after the $I \boxtimes$ opening bid, but this line couldn't cost, could it? Clubs can be dealt with later if necessary, and you might get an actual or inferential count to tell you who to play for the doubleton club honor. If trumps do not split, you have to play on clubs first, of course.
After this, Nickell rallied again and eventually won convincingly to join the Steve Robinson team in the Bermuda Bowl.


THE WORLD BRIDGE CHAMPIONSHIPS São Paulo, Brazil
August 29 to September 12
Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup, Ernesto d'Orsi Seniors Bowl World Transnational Open Teams Championships

HEAD-QUARTERS AND PLAYING AREA: HOTEL TRANSAMERICA

## Opening ceremony

August $29^{\text {th }}$ - to be held at the "teatro alfa" (connected to the hotel); the ceremony will be followed by a musical show at the theatre and by a cocktail/dinner at the hotel.

The Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup \& Senior Bowl
The Round Robin for all three Championships will start on Sunday $30^{\text {th }}$ August and finish on Saturday $12^{\text {th }}$ September, with the knock-out stages starting on Sunday $6^{\text {th }}$.

The Quarter Finals for each of these events will end before the start of the Transnational Open Teams, thus enabling players eliminated from the main Championships to participate Transnational Championship.

## The World Transnational Open Teams Championship

The $7^{\text {th }}$ World Transnational Open Teams Championship is a prestigious and most enjoyable event. Being Transnational, it
is open to teams composed of players coming from different countries, nominated by their National Bridge Organisation and approved by the WBF Credentials Committee.
It is a great opportunity for players to participate in a wonderful Bridge tournament while at the same time enjoying a unique opportunity to experience the atmosphere and excitement of the final stages of the Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup and watch some of the greatest players in the world on the first class vugraph presentation. Players wishing to compete in this Championship should contact their NBO and request nomination by the end of July 2009. There is no quota, and NBOs may nominate as many teams as they wish to compete in this special tournament.
Players eliminated from the Round Robin of the Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup \& Seniors Bowl will be able to enter the World Transnational Open Teams Championship free of charge if they enter as a complete team.
The WVorld Transnational Open Teams will take place during the second week, starting in the late afternoon on Monday $7^{\text {th }}$ September. The format will be Swiss Teams. It is normally played as 10 -board matches ( 3,4 or 5 per day) for 15 qualifying rounds ( 150 boards). The Quarter Final will start on Thursday late afternoon, the Semi Final will be played on Friday $11^{\text {th }}$ September and the Final will end on Saturday $12^{\text {th }}$ September.

## RECSTRATION

REGISTRATION OF TEAMS

| - Bermuda Bowl / Venice Cup | $15^{\text {th }}$ May |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| - D'Orsi Seniors Bowl | $15^{\text {th }}$ May |  |
| - World Transnational Open Teams | $1^{\text {tt }}$ July |  |
| REGISION OF PLAYERS NAMES |  |  |
| - Bermuda Bowl / Venice Cup | $1^{\text {th }}$ June |  |
| - D'Orsi Seniors Bowl | $1^{\text {th }}$ June |  |
| - World Transnational Open Teams | $1^{\text {th }}$ August |  |

PAYMENT OF ENTRY FEES

- Bermuda Bowl / Venice Cup US\$ 4,000
- D'Orsi Seniors Bowl US\$ 4,000
- World Transnational Open Teams US\$ 1,500
$1^{\text {th }}$ July
$1^{\text {ts }}$ July
$1^{\text {th }}$ August
Players eliminated from the Open, Women's or Senior Teams may form new Open teams and will receive free entry provided no players who have not participated in these events are added.

In the event that a team is made up from players who have not participated in the three main events, with players from these events added to the team, the charges will be as follows:

- A team with 4 new players
\& 1 or 2 eliminated players:
- A team with 3 new players \& up to 3 eliminated players:
- A team with 2 new players \& up to 4 eliminated players:
- A team with 1 new player \& up to 5 eliminated players: $\$ 1,500$
\$1,200
$\$ 800$
\$400


## REGISTRATION OF SYSTEMS

## - Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup

\& D'Orsi Seniors Bowl
$7^{\text {th }}$ July
ENTRIES must be sent to:
The World Bridge Federation
40, rue François $1^{\text {er }}$
75008 Paris - France
cfrancin@worldbridgefed.com

## SYSTEMS

For Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup \& Senior Bowl, the conditions of contest will give full details of systems regulations and registration, but players should note that it will be a requirement that all systems are registered in advance via e-mail to Anna Gudge: anna@ecats.co.uk
HUM systems or Brown Sticker conventions are not permitted in the Round Robin stage of the Bermuda Bowl or Venice Cup, or at any stage of the Senior Bowl.
Pairs wishing to register HUM systems or Brown Sticker conventions for use in the Knockout phase of the Bermuda Bowl or Venice Cup must register these, together with the relevant HUM or BS forms no later than $7^{\text {th }}$ July 2009. No extension to this deadline will be accepted. Teams using HUM systems or BS conventions lose their seeding rights when they play against teams that do not use such methods.

