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## HAPPY WINNERS 2014 GCC OPEN TEAMS CHAMPIONS



Matthew Thomson, Michael Ware, Hugh McGann, GeO Tislevoll, Fiona Brown and Tony Nunn 2014 GCC OPEN TEAMS RUNNERS-UP


CHINA NANGANG: Li Xin, Zhang Bankxiang, Shen Jiaxing - Gan Xinli


## SEMI FINAL ROUND 3 - DISAPPEARING TRICK

## Brent Manley

The third set of the Open Teams semi-final match between the McGann and Burke teams did not feature much action, but two boards stand out.

The first features a spectacular play by Tony Nunn, who was playing with Fiona Brown against David Beauchamp and Sartaj Hans.

| Dealer: North | A 532 | Semi Finals 3/4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - AK 105 |  | Brown | B'champ | Nunn | Hans |  |
| Brd 5 | - J 8 |  |  | Pass | Pass | 24 |  |
|  | -K 1042 |  | 44 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
| ヘ Q 97 |  | AKJ10864 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark 7$ |  | $\checkmark$ Q J 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - AK5 2 |  | - 73 |  | Makeab | le Con |  |  |
| ¢QJ873 |  | ¢96 | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | A A |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\wedge$ |
|  | $\checkmark 96432$ |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -Q10964 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | - |
|  | \& A 5 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\%$ |

As you can see, there are four top losers - two clubs, a heart and a spade. Excluding the trump ace, can you guess which loser went away? Here's what happened.
Hans led the 10, taken in dummy with the ace. At trick two, Nunn called for the $\AA \mathrm{Q}$, playing the 9 from hand when Beauchamp played low. Hans won the \&A and continued with a diamond. Dummy’s $\varangle$ Kon that trick, and Nunn followed with a low club. Understandably, Beauchamp was taken in, and when he followed low, Nunn's $\% 6$ won the trick.

Declarer then played the $\mathbf{\vee 8}$ from hand. Beauchamp won the $\mathbf{V 1 0}$ and played a trump. Hans won but did not have another trump to play, so Nunn was able to ruff both heart losers on his way to 10 tricks. At the other table, Anthony Burke and Peter Gill faced GeO Tislevoll and Michael Ware.

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Burke | Tislevoll | Gill | Ware |
|  | 1\% | 14 | $2 \vee$ |
| 36 | 4 | Pass | Pass |
| 40 | Pass | Pass | Double |
| Pass | Pass | Pass |  |

The opening lead was the same - the 10 - taken in dummy. At trick two, Gill played a club to his 9 and Ware's ace. A second diamond went to the king, followed by dummy's heart. Tislevoll won the VK and exited with a spade to Ware's ace. Gill ruffed the diamond continuation, then ruffed a heart, ruffed a diamond and ruffed his last heart. There was no chance Tislevoll would duck a club at that point, so declarer was one down for minus 100 and an 11-IMP loss.
Board 7 helped Burke to win 12 IMPs.

| Dealer: South | A K Q 86 | Semi Finals 3/4 | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark$ AK8 |  | Brown | B'champ | Nunn | Hans |
| Brd 7 | -9875 |  |  |  |  | Pass |
|  | -102 |  | 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| A AJ742 |  | A --- | 24 | Pass | 2* | Pass |
| $\bullet 7$ |  | - J 10654 | 3\% | Pass | $3{ }^{4}$ | Pass |
| - J 3 |  | - AK 1042 | 34 | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| \& AK Q 84 |  | \& 976 | Pass | Dbl | 4* | All Pass |
|  | A 10953 |  |  | Makeab | le Con | acts |
|  | - Q 932 |  | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | - Q 6 |  | 2 | - | 2 | $\cdots$ |
|  | \& J 53 |  | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | 4 | - | 4 | - * |
|  |  |  | 5 | - | 5 | $\%$ |

Beauchamp led the VA, switching to the $\$ 2$ at trick two. Brown won the $\$ J$ in hand and ran the $J$ to Hans's queen. Hans returned a diamond to dummy and Brown followed with a low club to her 8 and North's 10. That ended her chances of making 10 tricks. She could ruff the heart return and enter dummy with the $\% 9$, but with only three pitches on diamonds, she would still have to lose a spade. If she ruffed the return and ruffed a spade to dummy, Hans would be able to ruff the third round of clubs. The result was one down for minus 100. At the other table:

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Burke | Tislevoll | Gill | Ware |
|  |  | Pass |  |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 2\& | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2 0}$ | Pass |
| 3* | Pass | 5\% | All Pass |

Tislevoll started with the VA and continued with the VK, ruffed by Burke. He then cashed the $\uparrow A$ and ruffed a spade. The $\downarrow Q$ dropped when Burke cashed dummy's high diamonds. He then ruffed a heart and ruffed a spade. On the 10 , Ware discarded his last spade. Burke ruffed a heart with the trump queen and played another spade, ruffing with dummy's 9 . Ware could overruff, but declarer had five trumps in hand, the AA, two spade ruffs in dummy and three diamond tricks for a total of 11 . Plus 600 was good for a 12-IMP gain.
So at the end of the set McGann led by 50-34 with ten boards to go.

## SEMI FINAL ROUND 4

## Barry Rigal

The semi-final between Burke and McGann had been basically even-steven since McGann took a 20 imp lead at the start of the match. Each time McGann had increased the lead Burke had closed it back to 20, but it was still an 18 imp differential as the final set of 10 deals began.
After a couple of overtrick imps to Burke, Beauchamp found himself in a game on an unopposed auction while GeO had played partscore.

| Dealer: West | A K Q 5 | Semi Finals 4/4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | $\checkmark$ - 7 |  | McGann |  | T'son | Hans |  |
| Brd 12 | -K7652 <br> \& A J 7 |  | Pass | $1 *$ | Pass | 19 |  |
|  |  |  | Pass | 2NT | Pass | $3 *$ (Vs) |  |
| A 64 |  | A A J 83 | Pass | 36 | Pass | 3NT // |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \vee K J 654 \\ & \bullet \text { Q } 3 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\checkmark 2$ | Burke | GeO | Gill | Ware |  |
|  |  | -1094 | 29 | 2NT | All pass |  |  |
| \&10954 |  | \& K Q 632 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
|  | A 10972 |  | - | 3 | - | 2 | NT |
|  | - Q 10983 |  | - | 3 | - | 2 | $\stackrel{\sim}{1}$ |
|  | - A J 8 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 8 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | - |
|  |  |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\%$ |

Thompson's low club lead cost a trick, but now declarer simply took the diamond finesse - as would we all? The defenders cleared clubs and North was out of chances. In the other room Gill tried to hit his partner's minor ( $2 \downarrow$ showed hearts and a minor) and led the $\$ 10$. That brought in the diamonds while allowing declarer to establish hearts, and McGann had 6 imps to lead 56-36.
Then Ware had the chance to beat a game, or allow the match to close right up.

| Dealer: North | A 963 | Semi Finals 4/4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -K932 |  | McGann | B'champ | T'son | Hans |  |
| Brd 13 | - 743 |  |  | Pass | Pass | 1A Pass |  |
|  | \& 1093 |  | Double | Pass | 3 |  |  |
| A A 54 |  | A 872 | 34 | Pass | 4\% | Pass |  |
| - A J 87 |  | $\checkmark 654$ | 4 | All pass |  |  |  |
| -Q1095 |  | - AK J 8 | Burke | GeO | Gill | Ware |  |
| \& A 4 |  | \& K 82 |  | Pass | Pass | 1\% |  |
|  | A K Q J 10 |  | Double | Pass | 2NT | Pass |  |
|  | $\bullet$ Q10 |  | 3NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 62 \\ & \& Q J 765 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | NT |
|  |  |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | A |
|  |  |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\%$ |

Whether or not McGann should bid on over 3 , he was right to do so given the result from the other table, where Ware's defence of three rounds of spades had let declarer win and establish the extra heart trick, while keeping South off play. Should Ware have found the club shift at trick three? GeO certainly thought so.

After both East-West pairs had gone two down at the four-level in their long minor suits, against their opponents probably making $3 \vee$, Ware was in the hot seat once again. I'm not sure I believe the Vugraph records, but that is what we have to work from:


While Beauchamp-Nunn stopped in 3 after McGann had made a Multi 2 overcall of 10 and allowed the opponents to stop low, Ware found himself in $4 \mathbf{V}$.
The defenders led the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} J$ to the ace, a diamond to the queen and ace, then West played two more rounds of diamonds. Granted a reprieve, declarer ran his trumps pitching low clubs from hand and the Vugraph indicates that East pitched two clubs - exposing his partner to a criss-cross squeeze. Burke did bare his \&K, and the fact that declarer then did not cross to the \&A implies that maybe the vugraph record was wrong. We hope so -since we don't think Peter Gill would keep two losing diamonds to pitch winning clubs, and otherwise there would have been some very unhappy campers at the table!
In the other room the defence to $3 \boldsymbol{V}$ led the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$, and when West played the $\uparrow \mathbf{J}$ East shifted to diamonds to take the ruff and that was a quiet one down; no drama.

| Dealer: West | A 8653 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark$ Q 3 |  |
| Brd 16 | $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & \& K 76542 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| A A J 102 |  | -974 |
| - K 54 |  | - 962 |
| -K103 |  | - Q 982 |
| \& A Q J |  | -9 98 |
|  | A K Q |  |
|  | - J 1087 |  |
|  | - AJ 764 |  |
|  | \& 103 |  |

Both tables bid unopposed to 3NT by West. Both Norths led a spade (well done, I think, since a club lead makes it easier) and both declarers won and led a LOW spade to the nine, unblocking the suit, but losing the entry to dummy. When Ware won the aK and shifted to the VJ, Tislevoll overtook, and returned the suit when Burke ducked. Burke won the next heart, and cashed off the spades before leading a diamond to the queen. Ware won and exited in clubs, and GeO scored his king and returned the suit. Now Burke cashed two more clubs and when South showed out, he had now seen all 13 of North's cards. But he crossed to the VA and led a diamond to the king, losing trick 13 to South for down one, and no joy in Muddville.
By contrast at trick three McGann won the shift to the VJ with the king in hand, North unblocking the queen, and played the $\uparrow$ K, ducked, the $\uparrow 10$ losing to the $\diamond$, and now came a low club. To make the game McGann had to fly with the ace - playing South for the \&K, then clear diamonds; if he ducked North would win and revert to hearts. Eventually he ducked, and went down when Beauchamp won and played the heart through. No swing and several unhappy players, yet again.

