



BULLETIN
www.ibpa.com

THE INTERNATIONAL BRIDGE PRESS ASSOCIATION

Editor: John Carruthers

This Bulletin is published monthly and circulated to around 400 members of the International Bridge Press Association comprising the world's leading journalists, authors and editors of news, books and articles about contract bridge, with an estimated readership of some 200 million people who enjoy the most widely played of all card games.

Bulletin No. 586

November 5, 2013

President:

PATRICK D JOURDAIN
8 Felin Wen, Rhiwbina
Cardiff CF14 6NW, WALES, UK
(44) 29 2062 8839
president.ibpa@gmail.com

Chairman:

PER E JANNERSTEN
Banergatan 15
SE-752 37 Uppsala, SWEDEN
(46) 18 52 13 00
ibpa@jannersten.se

Executive Vice-President:

JAN TOBIAS van CLEEFF
Prinsegracht 28a
2512 GA The Hague, NETHERLANDS
(31) 70 360 5902
jvcleeff@xs4all.nl

**Organizational Vice-President &
Bulletin Production Manager:**

DILIP GIDWANI
401 Mariden, 16th Road Bandra West
Mumbai 400 050, INDIA
(91) 22 98205 47150 Fax: 22 26002241
dilipgidwani@hotmail.com

Secretary:

HERMAN DE WAEL
Michel Willemslaan 40
B-2610 Wilrijk, BELGIUM
(32) 3 827 64 45 Fax: (32) 3 825 29 19
hermandw@skynet.be

Treasurer:

RICHARD SOLOMON
308 Kauri Road, RD2
Tuakau 2697, NEW ZEALAND
(64) 9 232 8494
rsolomon@xtra.co.nz

Membership Secretary:

JEREMY DHONDY
Cedar Lodge, Knapps, Shillingstone
Dorset DT11 0RA, ENGLAND
(44) 7967 475925
jdhondy@gmail.com

Honorary General Counsel:

WILLIAM J. PENCHARZ
Lacourarie, Barthelemy de Bussière
24360 Piegut Pluvier, FRANCE
+33(0)5 53 60 30 60
billpencharz@hotmail.co.uk

Awards Secretary:

BARRY J. RIGAL
Apt 8E, 22 West 26th Street,
New York NY 10010, USA
(1) 212 366 4799
barryrigal@mindspring.com

Presidents Emeritii:

TOMMY SANDSMARK (NORWAY)
HENRY FRANCIS (USA)

Editorial

The opinions expressed here do not necessarily represent those of the IBPA Executive or its membership.

The WBF continues to improve its tournament conditions of contest. One such laudable change, implemented in Bali, was to allow the fourth-placed team among eight qualifiers for knockout play to declare itself available to be picked by the first-, second- or third-placed teams. Subsequently, the third- and second-placed teams could declare themselves available to the teams finishing ahead of them. This corrects the often-unfair plight of the fourth-placed team, previously guaranteed to face the best of the fifth-through-eighth group. It had often been thought advantageous to finish fifth rather than fourth.

Another improvement is a relaxing of the requirements for financially-strapped NBOs to compete in the Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup. Now they will need to either have a team in the World Bridge Games or send a pair in the new National Open Pairs.

In contrast with these improvements is the change from the 0-25 VP scale to a 0.00-20.00 scale. The rationale behind the change was the credo, "Every IMP counts." That assertion, however catchy it sounds, has no intrinsic merit whatsoever. In bridge, not every point counts as a fraction of an IMP, so why should every IMP count as a fraction of a VP. It is inherent in the game that not all tricks are of equal value and that each IMP covers a range of points. Why should VPs be different?

The new scale will discourage newcomers with its apparent complexity and will convince editors to truncate or round off scores, or worse, ignore them altogether. Are we no longer trying to get young people into the game? Do we no longer care to report bridge scores in the press? Opposition to the new scale has come in an official statement from the IBPA Executive to the WBF and informally from a host of scribblers such as Ron Klinger, Brian Senior, Tim Bourke, Paul Marston and yours truly.

The major correspondence (abridged) pro and con is presented in extra pages in this Bulletin (see pages 16-18). The unabridged correspondence can be found at www.ibpa.com.