## THE VENUE

São Paulo is one of the biggest cities in the world, having over 17 million inhabitants, and it is the most important Brazilian city. Quite often São Paulo intimidates people because of its size, its constant pedestrian and vehicle traffic, ethnic and cultural multiplicity. But it is this very "city-in-a-hurry" tempo that makes the city entertaining, attractive, diversified and unique.
To think of São Paulo as merely a business destination, although the largest in Latin America, would be inaccurate. After all, what business capital has 280 movie theatres, more than 70 shopping malls and 12,000 restaurants featuring every sort of international cuisine. Feel like seeing a Broadway-style play? This is the place. Or would you rather max out your credit card at some charming street boutiques? São Paulo has so many of them, from the simplest and cheapest to the most sophisticated and expensive.
As for art - the offerings are many and varied, including "MASP" The Art Museum of São Paulo, the Museum of Brazilian Art, the Museum of Modern Art to name just three; in addition there are also important architectural works.
The Championships will take place at the Transamerica Hotel, a wonderful deluxe five-star hotel, located near the most important business, shopping, and gourmet areas of the city. The hotel
has free internet access (wifi and intranet) and offers very comfortable, well equipped rooms, two restaurants, a bar, tennis courts, soccer field, three-hole golf course, jogging lane, fitness center, heated pool, dry sauna and steam rooms, pool tables, etc.

## HOTEL INFORMATION

## HOTEL. TRANSAMERICA

Double-room (single or double occupancy): US\$180.00
(tax included) per night, breakfast-buffet included. 3 nights payment in advance is required for reservations, refundable for cancellations only until June 30. A 5\% discount is offered if reservations are made for 12 or more nights, paid totally in advance, with no reimbursements in the event of an early checkout. Suites can be reserved at prices to be arranged with the hotel. Reservations can be made directly with the hotel:

- Group Sales Department by e-mail: grupos@transamerica.com.br - or phone (+55 11) 5693-4092/5693-4098/5693-4972

Hotel web-site: www.transamerica.com.br

## Economic alternative Hotel:

## TRANSAMERICA FLAT NACOES UNIDAS

Located at 4 km ( 2.5 miles) distance from the main hotel (shuttles will be provided)
Double-room (single or double occupancy): US\$110
(tax included) per night, breakfast-buffet included. Triple room, with rollaway bed, subject to availability: US $\$ 140$ (tax included) per night. 3 nights in advance required for reservations, refundable for cancellations only until June 30.
Reservations can be made directly with the hotel

- by e-mail: rsnunidas@transamericaflats.com.br
- or phone (+55 11) 5187-2955/5693-4952

Hotel web-site: www.transamericaflats.com.br

Alternatively, reservations can be made directly with the organization by e-mail: contact@brazilbridge2009.com.br

Championship Official Site: www.brazilbridge2009.com.br

Zonal Qualified teams for BB, VC and E. DOrsi SB

| Zone 1 | 6 | Zone 5 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Zone 2 | 3 | Zone 6 | 3 |
| Zone 3 | 3 | Zone 7 | 2 |
| Zone 4 | 2 | Zone 8 | 2 |

If any Zone does not fill its quota the first berth will be offered to Zone 1, the second one to Zone 6

## Semi-finals Mixed Pairs \|I

by Barry Rigal

My plan was to take a brief visit into semi-final and watch a few of the more highly ranked pairs. I was lucky that I managed to find a few interesting deals.

Irene Baroni and Enzio Fornaciari were N/S here.
Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul.

|  | ¢ 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AKJ 103 |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 85 |  |  |
|  | \& Q 653 |  |  |
| ¢ AK964 | $W^{\text {N }}$ E |  | - QJ 105 |
| $\bigcirc$ Q 5 |  |  | $\bigcirc 987$ |
| $\checkmark 764$ |  |  | $\diamond 109$ |
| ¢ K J 7 | S |  | 4 10842 |
|  | ¢ 872 |  |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 642$ |  |  |
|  | $\diamond$ A Q J 32 |  |  |
|  | \% A 9 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  | Fornaciari |  | Baroni |
|  |  | Pass | INT |
| $2 \checkmark *$ | Pass | $2 \bigcirc$ | Pass |
| 24 | 34 | 49 | ?? |

Baroni passed (l might have been tempted to try $5 \diamond$ myself) and when North came forth with $5 \checkmark$ she thought for a while before passing again. That was right in theory, since $5 \bigcirc$ made II tricks when the heart finesse succeeded. But of course that same finesse meant that $6 \diamond$ was there for the taking. +650 was a $57 \%$ result, 1370 would have been a clear top.
Would North have been able to raise $5 \diamond$ ? I suspect not, and +620 would have been worth only a $20 \%$ board.
lan Pagan worked hard here, only to be frustrated by the favourable lie of the cards.