Of course both defenders could have shifted to a low heart at trick three; now declarer is far worse placed.
That left the margin at 8imps to Burke. After both tables made $2 \leqslant$ Gill (who must surely have expected to be trailing, despite his good result on board 13) made a try for game after 1^-2A by bidding 3 C on A A10942 $\vee$ Q9732 - 10 \& AJ. His view might have been right, since when partner bid 4^ and put down a KQJ and $\checkmark$ J105 he must have felt he would be in with a shout. But the rest of dummy was just the $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$, and not only did
the defenders lead a club, both hearts and spades were 4-1. So 44 was down without the option, while in the other room Thompson passed $2 \uparrow$ and went quietly +140 . The margin was up to 14 now.
On the next deal Burke had their last chance:

| Dealer: South | A A 7654 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - AK 3 |  |
| Brd 19 | $\text { Q J } 106$ <br> \& J |  |
| AK982 |  | A 10 |
| $\checkmark 9$ |  | - QJ8764 |
| - 3 <br> \&K Q 106432 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { - A } 8754 \\ & \& 8 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | AQJ3 |  |
|  | -1052 |  |
|  | -K92 |  |
|  | \& A 975 |  |

The defence to $3 \& x$ started with a top heart and shifted to a top diamond. Declarer won in dummy and led the A10, covered all round. The $\quad \mathrm{J}$ went round to the $\& \mathrm{Q}$ leaving West with two spades and two clubs to lose for down one.

So how would 4^ play? Beauchamp won the club lead and crossed to hand with a heart and led a spade up towards the king. He could now not avoid two spades and a diamond and a heart when trumps did not behave, and McGann had six imps to increase the lead to 20, and after an overtrick on the last deal they won 69-48.
Since China Nangang had drawn the final set and had won the match 102-54, we could expect a good final between two teams that had reached the finals in very contrasting fashion.

## PEARLS FROM PETER

Sometimes you end up in contracts that seem to have no chance. It is vital not to give up under such circumstances.

| Dealer: South | A A J 84 | Pairs Final S3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | $\checkmark$ A 1072 |  |
| Brd 23 | $\begin{array}{r} 96 \\ \& 942 \end{array}$ |  |
| AKQ632 |  | A 7 |
| $\bullet$ Q |  | -K86543 |
| - AK 105 |  | - J 82 |
| \& A 87 |  | \& Q 53 |
|  | ヘ 1095 |  |
|  | - J 9 |  |
|  | - Q 743 |  |
|  | \& K J 106 |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Burke | Gumby | Gill | Lazer |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| 14 | Pass | 1NT | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | 30 | Pass |
| 4\% | Pass | 4 | All pass |
|  | Makea | le Con | acts |
| - | - | - | 1 NT |
| - | - | - | A |
| 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
| 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
| - | - | - | 9 |

An earlier report on this deal had mentioned that when West finds his partner with a weak hand and long hearts, it was sensible not to commit the hand to no-trumps. Tony Burke came to the same decision as West, when he realized that with no entries to the hearts and weak spade spots opposite likely shortage, neither suit would set up easily in no-trump. Gill therefore bid 4e to get his partner to pick a game and Gill selected hearts - the East least worst of the possible games.

Warren Lazer naturally if unfortunately led a club and Gill won the queen, led a spade to the king and ace, took the club return and pitched his club loser on the top spade.

Now came the VQ to Pauline Gumby's ace, and when a spade came back (helpful defence, since this allowed declarer to establish dummy's winner) Gill ruffed, cashed the VK noting the fall of the jack, and correctly used restricted choice in deciding to play North for both the missing heart spots, the 10 and 7.
So Gill led a diamond to the ace, ruffed a spade establishing dummy's fifth card in the suit, then took the diamond finesse. This was the ending:

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A --- } \\ & \vee 107 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | ---- |  |
|  | $\& 9$ |  |
| A 2 - --- |  |  |
| - --- |  | $\checkmark 86$ |
| - K 10 |  | - J |
| \& --- |  | \& --- |
|  | A --- |  |
|  | - --- |  |
|  | - Q 7 |  |
|  | \& K |  |

When Gill led the fifth spade from dummy Gumby could ruff in now and lose her second trump trick or discard and be trump couped at trick 12.
Just for the record, a club return after winning the $\vee$ A prevents the establishment of the fifth spade. The fact that North does not follow to the third diamond prevents the trump coup.

| Dealer: North | AK10975 | Teams Qual R7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark 4$ <br> - 832 <br> \& $A$ Q 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AJ42 |  | A A 863 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 7653 |  | $\checkmark$ KJ 9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -K4 |  | - A 96 |  | ak | C |  |  |
| \& 952 |  | \& J 106 | - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | A Q |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | - Q 1082 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Q J 1075 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | - |
|  | \& K 87 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | \% |

Tony Burke played $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ as North, after opening with that call to show spades and a minor. Quite reasonably Dee Harley led a heart, and West won the ace and continued the suit. Certainly not unreasonable, and declarer still appears to have his work cut out. Burke found the best way to eight tricks when he ruffed the second heart, played $\& A$, $\% \mathrm{~K}$ and a third club up. When both hands followed, he ruffed the fourth club in dummy with the queen, in this position:

|  | $\underset{\bullet}{\text { A K }} \mathrm{---} 1097$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 832 \\ & \& 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| - J 42 |  | ^A863 |
| - 765 |  | $\checkmark$ K |
| - K 4 |  | - A 96 |
| \& --- |  | \& --- |
|  | $\wedge$ Q |  |
|  | $\bullet$ Q 10 |  |
|  | - Q J 1075 |  |
|  | \& --- |  |

When East discarded a diamond the contract could no longer be defeated. Tony ruffed with the $\uparrow \mathbf{Q}$, ruffed a heart back to hand, and exited in diamonds, to be sure as the cards lay of two more tricks. East can set the hand either by ruffing the fourth club low, or more simply by discarding a heart on the fourth club. Declarer can do no better than ruff a heart back to hand with the spade ten, East 'discarding' a low trump. Then declarer exits in diamonds and the defence take their ruff, then play the fourth heart. Declarer ruffs with the spade ten and east overruffs and leads a spade back to his partner's jack, to score the last trick with the spade eight.
Just for the record, declarer must ruff a heart when in dummy with the club king, and then cannot be prevented from scoring enough of his small trump tricks one way or another.

## OPEN TEAMS FINAL BOARDS 1-12 OF 48 - A CLOSE ONE

Brent Manley
The Open Teams final between China Nangang and the Hugh McGann squad was expected to be closely contested - McGann was the No. 2 seed and the Chinese finished atop the round robin standings. Based on first-set results, the two teams did not disappoint.

After the first 12 boards, China Nangang had the lead at 26-25.
China had a 1-IMP lead after two boards but expanded it considerably on deal three.

| Dealer: South | AJ42 | Teams Final 1/4 | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | -QJ95 |  | McGann | Li | Thomson | Gan |
| Brd 3 | -K1096 |  |  |  |  | 1\% (Strong) |
|  | \& Q 10 |  | 29 | Pass | Pass | 3 |
| A 73 |  | ^AQ95 | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |
| - AK8643 |  | $\checkmark 1072$ | Shen | Brown | Zhang | Nunn |
| - 3 |  | - 42 |  |  |  | $1 *$ |
| \& K 652 |  | \&9843 | 19 | 1NT | Pass | 24 |
|  | A K 1086 |  | Pass | 34 | Pass | 4, |
|  | $\checkmark$--- |  |  | Make | le Contra | cts |
|  | - A Q J 875 |  | - | 3 | - | 4 NT |
|  | \& $\mathrm{A} J 7$ |  | - | 2 | - | 2 * |
|  |  |  | 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | - | 5 | - | 5 * |
|  |  |  | - | - | 1 | $\ddagger$ |

Matthew Thomson led a low heart to McGann's ace. A heart was returned to the queen and Li Xin took the losing club finesse. Declarer could not be prevented from taking six diamonds, a heart and two clubs for nine tricks and plus 400. Things went awry for Fiona Brown and Tony Nunn at the other table.

Shen Jiaxing led the $\mathbb{V}$, forcing Nunn on the go. He played a diamond to dummy and continued with a spade to his 10. When he played another diamond, Shen ruffed and tapped Nunn again with the VK. Down to the singleton trump king, Nunn played it to East's ace. The AQ was next. Nunn finished two down for minus 100 and 11 IMPs to China.
Board 4 could have been a 3 -IMP gain for China but turned out to be a 13 IMP loss.

| Dealer: West | A J 109743 | Teams Final 1/4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - Q 84 |  | McGann | Li | Thomson | Gan |  |
| Brd 4 | - 3 |  | Pass | Pass | 1* | $2 \vee$ |  |
|  | \& 96 |  | Pass | $3{ }^{3}$ | All Pass |  |  |
| AQ65 |  | A AK8 | Shen | Brown | Zhang | Nunn |  |
| -103 |  | $\bullet$ J 9 | Pass | Pass | 1\% | $1 \checkmark$ |  |
| - A 85 |  | -Q1042 | Dbl | $2 \vee$ | Dbl | Pass |  |
| \&J10432 |  | \& AK Q 5 | $3 \%$ | Pass | Pass | $3{ }^{3}$ |  |
|  | A 2 |  | Dbl | All Pass |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 7652 |  |  | Makeab | e Contra |  |  |
|  | -J976 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
|  | ¢ 87 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\uparrow$ |
|  |  |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | * |
|  |  |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\%$ |

McGann led the ad, overtaken by Thomson to switch accurately to a trump. Gan Xinli won with the trump ace and led a low diamond to dummy's king, continuing the suit at trick three. McGann won and played another trump, taken in dummy. A spade went to Thomson's king, and he continued with the \&K and the 』A. Gan ruffed and could ruff a diamond in dummy but he could not avoid losing two diamonds, two clubs and a spade for one down.

Shen in the Closed Room started with a low spade, which was fatal to the defence. Zhang won the AK and played a trump, but Nunn took the ace, played a diamond to dummy's king and ruffed a spade before exiting with a diamond. The defenders won, cashed two clubs and continued with a heart, but Nunn could win in
dummy and ruff a spade, setting up the suit with a diamond ruff as the entry. Nine tricks meant plus 730 and 13 IMPs to McGann.

On board 7, light openings by the China - South at one table, West at another - swung another 9 IMPs to their side.

| Dealer: South | A Q 108 | Teams Final 1/4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -K92 |  | McGann | Li | Thomson | Gan |  |
| $\text { Brd } 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q43 } \\ & \& \text { AQJ } 6 \end{aligned}$ |  | Pass | 3NT | All Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AK6 |  | ヘ9742 | Shen | Brown | Zhang | Nunn |  |
| - ${ }^{\text {8 }} 65$ |  | $\checkmark 43$ |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| - A 652 |  | - J 108 | $1 *$ | Pass | Pass | Dbl |  |
| \& 1095 |  | ¢ K 842 | Pass | 1NT | All Pass |  |  |
|  | A A J 53 |  |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
|  | $\vee Q J 107$ |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | NT |
|  | $\text { -K } 97$ |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\uparrow$ |
|  | \& 73 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | - |
|  |  |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | $\%$ |

Thomson led the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathbf{7}$, ducked to McGann's king. The $\$ 10$ went to the jack and king, and Thomson exited with the $\quad$ J, ducked to declarer's queen. Declarer played a heart to dummy's queen and McGann's ace. At that point, McGann cashed the $\forall$ A. The defenders took one trick in each suit and declarer scored plus 600.