Since I'm a curious guy, I compared the official rankings of the Bermuda Bowl in Bali with the rankings as they would have resulted under six other scoring methods (see page 15 for the results). All these methods reveal that (at least for the Bermuda Bowl in Bali) it doesn't matter which scoring method we use, the results are the same (there were a couple of minor differences). In that case, what we should be doing is simplifying the Victory Point scoring, not complicating it. It seems Victory Points are an illusion.

How about a simple 8-VP scale with 16 IMPs (in a 16-board match) for an 8-0 win and 5-IMP spreads for the other VP totals, i.e., an 11-15 IMP win = 7 VP, 6-10 IMPs = 6 VP, and 1-5 IMPs = 5 VP. An IMP draw would be a VP draw. The ranges and maximum for 8 VP could be modified if it were desired. Other than win/loss, what could be simpler? Another possibility is IMP differential, perhaps with a maximum. No VP conversion would be needed, simplifying things even further. Either method would be better than the current one and both would give the same result. The new scale may be mathematically sound, but it could be improved upon socially.

Address all IBPA Bulletin correspondence to: JOHN CARRUTHERS
1322 Patricia Blvd., Kingsville, Ontario, N9Y 2R4, CANADA
Tel: +1 519-733-9247
email: ibpaeditor@sympatico.ca

MONACO WELCOMES THE CAVENDISH

MONACO & THE CAVENDISH INVITATIONAL 2013

Jean-Paul Meyer, Paris
Mark Horton, Sutton Bengier, Wilts., UK
Katie Thorpe, Kingsville, ON

For the second year running, the Cavendish Invitational was held in Monte Carlo. Immediately prior to the Cavendish, Monaco also hosted a Teams Tournament, the Monaco Patton.

Franck Multon, Superstar (JPM)

In the semifinal match of the Monaco Patton Teams, Lavazza met Zimmermann.

Board 2. Dealer East. NS Vul.

	♠ 6		
	♥ A 10 9 8 7 2		
	♦ K 8 5		
	♣ J 10 5		
♠ 7 5 2		♠ A K Q 10 3	
♥ Q		♥ K 6 3	
♦ A Q J 7 6		♦ 4	
♣ 7 6 3 2		♣ A 9 8 4	
	♠ J 9 8 4		
	♥ J 5 4		
	♦ 10 9 3 2		
	♣ K Q		
West	North	East	South
<i>Zimmermann</i>	<i>Bocchi</i>	<i>Multon</i>	<i>Madala</i>
—	—	1♠	Pass
2♠	3♥	4♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Franck Multon for the Zimmermann team was in four spades just as his opponent, an Italian world champion, was at the other table. Only Multon succeeded in making his contract.

After a heart lead to the ace and a club switch, Multon, East, took the second club and played the ace and king of spades, discovering the bad break. Then: a diamond to the ace, the queen of diamonds, covered and ruffed, the king of hearts, a heart ruff, the jack of diamonds for a club discard, and a diamond ruff. The queen of spades was still to come.

Ten tricks were in the bag, the losing club being ruffed by the defence's master trump.

May the Force Be with You (MH)

The expression, 'May the Force be with you,' has achieved cult status and is symbolic of the Star Wars series of films. The line has been exclaimed by at least one character in each of the Star Wars movies. It occupies eighth place in the American Film Institute's list of the 100 most memorable film quotes.

In bridge terms, one of the many options open to the defenders is to play a forcing game, but it is not always clear when that it is the winning option. Take a look at this deal from Round 1 of the Cavendish Teams:

Board 6. Dealer East. EW Vul.

	♠ 8 7 6 3		
	♥ A Q 6 4		
	♦ 7		
	♣ K 8 6 2		
♠ J		♠ Q 9 5	
♥ 10 7		♥ K 9 5	
♦ A Q J 8 2		♦ K 10 6 5	
♣ A 7 5 4 3		♣ J 10 9	
	♠ A K 10 4 2		
	♥ J 8 3 2		
	♦ 9 4 3		
	♣ Q		
West	North	East	South
<i>Weinstein</i>	<i>Helness</i>	<i>Levin</i>	<i>Helgemo</i>
—	—	Pass	Pass
1♦	Double	INT	4♦
Pass	4♥	Pass	Pass

A disadvantage of watching from a distance is that you can't ask about the precise meaning of a particular bid. I can see that North's double was wafer-thin, but what of South's four diamonds? It seems probable that it simply asked North to choose a major.