Board 3. Dealer South. E/W Vul.

|  | -1062 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q 7 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 1064 |  |
|  | ¢ K 987 |  |
| - AQ 8 | N | ¢ 973 |
| $\bigcirc$ KJ952 |  | $\bigcirc$ A 643 |
| $\checkmark$ A 82 |  | $\diamond$ K 95 |
| - $A 2$ | S | 21065 |
|  | ¢ K J 54 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc 108$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 73 |  |
|  | \% Q J 43 |  |

He declared $4 \triangleright$ as West on an unrevealing auction and no one could blame North for leading a low diamond to the jack and ace. Pagan's target was to avoid having to rely on the spades. Maybe the most deceptive approach is to lead a low club at trick two but he played 9 A and a second club. South was too mean to overtake North's nine, and North continued with a top diamond. Pagan won in dummy, ruffed a club, cashed the ace and king of hearts, then exited with a diamond, leaving North on play to open up spades. But even had South been able to win the third diamond the endplay would have limited the spade losers to one. That was still only a $43 \%$ result because 3NT fetched ten tricks at a few tables, but I felt it deserved more.

On the next round I moved to watch Fredin/Campanile take on an American pair, and emerge smelling of roses.

Board 5. Dealer North. N/S Vul.
-106432
$\bigcirc 4$
$\diamond 72$
\& Q 8652
$\stackrel{-}{\triangle A K Q 985}$
$\diamond$ A Q 103
\& AJ 4


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Pass | 19 |
| Dble | 19 | Pass | 2 2 |
| Dble | $3 \boldsymbol{s}$ | Dble | Pass |
| ?? |  |  |  |

From the post-mortem comments it appears West may not have seen his partner's doubles - although I'm not sure I would sit for the double even if I had seen it! The defenders are due 800 against $3 s$-- and even 500 would have got an $85 \%$ board. $4 \checkmark+$ I on Fredin's club lead was going to be worth a dead average. When declarer made the huge mistake of winning the club lead and drawing trumps instead of ruffing a club winner to dummy to take the diamond finesse, he emerged with only 420 and a $25 \%$ result. Incidentally spare a thought for the N/S pair who defended $7 \diamond$; on a heart or club lead this rates to go two down, but on a spade or diamond lead declarer has 13 tricks - a true top to bottom swing.

Board 6. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

|  | ¢ 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AK 975 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 953$ |  |
|  | * A 1085 |  |
| ¢K762 | N | ¢ Q 10953 |
| $\bigcirc 10843$ | N | $\bigcirc 62$ |
| $\diamond 108$ | W E | $\diamond$ Q 6 |
| \% Q 72 | S | 2 K943 |
|  | - AJ 8 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ Q J |  |
|  | $\diamond$ AKJ 742 |  |
|  | 2 J 6 |  |

Campanile/Fredin are a completely untested partnership. They bid the next deal $|\diamond-1 \diamond-2 N T-3 \Leftrightarrow-3 \diamond-4 \diamond-4 \Leftrightarrow-6 \%-6\rangle-$ Pass. Campanile indicated that they had never discussed what $3 \diamond$ should mean, but the auction went swimmingly nonetheless. In Vaupillon they would doubtless claim 13 tricks in 7NT as a mere formality, but even +940 was $73 \%$ for $N / S$; four pairs bid the grand slam. N/S ended the qualifying event in third place.

I moved from one pair who had avoided catastrophe by the skin of their teeth to another pair who appeared to have jumped into the septic tank and emerged smelling of roses.


Quantin-Willard held the N/S cards, and Quantin overcalled 2\%. Willard raised to $3 \%$, West doubled, and Quantin tried 3NT, perhaps more in hope than expectation. East (a seasoned French international) paused for some while, no doubt considering $4 \oslash$, but elected to defend, and right she was. On the $3 / 5$ th lead of 86 to the ace and ten, declarer was booked for two down and a $13 \%$ result...but something went horribly wrong in the defence. West perhaps read the lead as from two low - the only holding consistent with the lead of 86 ? If that was the case, he needed to cash out the spades before declarer took his winners. This reasoning is flawed of course - declarer has only eight tricks still. Whatever the case, West cashed the spade ace
and that was fatal, because it let declarer take two spades to go with his heart and six clubs. Another top to bottom swing.

Board 8. Dealer West. None Vul.

| ¢ K 865 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 985$ |  |
| $\checkmark 104$ |  |
| ¢ A Q 93 |  |
| N | - AJ 4 |
| W E | ¢ K Q 642 |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 872 |
| S | \& 10 |
| ¢ 72 |  |
| $\bigcirc$ J 10 |  |
| $\diamond$ A Q 93 |  |
| ¢) 8764 |  |

West heard her partner open one club, respond one spade over one heart, then support to hearts over the fourth-suit forcing enquiry; you or I might like just a little more shape than 4333 for the three suit-calls but apparently that is not de rigueur in Standard Francais. East jumped to $4 \bigcirc$ and could take no more than nine tricks there despite the favourable spade position. Quantin/Willard emerged with an $85 \%$ result, on their way to leading the qualifiers.

Another pair who did well in the qualifier were Lebedeva/Khazanov. Here they did nothing extraordinary but just happened to be in the right place at the right time.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul.