The successful defence to 3NT is strictly double dummy. East must start with a diamond and West must rise with the ace to switch to the $\& 10$. When declarer plays the ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{J}$, East wins the king and continues with a diamond. Now, whether declarer next plays on hearts or spades, West gets in to play a third round of diamonds, giving him the setting trick when he later gets in with the other major.
In the Closed Room should Shen's light opening have kept North-South from their vulnerable game? Brown might have doubled in second seat or bid 2NT over her partner's balancing double. She did neither and must have been disappointed to see such a good dummy.
Interestingly, Zhang found the potentially killing lead of the $>$, but without the benefit of a look at the other two hands, Shen did not play the ace and Brown ended up with plus 180.

## OPEN TEAMS FINAL BOARDS 13-24 OF 48

Barry Rigal
The second set started with the Chinese leading by one imp.
Both tables bid and made a game in the face of preemption on the first deal, then GeO and Michael Ware climbed a little high on the next board.

| Dealer: East | A A 65 | Teams Final 2/4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | $\checkmark$ Q 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 14 | $\begin{aligned} & K 854 \\ & \& 10732 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { AQ9742 } \\ & \checkmark 94 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A K J } 8 \\ & \vee A 1087 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| -QJ73 |  | - A 10 |  | Makea | Con |  |  |
| ¢ 65 |  | \& Q 864 | 2 | - | 2 | - | NT |
|  | A. 103 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\wedge$ |
|  | -KJ653 |  | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -962 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | * |
|  | \& A J 9 |  | 1 | - | 1 |  | $\%$ |

Zhang, sitting West heard his partner open a 14-16 no-trump and transferred to spades then passed the $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ response, Ware transferred to spades then invited with 2 NT , and GeO corrected to 3 A . With all the suits splitting nine tricks were not a problem. The record shows 11 tricks taken in spades after a diamond lead which seems odd but confirmed by the players both making five. 2 imps to China Nangang.
The boards got more interesting in a hurry.

| Dealer: South | ^A Q J932 | Teams Final $2 / 4$ | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | $\checkmark 108$ |  | Ware | Li | Tislevoll | Gan |  |
| Brd 15 | - 75 |  |  |  |  | $1 *$ |  |
|  | \& K 107 |  | $1{ }^{\circ}$ | Double | $4 \checkmark$ | 4NT |  |
| A 108 |  | A 654 | Pass | 5 | All pass |  |  |
| -AJ7432 |  | -KQ965 | Zhang | Brown | Shen | Nunn |  |
| - 942 |  | -K10 |  |  |  | $1 *$ |  |
| - A 2 |  | \& Q 65 | 19 | 14 | 2NT[vs] | 3* |  |
|  | A K 7 |  | 34 | 34 | Pass | 44 1 |  |
|  | - --- |  |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
|  | - A Q J 863 |  | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | ¢J9843 |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\uparrow$ |
|  |  |  | 2 | - | 2 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | - |
|  |  |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | $\%$ |

$5 \diamond$ proved to be very easy to play on a top heart lead. Declarer ruffed and played ace then jack of diamonds, leaving the defence the club ace now or later (declarer only gets four clubs away on the spades). By contrast 4A was very awkward (and if Shen had found the lead of 10 declarer would have been sweating bullets. He actually led a trump and Brown sensibly won in hand and ruffed a heart then tried to guess clubs. Who knows what she would have done had West followed low: but when he hopped up with the ace and played back a low club Brown had a further problem. She got it right by rising with the king and drawing trumps to lose two clubs and a heart for a sweaty imp to McGann. They trailed 28-26.

| Dealer: West | a J 10 | Teams Final $2 / 4$ | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | -KQJ6 |  | Ware | Li | Tislevoll | Gan |  |
| Brd 16 | -1072 |  | Pass | Pass | 19\% | Double |  |
|  | \&9862 |  | Pass | 19 | Pass | 2* |  |
| -983 |  | A A Q 54 | Pass | 3 | Pass | 3NT // |  |
| -10532 |  | - A984 | Zhang | Brown | Shen | Nunn |  |
| - J 94 |  | - 85 | Pass | Pass | $1 *$ | Double 3NT // |  |
| \& Q 75 |  | \& J 104 | Pass | 29 | Pass |  |  |
|  | AK762 |  |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark 7$ |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | $\text { - A K Q } 63$ <br> \& $A K 3$ |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\uparrow$ |
|  |  |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | - | 4 | - | 4 | - |
|  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 4 | 9 |

Both tables played 3NT here, Nunn after Brown's extravagant jump to $2 \boldsymbol{\vee}$, Gan on a slower auction. Nunn won the diamond lead and led a heart to the king, and when that held he could build a spade trick for his contract, and the fall of the A9-8 made his route to an overtrick comfortable. Meanwhile Gan was given a far harder task on a club lead. After testing diamonds early he found the suit splitting, but no delayed entry to dummy. when he led a heart to the king Tislevoll took the first heart and exited with the club jack. Gan ran his diamonds on which Tislevoll erred (in theory and practice) by letting go of a spade. So declarer could exit in clubs, and wait for West to play spades for him, holding his losers to two tricks in the suit since the defenders had to give the lead to dummy eventually.

Had Tislevoll kept all four of his spades he would have given declarer a nasty guess if the spades were divided slightly differently. Imagine reaching this ending:


West shifts to the spade seven，$\uparrow 10, ~ A A$ and $\uparrow 2$ ．When East returns the queen declarer has to choose between West having begun life with $\uparrow$ AQ96 or $\uparrow$ AQ95－when he must duck－or the actual holding．It feels wrong to play for the spade blockage，but whatever the answer，it would certainly be a close decision．

The next board was also a small pick－up for McGann，but here the error by his side was far more tangible．

| Dealer：North | A K Q 2 | Teams Final $2 / 4$ | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul：None Brd 17 | $\bullet$ J 72 |  | Ware | Li | Tislevoll | Gan |  |
|  | －AQJ 74 |  |  | 1NT（1） | Pass | $2 \checkmark$ |  |
|  | ¢9 4 |  | Double | 2＾ | 3＊ | 34 |  |
| A 7 |  | A AJ43 | 5\％ | All pass |  | （1）$=13-16$ |  |
| －A 983 |  | －Q 65 | Zhang | Brown | Shen | Nunn |  |
| －K9 |  | －10 |  | 1NT | Pass | 29 |  |
| ＊A Q J 1032 |  | ＊K8765 | 3\％ | Pass | 4＾ | Pass |  |
|  | A 109865 |  | 4NT | Pass | 54 | Pass |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 104 |  | 6\％ | All Pass |  |  |  |
|  | $86532$ |  |  | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2 | － | 2 | － | NT |
|  |  |  | － | 3 | － | 3 | $\uparrow$ |
|  |  |  | 3 | － | 3 | － | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | － | 4 | － | 4 | － |
|  |  |  | 5 | － | 5 | － | $\%$ |

Both tables found their way to clubs，but Zhang＇s exuberance got him to a no－play slam whereas Tislevoll was in a contract he could（and should）have made．Tislevoll received the $\uparrow 10$ lead to the queen（the expert and cost－nothing false－card of the king was surely available to North）and ace．GeO，who knew South had one card at most out of the $\triangle A \wedge Q$ and $\nabla K$ started well by ruffing a spade，drawing two rounds of trumps ending in hand，then erred by leading a diamond to dummy＇s king．The defenders played back a diamond and declarer ruffed and eventually lost two hearts for down one．Unlucky，but if declarer ruffs a spade high and no king appears then the VK must be right，since North has no more spades．As the cards lie，the spade king appears， and you have reached this ending．

|  | ヘ－－－ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \vee J 72 \\ & \text { AQJ } 74 \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | \＆－－－ |  |
| ヘ－－－か ｣ |  | A J |
| V983 3 －Q65 |  |  |
| － 9 － 10 |  |  |
| が3 ${ }^{\text {¢ }} 876$ |  |  |
|  | A 98 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K 104 |  |
|  | － 865 |  |
|  | \＆－－－ |  |

Now you cross to a trump，take the $\uparrow \mathbf{J}$ to pitch a diamond，then lead a diamond up．Again if South surprises you by scoring the A ，the VK will be right．When North wins the $\boxtimes K$ he will have to play a heart，and you get to take two finesses in the suit instead of one．You are favourite to guess the suit－－South＇s decision to compete is surely more likely to be based on a king than a couple of jacks．

A A 3
－AKQ1032
－ 6
＊K J 74

On the next deal Gan gained his side 3 imps with one of the more cautious bids of this tournament．

Holding this hand he overcalled $3 \diamond$ with $3 v$ and bought it there－catching his partner with the equivalent of a 6－1－4－2 Yarborough with the $\$ 10-9$ to rescue the hand from utter misery．He got out for down one while Nunn played $4 \checkmark$ down two when he made that call over the same preempt．It was 31－29 now to China Nangang．

All of these boards had been interesting but not much blood had been spilt．On the next hand there was blood all over the carpet＇s，and all of it was Fiona Brown＇s．

| Dealer: South | A A Q 85 | Teams Final 2/4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 19 | -A 974 <br> \& K J 1043 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A 93 |  | A 1062 |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 10632 |  | -KQJ54 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -1082 |  | - 53 | Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| \& A Q 6 |  | \& 982 | - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
|  | A K J 74 |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | A |
|  | - 987 |  | 1 | - | 1 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | -KQJ6 |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& 75 |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\%$ |

The computer did not relay the auction that led to Brown declaring 64 from the North seat after opening $1 \boldsymbol{\infty}$, but on a diamond lead Brown won in dummy and a club up. West took the club ace and played a heart. Declarer ruffed and drew trumps then led a club to the king and took the ruffing finesse in clubs, for down two. Not unreasonable, but very expensive. Nangang led 42-29
Three deals later both McGann pairs combined to lose another 11 imps .

| Dealer: East | A J 106 | Teams Fina |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: E-W | - K Q 104 |  |
| Brd 22 | - AK 105 |  |
|  | \& 6 |  |
| A Q 85 |  | A A 32 |
| - A 97 |  | - J 652 |
| - Q J 2 |  | -864 |
| \& AK 92 |  | $\%$ Q J 5 |
|  | AK 974 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 83$ |  |
|  | -973 |  |
|  | \& 10874 |  |

Ware Tislevoll bid unopposed via strong no-trump to 3NT. The defenders led hearts and declarer set up a heart winner - and eventually emerged with seven tricks; not a triumph but not a disaster either. In the other room after West opened 1NT Brown doubled, and that ended the auction. I suppose it could have been worse for N/S but - 380 didn't thrill the scorers either. The lead was 53-29 now.

McGann finally got on the score-sheet again on the final deal of the set when both pairs did their bit to earn their share of a 5 imp pick-up.

| Dealer: West | A Q J 106 | Teams Final 2/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | -K10742 |  |
| Brd 24 | -K <br> \& A 98 |  |
| A 872 |  | A AK 95 |
| $\checkmark 953$ |  | $\checkmark$ J |
| -107 |  | - A Q 98 |
| \&K7654 |  | \& Q J 102 |
|  | A 43 |  |
|  | - AQ 86 |  |
|  | - J 65432 |  |
|  | * 3 |  |


| West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ware | Li | Tislevoll | Gan |  |
| Pass | 10 | Double | 2NT |  |
| Pass | 30 | Double | Pass |  |
| 4\% | All pass |  |  |  |
| Zhang | Brown | Shen | Nunn |  |
| Pass | 17 | Doble | 4 |  |
| Pass | Pass | Double | Pass |  |
| 5\% | All Pass |  |  |  |
| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | - | 1 | - | NT |
| 1 | - | 1 | - | A |
| - | 4 | - | 4 | $\checkmark$ |
| - | 1 | - | 1 | $\checkmark$ |
| 4 | - | 4 | - | 8 |

With $4 \checkmark$ cold because of the 3-1 heart break (one spade one club and eight trump tricks) $5 \%$ was a cheap save but McGann still had 5 imps to trail $55-34$ at the half.

## OPEN TEAMS FINAL BOARDS 25-36 OF 48 - BIG SWING

Brent Manley
Trailing China Nangang by 21 IMPs with two sets to go, the Hugh McGann team had some work to do, and they wasted no time, scoring in double digits on the first deal of the third set.

| Dealer: North | A 52 | Teams Final 3/4 | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: None | - A U 82 |  | McGann | Li | Thomson | Gan |
| Brd 1 | - A J 963 |  |  | 10 | Dbl | 2 |
|  | \& 6 |  | $2 V$ | 3 | 30 | 4 |
| A K 986 |  | A AQJ3 | 4^ | Pass | Pass | 5 |
| $\checkmark 65$ |  | -743 | Pass | Pass | Dbl | All Pass |
| -7 |  | - Q 2 | Shen | Tislevoll | Zhang | Ware |
| \& Q 98543 |  | \& AK 72 |  | 10 | Dbl | $2 V$ |
|  | A 1074 |  | 24 | $3 \%$ | Dbl | 3 |
|  | - K 109 |  | Pass | 4 | All Pass |  |
|  | -K10854 |  |  | Makeab | le Contra | acts |
|  | \& J 10 |  | - | - | - | NT |
|  |  |  | 4 | - | 4 | A |
|  |  |  | - | 4 | - | 4 - |
|  |  |  | - | 4 | - | 4 - |

Gan Xinli did well to bid 5 because North-South were not beating 4a. Minus 100 should have been a gain for The excellent double fit meant GeO Tislevoll had an easy 10 tricks in $4 V$. That was 11 IMPs to McGann, now only 10 IMPs behind.
The score was 56-48 for China when McGann and company outbid their opponents again.

| Dealer: South | A AQ965 | Teams Final 3/4 | West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | -K76 |  | McGann | Li | Thomson | Gan |
| Brd 7 | -9642 |  |  |  |  | 10 |
|  | \& 7 |  | Dbl | 2 | $3 \%$ | 34 |
| A 10732 |  | A J 8 | Dbl | Pass | 4\% | All Pass |
| $\checkmark 95$ |  | $\bullet$ J | Shen | Tislevoll | Zhang | Ware |
| - K Q 3 |  | - A J 87 |  |  |  | 10 |
| \& AKQ 10 |  | \& 865432 | Dbl | 19 | Pass | $2 v$ |
|  | A K 4 |  | Pass | 30 | 3NT | 4- // |
|  | -AQ108432 |  | Makeab | le Contr | cts |  |
|  | $105$ |  | - | - | - | - NT |
|  | \& J 9 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 a |
|  |  |  | - | 4 | - | 4 - |
|  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | - |
|  |  |  | 3 | - | 3 |  |

Li's $2 \vee$ presumably showed a better raise than a direct $2 \boldsymbol{V}$. North-South don't have a lot of high-card points between them, but they have enough tricks to score game in hearts. Thomson had enough tricks for his contract and he scored plus 130 with ease.

Plus 620 together with plus 130 equalled 13 IMPs to McGann, now in the lead.
By the time the final board of the set came along, China had regained the lead at 64-61, but it didn't last.

| Dealer: West | A Q 53 | Teams Final 3/4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | -9876 |  | McGann | Li | Thomson | Gan |  |
| Brd 12 | - AK 76 |  | 2 | Pass | $2 \vee$ | 34 |  |
|  | \& K 8 |  | Pass | 3NT | Pass | 4 |  |
| A A98642 |  | AKJ 107 | Pass | 5 | All Pass |  |  |
| $\checkmark 532$ |  | $\bullet$ K | Shen | Tislevoll | Zhang | Ware |  |
| -10 |  | - J 98543 | 24 | Pass | 4A | 4NT |  |
| \& 1072 |  | 4 A 3 | Pass | 5NT | Dbl | $6 \%$ |  |
|  | A --- |  | Pass | 6 | Pass | $6 \vee$ // |  |
|  | -AQ J 104 |  |  | Makeab | le Contra |  |  |
|  | - Q 2 |  | - | - | - | - | NT |
|  | \& Q J 9654 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | A |
|  |  |  | - | 6 | - | 6 | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | - |  | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  | - | 5 | - | 5 | $\%$ |

A curiosity of the game is that although no one actually bid spades, the other three players knew what West's long suit was. In that context, perhaps North's $5 \checkmark$ was meant to ask South about controls in that suit. With a void in spades, going on to slam seems automatic. On the other hand, that might have induced East-West to take their excellent save 6A, which would probably have been two down for minus 300 , less than the opponents' game. It would have been a $15-\mathrm{IMP}$ loss instead of 13 IMPs .

Shen and Zhang missed a chance for an 8-IMP gain, and McGann was in the lead 74-64 with 12 boards to play.

The last set of a pulsating finals would see all the momentum with a McGann team that had come back from 20 down to grab the lead by 10 imps on the very final deal.

OPEN TEAMS FINAL THE LAST 12
Barry Rigal

| Dealer: North | AK98742 | Teams Final 3/4 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - 643 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Brd 13 | - J 108 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \& 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A A 6 |  | A Q J |  |  |  |  |  |
| - A 2 |  | -KQ105 |  |  |  |  |  |
| -Q953 |  | - AK 764 |  | Makea | e Con | cts |  |
| \& J 8732 |  | \& 64 | 4 | - | 3 | - | NT |
|  | A 1053 |  | - | 1 | - | 1 | 4 |
|  | - J 987 |  | 3 | - | 3 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - 2 |  | 4 | - | 4 | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | \& AK Q 109 |  | 2 | - | 1 | - | $\%$ |

The first deal of the final set was certainly explosive. While Thompson/McGann bid 1NT-3NT, Tislevoll had tried passing once, and didn't like it. He opened a Multi $2 \downarrow$, after which E/W did well to get to 3NT when Zhang doubled (cards) and Shen converted Ware's $3 V$ boost to 3NT. On a low spade lead declarer had ten top tricks and a chance for an $11^{\text {th }}$ on a squeeze. Both tables ended with 10 tricks (and 4A would have cost at least 500).

The next deal saw McGann open a 5-5-1-2 three-count 1A in third seat non-vulnerable, catching a balanced 21 -count on his left, who was singularly unconvinced by the whole affair to stay out of the normal 3NT. Again, no significant swing - though declarer did take a safety play, and cost himself two overtrick imps.

| Dealer: South | Teams Final |
| :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S |  |
| Brd 15 |  |
| A AKQ9 5 | A 764 |
| -K64 | - J10987 |
| - A 853 | -K6 |
| \& J | \& 652 |

The next deal saw a difference of style which nearly translated into a game-swing for China Nangang. As West would you double 1* or overcall 1^? Put me in the former camp - old fashioned I know! McGann bid 1A and
played there, Shen doubled then bid spades, and was about to play 24 when his opponents balanced into 3\%. Now Zhang as East came to life with 3 , and Shen passed him out there, for +200 when VQ was onside. That was just an imp to them against 170 from the other room - and yes $4 \checkmark$ is a pretty decent spot, isn't it?

After a quiet partscore for both E/W pairs, the Chinese had a self-inflicted accident when they got their defences to 1NT scrambled and played $2 \checkmark$ in a 3-3 fit down two. This didn't have to be a major catastrophe, since though they could make 4n, it wasn't easy to get there after a third in hand no-trump opening bid was passed round to a 7-2-3-1 three-count with seven spades to the ten. However Matthew Thompson was never going to sell out to his opponents here, and when he balanced with $2 \boldsymbol{1}$, McGann raised him to game and suddenly the lead was 22 imps .
If that was painful to the Chinese, it was as nothing compared to the next exhibit.

| Dealer: East | A A J |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: N-S | - Q J 42 |  |
| Brd 18 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AJ } 962 \\ & \& A 9 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| - 8 |  | A Q 973 |
| -1063 |  | $\checkmark$ A |
| -Q104 |  | -K75 |
| \&QJ10865 |  | \&K7432 |
|  | AK106542 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ K9875 |  |
|  | -83 |  |
|  | $\%$ |  |


| West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shen | Tislevoll | Zhang | Ware |  |
|  |  | 1 | 2 |  |
| Pass | $4 \checkmark$ | Pass | Pass |  |
| 5* ${ }^{*}$ | 5 | 6\% | Dbl |  |
| Pass | 6 | All pass |  |  |
| McGann | Li | ThompsonGan |  |  |
|  |  | 24[1] | Pass |  |
| 3\% | Dbl. | Pass | $4 \checkmark$ |  |
| 5\% | Dbl. | All pass |  |  |
| [1] 4 Spades and a minor 10-14 |  |  |  |  |
| Makeable Contracts |  |  |  |  |
| - | 1 | - | 1 | NT |
| - | 5 | - | 5 | 4 |
| - | 5 | - | 5 | $\checkmark$ |
| - | 3 | - | 3 | $\checkmark$ |
| 4 | - | 3 | - | 4 |

McGann chose the slow route to $5 \%$ (which was subsequently doubled), gambling that he would be facing clubs and that his partner would be short in hearts - a very reasonable approach. Gan was not happy to bid on facing known spade length to his right. McGann declared $5 \%$ on a top heart lead and managed to strip off the majors without South getting in to play a diamond through him. Then after drawing trumps he led a diamond to his queen to endplay North to give him a second diamond trick. Nicely done, but the fate of $6 \vee$ would swing a huge number of imps. Not surprisingly, Zhang did not find the spade lead; I leave it to the Monday Morning quarterbacks to explain why they would have done so. After a diamond lead to the queen and ace, GeO cashed the club ace to pitch dummy's diamond, and now on the actual lie of the cards he had to ruff a diamond immediately to make his slam legitimately. Instead he led a heart from hand and had East won to play a club declarer would have been unable to set up either diamonds or spades. He actually shifted to spades, and declarer was back in control. Those 16 imps (which could so easily have been nine or so the other way sewed up the match. McGann led by 36 now and the rest of the deals had no potential to swing. The final margin was 38 imps at 104-66.
This was the third consecutive appearance in the finals for four of the six winners but their first win. Four of the players were Fiona Brown, Hugh McGann GeO Tislevoll and Michael Ware and Tony Nunn in 2013. Obviously adding Matthew Thompson made all the difference!