Khazanov, West doubled Is for takeout, on a hand where a INT bid looks to be middle of the road. Upmark as North passed rather than introduce (or transfer into) his

## NOTE

On Friday and Saturday evening all the shops in town will be open.
hearts and when Lebedeva responded $2 \triangleleft$ Bertheau decided not to double. Khazanov raised to $3 \triangleleft$ and silenced his opponents. The defenders took 100 but E/W collected an 86\% result.

The Russians gave it back on the next deal - although to be fair there was really nothing they could do.

Board IO. Dealer East. All Vul.

- KQ 105

ค 108742
$\diamond$ A 74
8

| ¢ A 87 | N | ¢ 1943 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc$ A | W E | $\bigcirc$ Q J 653 |
| $\diamond$ J 85 | W E | $\triangleleft 106$ |
| ¢K Q 9742 | S | ¢ 3 |
|  | $\pm 62$ |  |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 9$ |  |
|  | $\diamond$ K Q 932 |  |
|  | \& A 1065 |  |

Kathrine Upmark opened $\mathrm{I} \diamond$ and rebid 2NT when West overcalled $2 \%$ and North doubled. E/W clearly had not established their lead-style firmly enough since East unblocked the under the king. Bertheau won the trick and set up spades, collecting nine tricks on a club continuation for an $80 \%$ result. In fact the lie of the cards means that declarer can always emerge with nine tricks if she reads the position correctly.
I moved to watch the B semi-final and specifically to see Geo Tislevoll, facing the ebullient Faith Mayer.

| Board 12. Dealer West. N/S Vul. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ 82 |
|  | $\bigcirc \mathrm{K} 94$ |
|  | $\diamond$ K 742 |
|  | ¢ K 1094 |
| ¢ J 94 | N AK 1073 |
| $\bigcirc 62$ | W E Q Q 85 |
| $\diamond$ A Q 98 | W E $\quad \checkmark$ J 53 |
| \% Q 732 | S \% |
|  | ¢ Q 65 |
|  | $\bigcirc$ AJ 107 |
|  | $\diamond 106$ |
|  | A A 865 |

More than half the results on this traveller were the contract of 24, which should either make or be one down on a diamond lead you would fancy the defenders' chances, wouldn't you. Declarer has only six tricks if E/W lead and continue trumps but maybe declarer was allowed to get two ruffs in the West hand?

When East opened Is Mayer borrowed a king of diamonds from board II and doubled.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | Pass | 19 | Dble |
| Rdble | $2 \triangleleft$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | $2 \checkmark(!)$ | Dble | Pass |
| Pass | $3 \stackrel{9}{2}$ | Pass | Pass |
| Dble | All Pass |  |  |

The defenders led a top spade and shifted to trumps. Tislevoll won the ace and played on diamonds, establishing the $\leq \mathrm{Q}$ in due course to pitch his heart loser and score his trumps en passant. That was a not unimpressive +870 .

Board 17. Dealer North. None Vul.

- Q 96

ค A 6
$\diamond$ Q 653
Q Q J 74

```
$752
&}
\diamondAKJ97
& A 9 8
```


© AK 8
QQ7432
$\checkmark 82$
\& K 103

- J 104
- K J 1085
$\diamond 104$
9 652
As I was writing this article Valio Kovachev came through with this deal. He sat North and heard Michielsen-Verhees bid IS-I advanced the e and declarer won it in hand and led a spade to the king to lead a diamond to the jack. Kovachev ducked smoothly, and now declarer needs to set up the long spade to establish his ninth trick. Not unnaturally he actually opted for the simple line of taking the club finesse and trying to run the diamonds. When the suit did not split the defenders had a club a diamond and three hearts to cash. So N/S emerged with an $80 \%$ board instead of a $20 \%$ result.


Faith Mayer, Philippines

## Una partner deduttrice...

Marco CATELLANI

Nel Board 20, 3' sessione del qualificazione coppie miste, dopo pas - pas - pas la mia cortese avversaria di destra apriva IF, mentre io rimiravo K832 AJ87 J96 107.

Punti non sufficienti per un'apertura, ma per un intervento di contro take out... perché no?

Ovviamente gli ops giocavano fiori forte, ma dato che la segnalazione utilizzata non e' stata il cartellino dell'alert, ne' due dita che girovagassero picchiettando sul tavolo... il mio cartellino rosso del "contro" e' arrivato immantinente...

D'altra parte, provateci voi ad interpretare come "forte" l'alzata di un braccio stile 'braccio di ferro', quando però il braccio si ferma alle tempie... e voi pensate semplicemente che una simpatica ops voglia appoggiarci la testa...

Sia come sia, dopo il mio contro, l'ops di sinistra ha detto IP (6-9 col colore), e mentre la mia passava sempre a ds ripeteva due volte le cuori, atterrando infine a 4 cuori.

Qualche idea sull'attacco?
Giusto o sbagliato che fosse, ho pensato che due linee di difesa fossero valide: un accorciamento del dichiarante, o un possibile taglio a fiori. Insomma un asso nero, corroborato nel primo caso da qualche plusvalore...

Il tutto però iniziava con l'attacco, e dovendo sviluppare nel giusto ordine le due ipotesi, attaccai conseguentemente con una piccola picche. Questo il morto:
. 97654
K 4
$\checkmark$ K 54
\& 92
Dopo l'attacco, per la piccola, il 10 della compagna, e la Donna della dichiarante, come Vi sentite? Non bene, neh? Sapeste come Vi capisco...

La prosecuzione è stata cuori al Re, e cuori al 10 , la Vs chiamando a fiori.

Voi prendete col fante, e coerentemente giocate il 10 di fiori, per giocarvi la "seconda opzione".

E qui probabilmente dall'altra parte del sipario è entrata in funzione una deduttiva... perché quel che successe fu che immantinente scese un asso, seguito però dal ritorno picche... E insomma... fra i coacervi di ragionamento della Lavinthal, e del "prendi e torna", cosa potevo fare io?

Nulla...

Solo considerare la mano come equitativa, perché entrambi, coerentemente, avevamo in fondo regalato una presa a testa.

Ed ammirare estasiato la perfezione della lingua Italiana, peché in fondo la deduzione era stata perfetta: peccato riguardasse solo il numero di prese della difesa fatte in meno...

Board 20. Dealer West. All Vul.
, 97654

- K 4
$\diamond$ K 54
2982
(K 832
คAJ 87
$\diamond$ J 96
- 107

| N | - J 10 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bigcirc 6$ |
| W E | $\checkmark$ Q 10732 |
| S | - AJ643 |
| $\triangle A Q$ |  |
| QQ109532 |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 8 |  |
| \& K Q 5 |  |

## Swiss Round Four, revisited



The bulletin referred to the defence to North's $5 \diamond$ on a club lead.
In the match involving Jeremy Dhondy's team Lilo Poplilov declared $5 \diamond x$ as North on an informative auction (East had opened to show both majors and had doubled $5 \diamond$ and then led a club)
Lilo knew this to be from a singleton, so he did indeed play three rounds of hearts, and East dis-remembered to unblock two top hearts under the ace and king to let her partner win the third heart. So Lilo emerged with II tricks, but only a small pick-up since the same contract had been let through, undoubled, in the other room

## Small slam revisited

Jos Jacobs referred to the effects of the lead against 64. While the lead of the $\triangle K$ beats the slam out of hand there is still some play left after a top club lead.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \& Q 7 \\
& \diamond 9652 \\
& \diamond \text { Q } 654 \\
& \& 1076
\end{aligned}
$$

| - 103 | N | - AKJ9542 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\bigcirc 873$ |  | $\bigcirc$ AJ |
| $\checkmark$ A987 | W E | $\checkmark$ K 32 |
| - A 953 | S | -2 |
|  | - 86 |  |
|  | $\bigcirc$ K Q 104 |  |
|  | $\diamond$ J 10 |  |
|  | \& K Q J 84 |  |

As we saw, the heart loser can go on the established diamond but only if there is a side entry left in dummy and, of course, if there has been no heart lead.

Reess chose the K and Rimstedt won and played for diamonds 3-3, the logical enough approach. Had she preferred to play for the heart honours together she might have produced this ending on eg a top heart shift (a club continuation ruffed in hand produces the same result).


If South pitches a diamond declarer has a diamond finesse against North, if he pitches a heart declarer's 8 J scores, and if he pitches a club North is caught in a di-amond-club squeeze.
Of course if South is mean enough to shift to a diamond at trick two the squeeze is broken up, but who would be cruel enough to take advantage of a young lady like that?