## HAVE YOU DISCUSSED

Brent Manley

A well-known American player, Glenn Eisenstein, was competing in a major team game in the USA. He was reporting a win by 16 IMPs when he noticed on the scoreboard that his team's previous match, a loss by 16 IMPs, had been recorded as a blitz for the other team. When he asked the director to check the score, the TD said the record showed Eisenstein's team had lost by 169 IMPs. "If we lost 24 IMPs on every board," Eisenstein protested, "that would be only 168 IMPs!" Replied the TD, "Maybe there was a cell phone penalty."

In yesterday's article, the discussion centered on whether, holding 10 or more high-card points, you must redouble if partner's opening bid is doubled for takeout. It is important for you and your partner to discuss the exceptions, most of which involve holding support for the suit partner has opened.
It is recommended that you and partner discuss a handy agreement called "flip flop" 2NT.

That sounds odd, but it's useful and preferred by many experienced players. The meaning of the 2NT bid varies depending on whether partner has opened a major or a minor, and there is a sound rationale for the difference. If you understand the reason for the difference, it will be easier to remember the convention in the heat of battle.

Here's the scheme. When partner opens a MAJOR and the next player doubles:

- Pass: Nothing to say. Probably no support and a weak hand.
- Single raise: About what you would have for a raise without the takeout double, but you can shade it a point or two in an effort to preempt the bidding.
- Double raise: At least four-card support and a weak hand. This is a preemptive action meant to take bidding space from the opponents.
- Triple raise: Likely five-card support and a shapely hand short on high-card points, also preemptive.
- 2NT: At least a limit raise in partner's major (10-11 support points). Some prefer having four-card support, but that's an item for partnership discussion. Showing support for partner's suit is always a priority.
- Redouble: 10+ HCP, usually balanced and TYPICALLY with at most a doubleton in partner's suit. Good defensive values as a rule. Some partnerships agree that after a redouble, the opponents are not allowed to play a contract undoubled.
When partner opens a MINOR and the next player doubles:
Pass, single raise and redouble have the same meanings. Although rare, a triple raise is also weak and distributional, likely with five-card or better support.

The difference is in the meanings of the double raise and 2NT. When partner opens one of a minor and the next player doubles, a double raise shows 10-11 high-card points and good support for opener's minor (do not count distribution points).
2NT shows a preemptive raise of partner's minor. The "flip flop" comes from the change in the meanings of double raise and 2NT between majors and minors.
The reason for the difference is that if you and partner have a game, which could easily be possible, it will rarely be in five of the minor. It will almost certainly be in 3NT, and from a tactical point of view, it will be much better for partner to be declarer - putting the takeout doubler on lead - than for you to have that job.
Think it through. The doubler has most if not all of the HCP for his side. You could gain a lot if you make the doubler lead away from his assets.
If you play 3NT, the opening lead will go through partner's hand instead of up to it. This scheme has the same logic you use in agreeing to play Jacoby transfers over 1NT and 2NT. You want the stronger hand concealed and led up to rather than through.
So, you ask, what if you have more than a limit raise? Just pick a suit you can bid at the one level (remember, it's forcing) and do your best from there. Alvin Roth, one of the all-time great bidding theorists, is often quoted as saying, "If I can just get past this round of the bidding, l'll be all right."

## IMPROVING YOUR GAME

Barry Rigal

| Dealer: West <br> Vul: All | A Q J |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\bullet$ Q 2 |  |
|  | - A J 42 |  |
|  | \& 87654 |  |
| A 10543 |  | ヘ98762 |
| - J 1098 |  | - 76 |
| -1065 |  | -97 |
| -109 |  | \& K 32 |
|  | A AK |  |
|  | - A 543 |  |
|  | -KQ 83 |  |
|  | * $A Q J$ |  |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pass | Pass | Pass | $2 \star$ |
| Pass | $2 \star$ | Pass | 2NT |
| Pass | 6NT | All Pass |  |

South is too strong for a 2NT opening, which shows a balanced 20-22 count, so he opens $2 *$ and rebids 2NT over North's temporising $2 \star$ bid. It would not be wrong to respond 2NT initially with that North hand, but it often works out better to start with $2 \star$ as a waiting bid, to give the strong hand a chance to describe itself.

South's 2NT rebid shows a balanced 23-24, and North takes a confident shot at 6NT. 6 would be a better slam, but sometimes minor-suit fits are hard to find. One possible route would be to use Jacoby Transfers over the 2NT bid, with 3A being Minor Suit Stayman, looking for a four-card minor.
West remorselessly finds the best line of attack, a heart lead against 6NT, and when the VQ loses to the VK, South is in trouble. He not only needs the club finesse, he also has entry problems to dummy. To overcome them, he needs to make best use of the spot cards in dummy. The right approach is to win the VA, cash the
 finesse. Everything passes off peacefully, and South cashes the $\& A$, and can play that carefully preserved $\$ 3$ to dummy's $\downarrow$, to score the two club winners residing in dummy.
Again, the point of the hand was to plan ahead and see that the shortage of entries to dummy required careful preservation of all of dummy's possible entries in the diamond suit. If you waste that $\$ 3$, you sink the contract.

## APPEAL NUMBER 2

To ensure complete transparency of the appeals process, the Australian Bridge Federation ensures that the full details of appeals at National Events are published in the Daily Bulletins whenever possible. Here is the second such appeal for this tournament.

Event:
Chief Tournament Director:
Appeals Committee:
Scribe:

Gold Coast Congress Teams Championship RR9
Laurie Kelso
Bruce Neill (c), Kim Morrison, Stephen Fischer, Phil Gue \& Michael Wilkinson Brent Manley

| Dealer: South | ค A J 5 | Teams Qual R9 | West | North | East | South |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vul: Both | - J 654 |  |  |  |  | 1\% |  |
| Brd 7 | - Q J 83 |  | Pass | $1{ }^{1}$ | Pass | $1 \mathrm{~A}^{2}$ |  |
|  | ¢ 84 |  | Pass | 1 NT | Pass | 2NT |  |
| - 984 |  | A 1032 | Pass | 3\% | Pass | 3NT |  |
| $\checkmark$ A 1097 |  | - 32 | Pass | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| -K104 |  | - 7652 |  | Makea | le Con | acts |  |
| \& K 62 |  | \& Q 93 | - | 3 | - | 3 | NT |
|  | AKQ76 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | $\wedge$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ Q 8 |  | - | 2 | - | 2 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | - A 9 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | - |
|  | \& A J 1075 |  | - | 3 | - | 3 | 9 |

1 4+ hearts
2 4+ clubs, 4+ spades, fewer than 3 hearts, could be balanced
Table Result: North-South +600 .
The Director: Was called to the table at the end of the auction and given an explanation of the bidding. The players agreed that the 1NT bid had been somewhat slow, and the $3 \%$ bid had been slower - 5 to 10 second and 10-15 seconds, respectively.
North-South explained that 2NT showed four spades and five or more clubs, invitational, and that $3{ }^{\circ}$ was systemically non-forcing. South had bid 3NT on the basis of the presumed club fit.

The tournament director consulted a number of players regarding the slow 3\%. A large proportion were unsure whether the slowness suggested moving forward, or that North had been considering Pass.

The director cited Law 16B1a: "After a player makes available to his partner extraneous information that may suggest a call or play, as for example by a remark, a question, a reply to a question, an unexpected alert or failure to alert, or by unmistakable hesitation, unwonted speed, special emphasis, tone, gesture, movement or mannerism, the partner may not choose from among logical alternatives one that could demonstrably have been suggested over another by the extraneous information."
The directing staff ruled that the tempo of the $3 \%$ bid did not demonstrably suggest one alternative action over another, and therefore allowed the table result to stand.

The Appellants:

The Respondents:

The Committee:

Decision:

Argued that the slow bid of $3 \%$ suggested that North had choices of actions. One of those options would be to suggest 3 NT rather than a signoff in $3 \boldsymbol{4}$, which an intempo 3* would have indicated. Had North bid 3\% in tempo, South would have had no strong reason to bid further as $3 \&$ would then indicate a minimum 1NT rebid.

South said he bid 3NT because the bidding indicated a club fit and that such a fit made 3NT a better contract. South argued further that he did not want "a vulnerable game to slip away if it had a chance."

Ruled that the information conveyed by the combination of hesitations (i.e., that North did not hold a minimum for his bidding) thereby made 3NT demonstrably more attractive. The committee was in agreement that, without the unauthorized information, Pass was a logical alternative in the given auction.
The committee therefore changed the final contract to $3 \%$, making nine tricks for plus 110.


West leads the $\downarrow 2$, fourth-highest. How many spades does declarer have?
Solution: With the 2 lead as fourth-highest, you know West began with four hearts and so South has three hearts. With five spades and four hearts West would very likely have led a spade and not a heart. Therefore West does not have five spades and that means South will have five spades. You can play South for five spades and three hearts

> SESSION TABLES AS AT END OF THE TOURNAMENT 7759

## A SPECIAL BULLETIN CONTAINING ALL THE PHOTOS FROM THE DINNER DANCE WILL APPEAR ONLINE EARLY IN THE WEEK STARTING $3^{\text {RD }}$ MARCH