## MIXED PAIRS - FINAL A

 (final standings - provisional)| Rank | Names | s Percentage |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | KONDAKCI SEN Emine | SEN Tezcan | 58.33 |
| 2 | GUNEV Rossen Geourgiev | POPOVA Desislava B. | 57.47 |
| 3 | ALLIX Jean Francois | NEVE Joanna | 56.65 |
| 4 | MALINOWSKI Anna | SAELENSMINDE Erik | 56.40 |
| 5 | BROGELAND Boye | BROGELAND Tonje A. | 55.97 |
| 6 | PENFOLD Sandra | SENIOR Brian | 55.41 |
| 7 | BERTENS Huub | ZWOL Wietske van | 55.34 |
| 8 | PSZCZOLA Jacek | SIMPSON Gigi | 53.92 |
| 9 | ONISHUK Anna | DE RAEYMAEKER Karel | 53.86 |
| 10 | GROMOV Andrey | GROMOVA Victoria | 53.77 |
| 11 | MAUBERQUEZ Eric | REESS Vanessa | 53.72 |
| 12 | FREDIN Peter | ZUR-CAMPANILE-ALBU | 53.69 |
| 13 | QUANTIN Jean-C. | WILLARD Sylvie | 53.56 |
| 14 | BREKKA Geir | FUGLESTAD Ann Karin | 53.50 |
| 15 | ELSINEN Antti | ELSINEN Tiina | 53.31 |
| 16 | BUTRYN Piotr | SAKOWSKA Natalia | 53.25 |
| 17 | BEAUMIER Annie | BEAUMIER Dominique | 53.07 |
| 18 | HELNESS Gunn | HELNESS Tor | 52.97 |
| 19 | HINDEN Frances | OSBORNE Graham | 52.82 |
| 20 | BAHNIK Petr | BAHNIKOVA Eva | 52.82 |
| 21 | GIERULSKI Boguslaw | SAWICKA Malgorzata | 52.78 |
| 22 | BRKLJACIC Tihana | IVANCIC Matej | 52.26 |
| 23 | BREWIAK Grazyna | JAGNIEWSKI Rafal | 52.12 |
| 24 | ZIMMERMANN Pierre | CRONIER Benedicte | 52.05 |
| 25 | DUBININ Alexander | PONOMAREVA Tatiana | 52.04 |
| 26 | KOVACHEV AL-SHATIV. | RIMSTEDT Cecilia | 51.97 |
| 27 | NIEMEIJER Christoffer | PASMAN Jet | 51.79 |
| 28 | MAGNUSSON Thomas | ROMANOVSKA Maija | 51.45 |
| 29 | RINGSETH Jorn Arild | THORESEN Siv | 51.31 |
| 30 | GWINNER Hans-Herman | LANGER Darina | 51.12 |
| 31 | D'OVIDIO Catherine | GRENTHE Jerome | 50.97 |
| 32 | KRAVCHENKO Igor | SHOKHAN Elena | 50.96 |
| 33 | GOLIN Cristina | LANZAROTTI Massimo | 50.90 |
| 34 | MEGLIO Ferdinan | PISCITELLI Francesca | 50.88 |
| 35 | KHAZANOV Igor | LEBEDEVA Maria | 50.18 |
| 36 | ALBAMONTE Giovanni | SANI Federica | 49.84 |
| 37 | FEDERICO Rita | MINA Aldo | 49.74 |
| 38 | HAUGE Rune | VIST Gunn Tove | 49.57 |
| 39 | ElJCK Inez van | ElJCK Willem van | 49.34 |
| 40 | ENGEL Berthold | GLADIATOR Anne | 49.23 |
| 41 | CORNELL Michael | CORNELL Vivien | 49.21 |
| 42 | GENTILI Carlo Maria | GENTILI Luigina | 49.07 |
| 43 | FREY Nathalie | PRIMAVERA Federico | 48.99 |
| 44 | BRUNNER Michelle | HOLLAND John | 48.87 |
| 45 | SMEDEREVAC Jovanka | WERNLE Sascha | 48.13 |
| 46 | CALDARELLI Verino | CASTIGNANI Claudia | 48.08 |
| 47 | BARONI Franco | FRATI Angiolisa | 47.99 |
| 48 | DE BRONAC Christian | DE BRONAC Priscilla | 47.77 |
| 49 | ROTH Marion | STRETZ Francois | 47.40 |
| 50 | PACE Luisa | TARANTINO Marco | 46.96 |
| 51 | CORIAT Martine | CORIAT Alain | 46.16 |
| 52 | FIASCHI Andrea | ROMANO Annalisa | 44.56 |