| Rank | Pair | Names | Total | Rank | Pair | Names | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 107 | Geoff EYLES - Anne SOMERVILLE | 147.97 | 131 | 177 | Jan RANDALL - Peter RANDALL | 99.34 |
| 2 | 33 | Eva SAMUEL - Jeff FUST | 142.48 | 132 | 161 | Mahinder RANDHAWA - Ruth RANDHAWA | 98.98 |
| 3 | 176 | Kelvin RAYWOOD - Martin HENNEBERGER | 141.22 | 133 | 185 | Edgar BECKETT - Janice BECKETT | 98.95 |
| 4 | 198 | Shane HARRISON - Renee COOPER | 139.96 | 134 | 82 | Robin WEBCKE - Julia GARDINER | 98.94 |
| 5 | 5 | Sue INGHAM - Michael COURTNEY | 138.59 | 135 | 48 | Andrew WOOLLONS - Richard FOX | 98.90 |
| 6 | 138 | Maxim HENBEST - Kim MORRISON | 136.05 | 136 | 11 | Helen MILWARD - Elly URBACH | 98.89 |
| 7 | 46 | Alan DAVIES - Vivien ELDRIDGE | 133.43 | 137 | 204 | Peter ANDERSSON - Ashok TULPULE | 98.46 |
| 8 | 30 | Simon STANCU - Alex DUMITRESCU | 133.34 | 138 | 218 | Pam SCHOEN - Phil HALE | 98.09 |
| 9 | 98 | Lyn MULLER - Sandra CALVERT | 132.10 | 139 | 114 | Murray WIGGINS - Rosa MISHKIN | 97.95 |
| 10 | 81 | Lorraine STACHURSKI - Mindy WU | 131.28 | 140 | 155 | Jenny DATE - Jacqui MORTON | 97.68 |
| 11 | 75 | Michael JOHNSON - Michael SIMES | 130.92 | 141 | 113 | Roman MORAWIECKI - Lynne GRAY | 96.89 |
| 12 | 169 | Hugh MCALISTER - Diana MCALISTER | 130.29 | 142 | 192 | Tony BERGER - Merle BOGATIE | 96.72 |
| 13 | 125 | Wayne BURROWS - Kaylee LEMON | 128.67 | 143 | 153 | Carolyn LEACH - Sandy LEACH | 96.59 |
| 14 | 137 | Peter EVANS - Tony TRELOAR | 127.89 | 144 | 89 | Richard TOUTON - Ryan TOUTON | 96.42 |
| 15 | 150 | Tony HUTTON - Malcolm CARTER | 127.51 | 145 | 220 | Marie PURKISS - Toni DIXON | 96.24 |
| 16 | 140 | Peter HAINSWORTH - Joan BUTTS | 127.45 | 146 | 259 | Sue BROWN - Robert BROWN | 96.22 |
| 17 | 252 | Graham RUSHER - Stephen STENING | 127.30 | 147 | 166 | Coral AIKIN - Linda ABBENBROEK | 96.15 |
| 18 | 83 | Herve CHEVAL - Gilles JOSNIN | 126.83 | 148 | 195 | Ruth YOUNG - Dale WELLS | 96.12 |
| 19 | 43 | Michael WILKINSON - Susan HUMPHRIES | 126.07 | 149 | 39 | Ivy LUCK - John LUCK | 95.81 |
| 20 | 133 | Stephen GRAY - Lindsey GUY | 124.94 | 150 | 253 | Lucie ARMSTRONG - Rua FREEBORN | 95.68 |
| 21 | 67 | Tony BOND - Tony ONG | 123.06 | 151 | 100 | John NEWMAN - Michael GEARING | 95.53 |
| 22 | 87 | Ervin OTVOSI - Jeremi STEPINSKI | 122.97 | 152 | 49 | Kerry WOOD - Charles HOWARD | 95.09 |
| 22 | 102 | Edward BURROWES - James COUTTS | 122.97 | 153 | 239 | Bruce INGLIS - Stephen GOODMAN | 94.91 |
| 24 | 222 | Matt BLACKHAM - Michele TREDINNICK | 122.48 | 154 | 10 | Jens NORLYNG - Annabel NORLYNG | 94.88 |
| 25 | 190 | Frank KOVACS - David MCRAE | 121.02 | 155 | 157 | Peter NILSSON - Deborah NILSSON | 94.58 |
| 26 | 162 | Ranjit LIMAYE - Michael DRAPER | 120.89 | 156 | 256 | Pat WALKER - Ian LISLE | 94.30 |
| 27 | 243 | Carol DE LUCA - Bev HENTON | 120.78 | 157 | 20 | Ros WARNOCK - Valerie ISLE | 94.26 |
| 28 | 230 | Paul WEAVER - Terry BODYCOTE | 120.77 | 158 | 165 | Bev CROSSMAN - Bruce CROSSMAN | 94.26 |
| 29 | 55 | Pele RANKIN - Anita CURTIS | 120.76 | 159 | 74 | Carole HAMILTON - Elizabeth LAWRENCE | 94.20 |
| 30 | 231 | Judy HOLDOM - Jenny CLEAVER | 120.72 | 160 | 235 | Stephen BARON - Anita THIRTLE | 94.13 |
| 31 | 53 | Ellie FITZ-GERALD - Jim FITZ-GERALD | 120.39 | 161 | 96 | Ken CARMICHAEL - Glenys DEAN | 93.97 |
| 32 | 45 | Miroslaw MILASZEWSKI - Andrzej GORZYNSKI | 120.02 | 162 | 206 | Jan HACKETT - Tom HACKETT | 93.94 |
| 33 | 85 | Alan GLASSON - Geoff THOMAS | 119.68 | 163 | 115 | Jan TUNKS - Jan CLYNE | 93.79 |
| 34 | 38 | Bert ROMEIJN - Chris FERNANDO | 119.55 | 164 | 221 | Deborah COOPER - Bruce BATCHELOR | 93.63 |
| 35 | 194 | Michael PEMBERTON - Graham WAKEFIELD | 119.53 | 165 | 130 | Tipa GOODWIN - Ella GRAY | 93.62 |
| 36 | 159 | Diane QUIGLEY - Ross GYDE | 119.25 | 166 | 104 | Helen HEALY - Tim HEALY | 93.32 |
| 37 | 47 | Niek VAN VUCHT - Judith TOBIN | 118.65 | 167 | 240 | Arch MORRISON - Ines DAWES | 92.95 |
| 38 | 62 | Patricia HOBSON - Helen FITZPATRICK | 118.37 | 168 | 99 | Roger THOMAS - Margaret DYER | 92.89 |
| 39 | 216 | Brian CLEAVER - Mark SIEGRIST | 118.20 | 169 | 91 | Kaye HART - Jeff CARBERRY | 92.77 |
| 40 | 19 | Leigh GOLD - Maurice BRUMER | 117.96 | 170 | 147 | Marilyn WHIGHAM - Judy WULFF | 92.43 |
| 41 | 172 | Ken WILKS - Rosalie BROUGHTON | 117.53 | 171 | 141 | Vona HADFIELD - Lynn BAKER | 91.99 |
| 42 | 156 | Paula MCLEISH - David MCLEISH | 117.22 | 172 | 203 | Margaret AISTON - Jenny CRAWT | 91.65 |
| 43 | 202 | Maggie CALLANDER - Alison TALBOT | 117.19 | 173 | 72 | Joy TRIGG - Karin OLISLAGERS | 91.15 |
| 44 | 173 | Don LEVIN - Bob ASHMAN | 117.06 | 174 | 54 | Paul BRAKE - Margaret CHESSER | 91.07 |
| 45 | 123 | Maruta BOYD - Bert FORAGE | 117.05 | 175 | 94 | Debbie MCLEOD - Will ADLER | 91.00 |
| 46 | 78 | Rosemary GLASTONBURY - Marlies MAUSSEN | 116.95 | 176 | 22 | Frances GARRICK - Bruce DAGLISH | 90.91 |
| 47 | 158 | Peter STRASSER - Peter FORDHAM | 116.86 | 177 | 187 | Tessa TOWNEND - Colleen GRANT | 90.89 |
| 48 | 143 | Joan WALDVOGEL - Max WIGBOUT | 116.30 | 178 | 227 | Brian FITZSIMONS - Mairi FITZSIMONS | 90.69 |
| 49 | 1 | Terry BROWN - Peter BUCHEN | 116.26 | 179 | 248 | Denise KEENAN - Jenny HOMER | 90.17 |
| 50 | 116 | Judy JOHNSON - Joan MCCARTHY | 115.86 | 180 | 26 | Ken MOFFITT - Sue MOFFITT | 90.12 |
| 51 | 14 | Gwen CORDINGLEY - Desma SAMPSON | 115.63 | 181 | 105 | Rosalind TREND - Alan HARROP | 89.87 |
| 52 | 23 | Sharmini HOOLE - David ANDERSON | 115.09 | 182 | 124 | Ron HUMPHREYS - Warren LUEY | 89.55 |
| 53 | 36 | Katrina HEWINGS - Jenny WILLIAMS | 115.08 | 183 | 73 | Wendy HARMAN - Carmen JACKSON | 89.39 |
| 54 | 234 | Susan RODGERS - Diana STAGG | 114.92 | 184 | 164 | Sally CLARKE - Garry CLARKE | 89.27 |
| 55 | 225 | Glen COUTTS - James FERGUSON | 114.71 | 185 | 29 | Tom STRONG - Edda STRONG | 88.79 |
| 56 | 109 | Errol MILLER - Dorothy GEHRKE | 114.40 | 186 | 90 | Brian ASHWELL - Wayne GYDE | 88.08 |
| 57 | 214 | Gabor FLEISZIG - Janina FLEISZIG | 114.27 | 187 | 42 | Robina MCCONNELL - Eugene WICHEMS | 87.72 |
| 58 | 207 | Marlene WATTS - Mike PRESCOTT | 114.13 | 188 | 205 | Susanne GAMMON - Helen HELLSTEN | 87.61 |
| 59 | 178 | Len MEYER - Phyllis MORITZ | 113.65 | 189 | 183 | Jillian TUCKEY - Rozanne THOMAS | 87.48 |
| 60 | 27 | Greg MAYO - Sharon MAYO | 113.55 | 190 | 71 | Jeanne HEY - Joan VALENTINE | 87.40 |
| 61 | 58 | Lex RANKE - Jack ROHDE | 113.22 | 191 | 57 | Betty PRIESTLEY - Patricia LACEY | 87.31 |
| 62 | 260 | Roy ROBERTS - Barbara COXON | 112.62 | 192 | 16 | Beryl DAWSON - Maureen COOKSLEY | 87.25 |


| Rank | Pair | Names | Total | Rank | Pair | Names | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63 | 88 | Sue CHAPMAN - Sally MOORE | 111.58 | 193 | 131 | Lorraine CARR - John KABLE | 87.01 |
| 64 | 56 | Tony JACOB - Stephanie JACOB | 111.31 | 194 | 6 | Michael STONEMAN - Val ROLAND | 86.63 |
| 65 | 51 | Larry MOSES - John GOUGH | 110.80 | 195 | 134 | Marilyn CHADWICK - Toni SHARP | 86.58 |
| 66 | 199 | Brian LEACH - Peter MIKA | 110.57 | 196 | 224 | Eileen JOSEY - Valma MCCLEMENT | 86.49 |
| 67 | 154 | Nicole MCMANAMNY - Kathy YANG | 110.52 | 197 | 233 | Benjamin RIEDLER - Roger CAEL | 86.37 |
| 68 | 52 | Arthur BENNETT - Gillian BENNETT | 110.19 | 198 | 8 | Chris TURNER - Ian BRASH | 85.67 |
| 69 | 219 | Eric BAKER - Chris STEAD | 110.06 | 199 | 97 | Betty MILL - Vicki TAYLOR | 85.67 |
| 70 | 7 | Nicky STRASSER - George BILSKI | 109.95 | 200 | 110 | Rosemary MATSKOWS - Gillian ALEXANDER | 85.66 |
| 71 | 188 | Bente HANSEN - Madge MYBURGH | 109.81 | 201 | 120 | Barbara DALY - Lyn MANSFIELD | 85.34 |
| 72 | 9 | Eric HURLEY - Janet BROWN | 109.74 | 202 | 193 | Dianne MULLIN - Eddie MULLIN | 85.24 |
| 73 | 21 | Magnus MOREN - Paul WYER | 109.68 | 203 | 50 | Rodney CURTIN - Heather ENGLAND | 85.22 |
| 74 | 136 | Andrew HEGEDUS - Andrew MILL | 109.57 | 204 | 196 | Kath POOLE - Monica DARLEY | 85.18 |
| 75 | 129 | Freda BANNER - Helen STEWART | 109.43 | 205 | 112 | Morgan SVENSSON - Xue Kui JI | 84.67 |
| 76 | 111 | Catherine RITTER - Moss WYLIE | 109.21 | 206 | 244 | Christine HOUGHTON - Wayne HOUGHTON | 84.27 |
| 77 | 148 | Jill MAGEE - Terry STRONG | 109.14 | 207 | 232 | Patricia MANN - Ron SPEISER | 83.99 |
| 78 | 180 | Adam RUTKOWSKI - Judy MARKS | 108.54 | 208 | 80 | Barbara O'CONNOR - Robin STEINHARDT | 83.46 |
| 79 | 126 | Peter LANGSTON - Marit LANGSTON | 108.21 | 209 | 189 | Kemal AVUNDUK - Kiyomi AVUNDUK | 82.85 |
| 80 | 13 | Annette MALUISH - Neville FRANCIS | 107.53 | 210 | 61 | Alasdair BECK - Tom KISS | 82.81 |
| 81 | 77 | Timothy RIDLEY - David HARRIS | 107.31 | 211 | 228 | Steven WHITE - Christina MACQUARRIE | 82.80 |
| 82 | 28 | Judith APFELBAUM - Trish THATCHER | 106.74 | 212 | 2 | Heather FLANDERS - Judith CRAFTI | 82.43 |
| 83 | 37 | Pam MORGAN-KING - Leigh THOMPSON | 106.56 | 213 | 108 | Lorraine INGLIS - Judy PLIMMER | 82.34 |
| 84 | 25 | Astrid GONCHAROFF - James WALLIS | 106.55 | 214 | 35 | Ann MELLINGS - Marion SPURRIER | 82.32 |
| 85 | 92 | Russell WILSON - Alister STUCK | 106.47 | 215 | 167 | Jim THATCHER - Carolyn SEYMOUR | 82.23 |
| 86 | 254 | Tony MARKER - Barbara TOOHEY | 105.87 | 216 | 17 | Nicoleta GIURA - Nick HUGHES | 82.00 |
| 87 | 247 | Kate TERRY - Tracey LEWIS | 105.74 | 217 | 44 | John COX - Margaret PISKO | 81.93 |
| 88 | 103 | Frances THOMPSON - Ken SMITH | 105.69 | 218 | 229 | Geoffrey NORRIS - Erin BATCHELOR | 81.92 |
| 89 | 69 | Julie SHERIDAN - Karen MARTELLETTI | 105.63 | 219 | 200 | Ellie SPIRO - Beth GUTTERIDGE | 81.82 |
| 90 | 191 | Trish ANAGNOSTOU - Gillian GONTHIER | 105.62 | 220 | 242 | Therese GARBUTT - Vivian ZOTTI | 81.63 |
| 91 | 226 | Shirley WANZ - Susanne MOULD | 105.26 | 221 | 60 | Sue EASTMAN - Diane NICHOLS | 81.60 |
| 92 | 128 | Michael NEELS - Jan SPAANS | 104.90 | 222 | 151 | John LANHAM - Donna SMITH | 81.11 |
| 93 | 210 | Denis GRAHAME - Jeanette GRAHAME | 104.75 | 223 | 201 | Keith LONG - Brodie LOXTON | 80.60 |
| 94 | 121 | Lisa MA - Emlyn WILLIAMS | 104.49 | 224 | 241 | Allan MORRIS - Beverley MORRIS | 80.54 |
| 95 | 217 | Alan DORMER - Peter BACH | 104.03 | 225 | 175 | Ken MOSCHNER - Saftica POPA | 79.71 |
| 96 | 106 | Bev GUILFORD - Sue SPENCER | 103.77 | 226 | 171 | Carol WILSON - Laurie-Mar MCROBERTS | 79.53 |
| 97 | 12 | Vivienne OTTO - Freda HADWEN | 103.64 | 227 | 40 | Darrell WILLIAMS - Jackie WILLIAMS | 79.27 |
| 98 | 79 | Allison DAWSON - Meredith LAMBERT | 103.55 | 228 | 181 | Margie KNOX - Barry O'DONOHUE | 79.11 |
| 99 | 122 | Karen ERENSTROM - James FYFE | 103.53 | 229 | 257 | Patricia KNIGHT - Eileen GRAY | 78.74 |
| 100 | 237 | Johan ROOSE - Judith ROOSE-DRIVER | 103.33 | 230 | 146 | Elainne LEACH - John BROCKWELL | 78.42 |
| 101 | 215 | Brian SOUTTER - Diana SAVILL | 103.27 | 231 | 182 | Theo MANGOS - Leigh FORAN | 77.39 |
| 102 | 168 | George FINIKIOTIS - Milan DUROVIC | 103.15 | 232 | 208 | Bill NASH - Alex MCAULEY | 76.73 |
| 103 | 32 | Kathy PALMER - Helen CLAYTON | 103.09 | 233 | 246 | Donald KNAGGS - Vicky LISLE | 76.17 |
| 104 | 212 | Connie SCHOUTROP - Jan MALINAS | 102.77 | 234 | 258 | Veronica ROZIER - Cheryl STONE | 75.65 |
| 105 | 152 | Kuldip BEDI - Robert MILWARD | 102.66 | 235 | 70 | Helen KITE - Helen ROLLOND | 75.61 |
| 105 | 76 | Greg NICHOLSON - Jean BARBOUR | 102.66 | 236 | 86 | Mary PENINGTON - Margaret MARSHALL | 75.57 |
| 107 | 209 | Bianca GOLD - Tere WOTHERSPOON | 102.59 | 237 | 118 | Catherine ANG - Chris MARSHALL | 75.22 |
| 108 | 145 | David SHARMAN - Irene HAMILTON | 102.46 | 238 | 18 | Fifine HUTTON - Wendy HUTTON | 74.86 |
| 109 | 63 | Ian BROOKES - Joyce O'BRIEN | 102.45 | 239 | 135 | Brian HORAN - Lorraine COLLINS | 74.84 |
| 110 | 142 | Jeannette COLLINS - Peter KAHLER | 102.37 | 240 | 250 | Val CHURCHILL - Helga CORBETT | 74.78 |
| 111 | 179 | Lise ALLAN - Rilla ENGLAND | 102.21 | 241 | 95 | Sandra MILNER - Jeanette REITZER | 73.20 |
| 112 | 197 | Cecile SENIOR - Gwenda MEALYEA | 101.95 | 242 | 119 | Ian PATTERSON - Phil RAINS | 70.91 |
| 113 | 59 | Richard GRENSIDE - Sue GRENSIDE | 101.86 | 243 | 65 | Pat BACK - Jim ASCIONE | 70.45 |
| 114 | 170 | Ronald SMITH - Anne SMALL | 101.82 | 244 | 149 | Gwen GRAY - Lyn TURNER | 69.68 |
| 115 | 174 | John JOHNSON - Geoff ALLEN | 101.79 | 245 | 127 | Bruce FRASER - Helen KEMP | 68.58 |
| 115 | 184 | Marian OBENCHAIN - Tania GARIEPY | 101.79 | 246 | 236 | Derek STRINGFELLOW - Eunice STRINGFELLOW | 68.03 |
| 117 | 84 | Noel GRIGG - Bruce TURNER | 101.49 | 247 | 15 | Eva BERGER - Kathy JOHNSON | 67.82 |
| 118 | 31 | Heather CUSWORTH - Frances LYONS | 101.40 | 248 | 139 | Ruth CHAPMAN - Lucy BARUA | 67.50 |
| 119 | 223 | Noel WOODHALL - Brett GLASS | 101.29 | 249 | 163 | Marion BUCENS - Mike ROBERTSON | 66.18 |
| 120 | 245 | Jill CHURCH - Rhondda SWEETMAN | 101.14 | 250 | 3 | Bill HUNT - Rosa LACHMAN | 64.30 |
| 121 | 249 | Yuzhong CHEN - Gary FOIDL | 101.07 | 251 | 117 | Lex BOURKE - Lesley BEASLEY | 64.21 |
| 122 | 41 | Sophie ASHTON - Paul GOSNEY | 100.95 | 252 | 4 | Penny SYKES - Elizabeth FRENCH | 63.59 |
| 123 | 64 | Frank VEARING - Jo-Anne HEYWOOD | 100.90 | 253 | 24 | Robert WYLIE - Merleine WYLIE | 62.60 |
| 124 | 93 | Eileen LI - Charlie LU | 100.85 | 254 | 211 | Barbara STARR-NOLAN - Jocelyn LAWRENCE | 61.06 |
| 125 | 238 | Susan SYKES - Gerard PALMER | 100.69 | 255 | 255 | Janice QUIGLEY - Barbara GORDON | 54.34 |