## MIXED PAIRS - FINAL B

## (final standings - provisional)

| MISZEWSKA Ewa Name |  | es Percentage |  | 71 | FINN Mary | O'LUBAIGH Sean | 49.61 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ZAKRZEWSKI Stanislaw | 65.77 | 72 | ENGEBRETSEN Geir | SALDZIEVA Aida | 49.53 |
| 2 | LIGGAT David | McGOWAN Elizabeth | 63.63 | 73 | BRINK Klas | BRINK-BAKENS Veri | 49.26 |
| 3 | JANKOVA Jana | VOLHEJN Vit | 63.26 | 74 | EMODY Gila | SCHWARTZ Ron | 49.00 |
| 4 | CAPUCHO Maria J. | OREY CAPUCHO M. | 63.09 | 75 | BERG Sabine | GRENTHE Guillaume | 48.95 |
| 5 | JACOB Stephanie | JACOB Tom | 60.68 | 76 | CALLAGHAN Brian | DUCKWORTH Christine | 48.87 |
| 6 | ALLERTON Jeffrey | LESLIE Paula | 60.64 | 77 | PATTINSON Bob | PATTINSON Maureen | 48.77 |
| 7 | GOODMAN Peter | MACHALE Aoife | 60.51 | 78 | BESSIS Veronique | ZALESKI Romain | 48.74 |
| 8 | MARINO Leonardo | PISANI Rosanna | 60.11 | 79 | SIROLA Annamaria | SIROLA Luciano | 48.69 |
| 9 | ARONOV Victor | ZOBU Ahu | 59.94 | 80 | HANNAH Maureen | LEDGER Jimmy | 48.67 |
| 10 | KURKA Josef | POKORNA Jana | 59.55 | 81 | KAHYAOGLOUYusuf | YAVAS Dilek | 48.67 |
| 11 | CESARI Barbara | NATALE Francesco | 59.39 | 82 | ARTMER Ilse-Betina | SIMON Josef | 48.66 |
| 12 | WEBER EIke | WEBER Fried | 58.64 | 83 | FORNI Costanza | POLLEDRO Roberto | 48.53 |
| 13 | DE BOTTON Janet | MALINOWSKI Artur | 58.53 | 84 | HOEGER Walter | MALCHUS Petra Von | 48.53 |
| 14 | MILMAN Victor | STELMASHENKO Nadia | 58.31 | 85 | CAMINATI Walther | TRALLO Fiammetta | 48.51 |
| 15 | BASARAN Berk | KANSAK Fugen | 58.13 | 86 | HAPONAVA Ulyana | ZLOBICH Sergej | 48.50 |
| 16 | SVOBODA Otakar | SVOBODOVA Pavla | 57.99 | 87 | BANKOGLU Ergun | BANKOGLU Lelia | 48.49 |
| 17 | BEAUCHAMP David | BOARDMAN Kathrin | 57.74 | 88 | FOSSI Niccolo | TEMPESTINI Marc | 48.43 |
| 18 | STRAUME Ildze | TIHANE Aivar | 57.53 | 89 | KARAKOLEV Georgi | MITOVSKA Miriana | 48.35 |
| 19 | FEIGENBAUM Ellis | MICHELIN Marjorie | 57.33 | 90 | BABAC Mine | UYSAL Aydin | 47.99 |
| 20 | TESSARO Tina | WILLS Fred | 57.30 | 91 | TOKAROVA Ljubov | ZLACKY Alojz | 47.94 |
| 21 | BABSCH Andreas | HANSEN Renate | 57.09 | 92 | BELIANKINA Zoya | SHPAK Pavel | 47.93 |
| 22 | GAMIO Claudia Valerie | REYGADAS Miguel | 57.01 | 93 | CALZOLARI Cinzia | RONCONI Claudio | 47.91 |
| 23 | MANDELLI Massimo | MARIANI Angelica | 56.98 | 94 | CLAIR Paolo | PAGNINI-ARSLAN Carla | 47.73 |
| 24 | KHONICHEVA Elena | KHVEN Max | 56.79 | 95 | KARLSSON-UISK Yıva | UISK Ahto | 47.61 |
| 25 | DE RUSSE Aude | MORIN Luc | 56.39 | 96 | DAVIES Catherine | GILL Peter | 46.99 |
| 26 | SALVADORI Paolo | TONINI Francesca | 56.10 | 97 | ARLOVICH Andrei | BADRANKOVA Sviatlana | 46.71 |
| 27 | AVON Danielle | VOLDOIRE Jean-Michel | 56.10 | 98 | BARLA Simonetta | RUFFINO Michele | 46.70 |
| 28 | PETERKIN Stephen | PUNCH Sam | 55.68 |  | KEMPLE Brid | WALSH Terry | 46.37 |
| 29 | BUSI EIda | RICCI Sergio | 55.61 | 100 | CLIFFORD Baxter | CLIFFORD Carol Ann | 46.19 |
| 30 | ROSSANO Enza | VIVALDI Antonio | 55.57 | 101 | BLAKEY Irving |  | 46.13 |
| 31 | DHONDY Jeremy | DHONDY Heather | 55.32 | 102 | ROMANOW | ROSSARD Marti | 46.07 |
| 32 | PROIA Marco Luigi | CERRI Cinzia | 55.02 | 103 | DENNISON M | MOSSOP David | 46.05 |
| 33 | ALP Zeynep | GUR Okay | 54.96 | 104 | CHIEN Steven | LIN Phoebe | 46.03 |
| 34 | BEVILACQUA Sergio | VIOLA Giuliana | 54.79 | 105 | CHEN Steven | KENT Yasemin | 46.03 |
| 35 | FOUASSIER Jean-Claude | SERF Marianne | 54.63 | 106 | POPLILOV Lilo | KENT Yasemin | 45.87 |
| 36 | PAPYRAKI Maria | PROKOPIOY loannis | 54.56 | 106 | POPLILOV Lilo | POPLILOV Matilda | 45.87 45.49 |
| 37 | ERDEOVA Jana | MASEK Jiri | 54.45 | 107 | DITETOVA Eva | FORT Tomas | 45.49 |
| 38 | SIRIKLIOGLU Mehmet | TUNALI Mine Nurdan | 54.16 | 108 | MARINONI Pier Andrea | ROMANO Elisa | 45.34 |