| Rank | Pair | Names | Total | Rank | Pair | Names | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 126 | 186 | Ken STORR - Phaik YAO | 100.55 | 256 | 132 | Charles PAGE - Terry SHEADY | 53.51 |
| 127 | 101 | Gizella MICKEVICS - Mary WATERHOUSE | 100.45 | 257 | 68 | Joan LECKIE - Margaret WILLIAMSON | 50.63 |
| 128 | 66 | Noriko NISHIGAMI - Trevor DWERRYHOUSE | 99.83 | 258 | 251 | Lesley GILHOOLY - Paula JENNER | 50.59 |
| 129 | 144 | Julia HOFFMAN - Noelene LAW | 99.79 | 259 | 213 | Terence FARRALL - Betty DAY | 47.04 |
| 130 | 34 | Helen CRISP - Carolyn ROXBURGH | 99.34 | 260 | 160 | Ron LORRAWAY - Jan DOONER | 39.72 |
| lvy Dahler Restricted Butler Swiss Pairs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rank | Pair | Names | Total | Rank | Pair | Names | Total |
| 1 | 56 | Maurice LOOMES - Rachael LOOMES | 146.87 | 31 | 50 | Carole ROBINSON - Susan O'NEILL | 100.09 |
| 2 | 27 | Deana WILSON - Jo SKLARZ | 146.38 | 32 | 9 | Evelyn STEPHENSON - Linda HEALY | 99.87 |
| 3 | 51 | Dennis SULLIVAN - Sheila WILLS | 130.79 | 33 | 17 | Anne MCNAUGHTON - Margot MOYLAN | 99.68 |
| 4 | 7 | Jennifer HOLLINGWORTH - Peter COPPIN | 123.36 | 34 | 49 | Norma CAMERON - Patrick EATHER | 98.21 |
| 5 | 46 | Wendy GIBSON - Misako JAMES | 120.96 | 35 | 52 | Faye BELL - Jennifer MILLAR | 96.82 |
| 6 | 3 | Gregory GOSNEY - Judy WILKINSON | 119.95 | 36 | 19 | Marie IRVING - Allison SIMON | 95.57 |
| 7 | 58 | Max GILBERT - Kathy GILBERT | 116.64 | 37 | 43 | Raymond JONES - Rita JONES | 94.62 |
| 8 | 42 | Paul WILLIAMS - Barry WILLIAMS | 115.95 | 38 | 29 | Kevin BALKIN - Pauline BALKIN | 93.64 |
| 9 | 38 | Cassie MORIN - Helen ARENDTS | 115.91 | 39 | 2 | Robyn CLARK - Brigid MARLAND | 93.01 |
| 10 | 36 | Alan BOYCE - Monica PRITCHARD | 114.91 | 40 | 20 | Nannette JONES - Renate PETTIT | 92.92 |
| 11 | 4 | Camille HIRSCHOWITZ - Allan ROSENBERG | 114.31 | 41 | 30 | George KRUZ - Milton HART | 91.36 |
| 12 | 18 | Malcolm MOORE - Fran MARTIN | 114.17 | 42 | 15 | Dot PIDDINGTON - Carole ROACHE | 89.99 |
| 13 | 57 | Keith MABIN - Fiona SMITH | 112.99 | 43 | 54 | Maureen TREACEY - Kath PEEVER | 89.07 |
| 14 | 6 | John SHARP - Meg SHARP | 111.83 | 44 | 23 | Gordon BROADLEY - Ian BROADLEY | 87.26 |
| 15 | 11 | Arne JONSBERG - John LAHEY | 111.64 | 45 | 48 | Heath COOK - Barry COOK | 86.22 |
| 16 | 60 | Allan PIKE - Kathryn HAWKE | 110.24 | 46 | 34 | Neil STRUTTON - Helen CHAMBERLIN | 86.02 |
| 17 | 32 | Margaret ROGERS - John ROGERS | 109.88 | 47 | 59 | Ian CAMERON - Daria WILLIAMS | 85.97 |
| 18 | 40 | Malcolm CLIFT - Kathy CLIFT | 109.48 | 48 | 26 | Arjen DRAAISMA - Margot HARRIS | 85.69 |
| 19 | 14 | Archibald FRASER - Greta DAVIS | 108.87 | 49 | 47 | Margaret BAKER - Audrey WEBSTER | 84.65 |
| 20 | 13 | Genie HARBAND - Lea WOOLF | 108.70 | 50 | 53 | Peter HOOPER - Susie HERRING | 84.26 |
| 21 | 16 | Diana PERRY - Heather BROATCH | 107.42 | 51 | 12 | David CORNEY - Margaret CORNEY | 82.78 |
| 22 | 1 | Hope TOMLINSON - Martin JOHNSON | 107.36 | 52 | 37 | Diane CONNORS - Sally GRAHAM | 81.20 |
| 23 | 55 | Dov BERNS - Sandra BERNS | 107.08 | 53 | 10 | Janette KOLLISCH - Natasha THOMAS | 79.22 |
| 24 | 24 | Ella LUPUL - George LUPUL | 105.21 | 54 | 44 | Barbara ANDERSON - Janet BELL | 78.67 |
| 25 | 22 | Peter SCHMIDT - Suzanne SCHMIDT | 104.13 | 55 | 21 | Wendy BRISTOW - Trish DOLPHIN | 76.03 |
| 26 | 33 | Ashok CHOTAI - Veena CHOTAI | 104.09 | 56 | 25 | Wendy MCENTEGART - Nicolette BARTOLI | 75.28 |
| 27 | 5 | Christine PERKINS - Yvonne HOUBOLT | 103.56 | 57 | 41 | Renee HOY - Lynette FRASER | 74.34 |
| 28 | 31 | Jim TAYLOR - Cora TAYLOR | 102.84 | 58 | 28 | Gwyneth HOPKINS - Linda WHITE | 71.95 |
| 29 | 35 | Barbara WIPPELL - Brian WIPPELL | 102.43 | 59 | 45 | Helen BARKER - Anne SHEARER | 71.60 |
| 30 | 39 | Barbara O'SHEA - Glenda PARMENTER | 101.53 | 60 | 8 | Jessica MORRIS - Patricia POMEROY | 69.69 |


| Saturday Holiday Pairs Event 3 Session 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Place | North-South |  |  | East-West |  |  |  |
|  |  | \% | MPs | Place |  | \% | MPs |
| 1 | Anne WOODHEAD - Bob LAWRENCE | 59.91 | 1.5 | 1 | Paul THIEM - Jim WOOD | 61.82 | 1.5 |
| 2 | Linda OSMUND - Danny OSMUND | 57.14 | 1.05 | 2 | Lab PRINGLE - Gillian TROWSE | 58.39 | 1.05 |
| 3 | Dee HARLEY - Pablo LAMBARDI | 55.77 | 0.75 | 3 | Naomi HANNAH-BROWN - Max ROBB | 57.48 | 0.75 |
| 4 | Helen FLEET - Robert FLEET | 54.86 | 0.5 | 4 | Di DIXON - Jill MCAULEY | 56.97 | 0.5 |
| 5 | Lesley KENYON - John PELLEN | 54.47 | 0.38 | 5 | Sandor VARGA - Helen GAULT | 55.38 | 0.38 |
| 6 | Lillian PEARCE - Marcia KRAMPEL | 53.93 | 0.3 | 6 | Titus LING - Joan STOBO | 53.86 | 0.3 |
| 7 | Anna ST CLAIR - Brett MIDDELBERG | 52.93 | 0.25 | 7 | Annette GOUDIE - Shelley HOOPER | 53.34 | 0.25 |
| 8 | Sue O'BRIEN - Paul COLLINS | 52.61 | 0.21 | 8 | Lesley BOWEN-THOMAS - Charles BOWEN-TH | 53.24 | 0.21 |
| 9 | Dale PEAK - Roger PEAK | 52.24 | 0.19 | 9 | Robert SUTTON - Robert COWLEY | 51.74 | 0.19 |
| 10 | Judy REYNOLDS - Roy REYNOLDS | 51.63 | 0.17 | 10 | Daniel HATCHER - Michael AIKIN | 51.09 | 0.17 |
| 11 | Barbara DAWSON - Meta GOODMAN | 51.2 |  | 11 | Ming Shu YANG - Margaret LIVERSAGE | 47.93 |  |
| 12 | Therese TULLY - Richard KUIPERS | 50.87 |  | 11 | Kathryn ATTWOOD - Larry ATTWOOD | 47.93 |  |
| 13 | David GARDINER - David O'GORMAN | 48.62 |  | 13 | Minnie BRAGG - Chris BRAGG | 47.83 |  |
| 14 | Susan CAPP - Kelela ALLEN | 48.26 |  | 14 | Marylou SHAW - Michelle JAMES | 47.71 |  |
| 15 | Glenys FITZPATRICK - Patrick REDLICH | 47.96 |  | 15 | Sally MORTON - Derek PONSFORD | 46.62 |  |
| 16 | Patrick BUGLER - Yolanda CARTER | 45.39 |  | 16 | Lyn TRACEY - Richard WALLIS | 46.44 |  |
| 17 | Lou TILLOTSON - Christina BERGMAN | 43.31 |  | 17 | Kathleen TOTH - John KENYON | 46.3 |  |
| 18 | Rob ZIFFER - Rob GAULT | 43.2 |  | 18 | Jillian GRIFFITH - Norma BROWNE | 42.64 |  |
| 19 | Gail PERRY - Tom LYONS | 39.16 |  | 19 | Louise SMITH - Roland TREVISANELLO | 38.93 |  |
| 20 | Lyn CARIUS - Laraine DOLAN | 36.52 |  | 20 | Joan HAZLEHURST - Madge BAKER | 34.36 |  |

YESTERDAY'S DIFFICULT CALCUDOKU

| $\begin{array}{r} 216 x \\ 2 \end{array}$ | 6 | ${ }^{0-} \quad 5$ | 3 | 480x | ${ }^{6+}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| ${ }^{0-1}$ | 4 | 6 | 5 | $15+2$ | ${ }^{9+} 3$ |
| ${ }^{1-} 3$ | 5 |  | 2 | 6 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 2 |
|  | 2 | 4 |  | 3 | 6 |

YESTERDAY'S IMPOSSIBLE SUDOKU

| 8 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 7 | 6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 8 |
| 2 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 1 |
| 6 | 9 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 5 |
| 7 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| 3 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 7 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 9 |
| 1 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 2 |

## Holiday Pairs Event 3 Overall

| Place |  | $\mathbf{S 1}$ | $\mathbf{S 2}$ | $\mathbf{S 3}$ | Overall | MPs |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Danny OSMUND - Linda OSMUND | $\mathbf{6 3 . 2 6}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 . 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 . 1 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 2 . 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 5 1}$ |
| 2 | Paul THIEM - Jim WOOD | 57.97 | 54.33 | 61.82 | 174.11 | 1.06 |
| 3 | Robert FLEET - Helen FLEET | 52.27 | 52.24 | 54.86 | 159.37 | 0.76 |
| 4 | Robert SUTTON - Robert COWLEY | 55.46 | 49.47 | 51.74 | 156.67 |  |
| 5 | Larry ATTWOOD - Kathryn ATTWOOD | 54.04 | 53.3 | 47.93 | 155.26 |  |
| 6 | Dale PEAK - Roger PEAK | 58.97 | 42.95 | 52.24 | 154.17 |  |
| 7 | Minnie BRAGG - Chris BRAGG | 46.97 | 40.63 | 47.83 | 135.42 |  |
| 8 | Gail PERRY - Tom LYONS | 47.28 | 42.95 | 39.16 | 129.39 |  |

# 2014 QBA Vancouver-Alaska cruise on Norwegian Sun \& Alaska tour 



## Itinerary 2014

30 Aug Vancouver - transfer to hotel
31 Aug Vancouver
1 Sep Vancouver-embark Norwegian Sun
2 Sep Cruise Inside Passage
3 Sep Ketchikan
4 Sep Juneau
5 Sep Skagway
6 Sep Glacier Bay
7 Sep Hubbard Glacier
8 Sep Whittier - disembark, transfer to Anchorage
$9 \mathrm{Sep} \quad$ Talkeetna via Alaska Railroad (return to Anchorage)
10 Sep Seward 6-hour sightseeing cruise (return to Anchorage)
11 Sep Anchorage
12 Sep Anchorage - transfer to airport for flight home.

## Inclusions

$\checkmark$ Fully escorted
$\checkmark 2$ nights pre-cruise hotel accommodation \& touring
$\checkmark 4$ nights post-cruise hotel accommodation \& touring
$\sqrt{ } 7$-night Alaska Cruise onboard Norwegian Sun
$\checkmark$ Internal flight from Anchorage to Vancouver
$\checkmark$ Alaska Railroad adventure
$\checkmark$ Return airport/cruise transfers
For bookings or enquiries, contact


## CALL 0755758094

sales@cruisetraveller.com.au - www.cruisetraveller.com.au or contact Theresa gttully@bigpond.net.au 0409870324


Therese Tully, Convenor of the Gold Coast Congress and her sister in law, Gay Tully from outback Queensland, join forces and invite you to cruise with them on their Alaskan holiday.

This is not a bridge tour, but there will probably be some bridge played on an informal basis! It's an opportunity for likeminded travellers to experience the world together in a small group.


GOLD COAST
congress

This is all about a great adventure at a great price.
All friends \& family members welcome. Join us!
*Advertised price is \$AUD per person, twin share based on category IC and twin share hotel accommodation. Norwegian Cruise Lines \& Cruise Traveller reserve the right to change, correct errors, withdraw from sale any or all fares, itineraries \& fees.