| 39 | BARENDREGT Rosaline | GOTARD Thomas | 54.02 | 109 | WARENDORF Ernst | WITTEVEEN Els | 45.28 |
| 40 | HARPER Ross | SMITH Nicola | 53.34 | 110 | ATALIK Leyla | ATALIK Selcuk | 45.18 |
| 42 | AMBROZ Bojan | AMBROZ Milojka | 53.01 | 111 | ABLEY Julie | IRWIN Richard | 45.09 |
| 43 | CAPORALETTI Candeloro | MARINELLI Rita | 52.81 | 112 | LEGGIO Donatella | SORO Fabio | 44.62 |
| 44 | EFRAIMSSON Bengt-Erik | SVEDLUND Helena | 52.37 | 113 | KANDEMIR Ismail | NUHOGLU Sevil | 44.45 |
| 45 | TITOW Joanne | TITOW Kenneth | 52.36 | 114 | CRESTEY Gilles | CYPRES Suzanne | 44.21 |
| 46 | DAVIES Pat | DAVIS Gwynn | 52.24 | 115 | FABRIZI Fabrizio | RAFFAELLI Alda | 44.05 |
| 47 | HODEROVA Pavla | KOPECKY Michal | 52.14 | 116 | PEDERZOLI Giuliana | MINALDO Claudio | 43.86 |
| 48 | CHODOROWSKA Irena | CHODOROWSKI Jan | 52.13 | 117 | SEQUI Elios | LEONARDI Luisa | 43.79 |
| 49 | PIEDRA Fernando | SAESSELI Irene | 52.12 | 118 | SANDQVIST Nicklas | SENIOR Nevena | 43.67 |
| 50 | BUDD Maria | HARRIS Malcolm | 51.94 | 119 | STANICIC Ognjen | ZJACA Dina | 43.57 |
| 51 | NORDBY Harald | VIGMOSTAD Ellen | 51.92 | 120 | PALMIERI (2) Maurizio | SCIUBBA Elisabetta | 43.50 |
| 52 | CASTRO RUZ DE LOMELI | FRONTAURA Frankie | 51.67 | 121 | ANGELINI Marisa | CAPITANI Primo | 43.28 |
| 53 | BARBAN Carlo | MARCELLO Giovanna | 51.66 | 122 | ALLGOWER Mats | OLSSON Ella | 43.21 |
| 54 | MITCHELL Louise | REDDAN Diarmuid | 51.66 | 123 | TERNBLAD Birgitta | TERNBLAD Sten | 43.09 |
| 55 | DALPOZZO Andrea | MALAGUTI Francesca | 51.32 | 124 | LESKELA Vesa | VIRTANEN Kirsi | 42.85 |
| 56 | ANIDJAR Nina | BRENNER Diego | 51.21 | 125 | FREY Fabien | GERST Ariette | 42.75 |
| 57 | SOLOMON Louise | SOLOMON Warner | 51.07 | 126 | AGHEMO Monica | CORTI Leonardo | 42.43 |
| 58 | DANYLYUK Tetyana | DANYLYUK Volodymyr | 51.03 | 127 | BETTARELLI Letizia | COSIMI Luciano | 42.24 |
| 59 | JELENIEWSKA Malgorzata | LUTOSTANSKI Piotr | 50.68 | 128 | KUZNIATSOVA Larysa | TIMAKHOVICH Aleh | 41.76 |
| 60 | SOBOLEWSKA Ewa | VAINIKONIS Vytautas | 50.65 | 129 | YILMAZ M.Gokhan | GULTEKINGIL Fusun | 41.66 |
| 61 | NELSON Alan | NELSON Kath | 50.49 | 130 | RONIN Michal | RONINOVA Renata | 41.62 |
| 62 | BALDI Elma | BALDI Matteo | 50.49 | 131 | BIANCHI Valeria | CATELLANI Marco | 41.47 |
| 63 | GOTARD Barbara | GOTARD Tomasz | 50.43 | 132 | GODFREY E | PAGAN lan | 41.36 |
| 64 | KAREKE Agneta | KAREKE Torbjorn | 50.33 | 133 | MUNTEANU Alex | MUNTEANU Aurelia | 41.33 |
| 65 | KOZYRA Ewa | OHRYSKO Lech | 50.20 | 134 | BARLA Angela | NATTA Giampiero | 41.20 |
| 66 | PAPAIOANNOY Myrsini | DELIMPALTADAKIS Nikos | 49.93 | 135 | VESTH-HANSEN Kirsten | VESTH-HANSEN Ole | 39.97 |
| 67 | JOST Nicole | JOST Patrick | 49.72 | 136 | BRANDOLINI Marinella | RIVANO Fulvio | 39.68 |
| 68 | DE GOETZEN Maria | PORCINO Demetrio | 49.68 | 137 | LILLIS Heidi | McGLOUGHLIN Michael | 38.20 |
| 69 | COYLE Willie | TELTSCHER Kitty | 49.68 | 138 | BARONI Irene | FORNACIARI Ezio | 37.53 |
| 70 | SEN Melih Osman | SUT Inci | 49.64 | 140 | AZERRAF Hortensia | BENYES Eli | 31.67 |


Swiss-KO teams
$15-19$ August
Board-a-match teams
$18-19$ August
Entry fee:
$500 € /$ team

MP Pairs 20-23 August<br>IMP Pairs<br>22-23 August<br>Entry fee: 200€/pair

NBO's are not restricted with any quotas. Transnational teams and /or pairs are also allowed. National anthems will be played, and national flags will be raised for only teams or pairs with all players of the same nationality.

Eligibility: born on or after January 01, 1984
In case of sufficient participation in U20 teams and/or pairs, the Championship will be palyed in both U25 and U20 categories.

Full board accommodation in double rooms: $45 €$ per person per day Registrations will be made through WBF site:
www.worldwide.org