East led the king of diamonds and West overtook it with the ace and continued with the jack. Declarer ruffed and played the six of clubs to the nine, queen and ace. West switched to the jack of spades and declarer won with dummy's ace, played a heart to the ace and a heart to the jack. When that held, he ruffed a diamond and played a spade to the ten, claiming ten tricks, plus 420.

Suppose West plays a third diamond rather than a spade? Declarer has to ruff and might play a spade to the king, dropping the jack. A heart to the ace puts

declarer in hand to take a spade finesse, but now West will be able to ruff. However, suppose declarer plays a heart at trick three (either the queen or a low one). East can win and force declarer with a diamond, but now declarer plays a spade to dummy and can return to hand with a trump to take a spade finesse.

Double Troubles (JPM)

In the Cavendish Teams, Board 15 was a swinging one in the match between Welland and Monaco.

Board 15. Dealer South. NS Vul.

<p>♠ Q J 10 6 3 2 ♥ A 10 6 ♦ 3 2 ♣ J 7</p> <p>♠ A 5 4 ♥ K 8 7 5 3 ♦ 7 6 5 ♣ 6 3</p> <p>♠ 7 ♥ Q J 9 4 2 ♦ A 4 ♣ A K 10 9 4</p>	<p>♠ K 9 8 ♥ — ♦ K Q J 10 9 8 ♣ Q 8 5 2</p>
---	---

In the Closed Room Jean-Jacques Palau, for Monaco, South, played in four hearts undoubled by the Bilde brothers. On a diamond lead, declarer played a heart to the ten and, when East discarded, the contract was doomed.

In the Open Room Brad Moss, West, doubled four hearts and led a diamond. Conscious of the possible bad distribution, Roy Welland won with the ace and played a spade to the queen and king. East took the second trick for the defence, a diamond, and exited with the nine of spades, which declarer ruffed in hand.

Welland played the ace, king and a low club. West ruffed with the seven of hearts, overruffed, another spade was ruffed and a fourth round of clubs played from hand.

<p>♠ — ♥ K 8 5 3 ♦ 6 ♣ —</p> <p>♠ — ♥ Q J 9 ♦ — ♣ 10 9</p>	<p>♠ J 10 6 ♥ A 6 ♦ — ♣ —</p> <p>♠ — ♥ — ♦ Q J 10 9 ♣ Q</p>
--	---

When the club is led from South, it seems natural, for West to ruff with the eight to knock out the ace that is what Brad Moss did. It was a fatal move and declarer then collected ten tricks for plus 790. Declarer

overruffed with the ace of hearts and ruffed a spade. West could overruff or not, as he saw fit, but declarer had the rest, either on a crossruff or by drawing trumps depending on West's next play.

Better defence requires West to ruff the fourth round of clubs with the three or the five or to discard his diamond. Declarer can overruff with the six but has to lose two more tricks when the eight of hearts becomes promoted to the setting trick. So beware of doubling and beware of ruffing too high.

A Classic Lead (JPM)

Place yourself in Antonio Sementa's (East) chair with this hand:

Board 23. Dealer South. Both Vul

		♠ Q 6	
		♥ 7 6 4 2	
		♦ J 9	
		♣ A K Q 5 3	
West	North	East	South
<i>Duboin</i>	<i>Lindqvist</i>	<i>Sementa</i>	<i>Brogeland</i>
—	—	—	1♠
Pass	1NT	Pass	2NT ¹
Pass	3♠	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	
			1. Game Force

It is your lead.

Antonio Sementa chose to lead his fourth best club(!) and right he was.

<p>♠ 10 9 ♥ A Q 3 ♦ Q 7 5 4 ♣ 8 6 4 2</p> <p>♠ 8 5 4 2 ♥ 9 8 ♦ 8 6 3 2 ♣ J 9 7</p>	<p>♠ Q 6 ♥ 7 6 4 2 ♦ J 9 ♣ A K Q 5 3</p> <p>♠ A K J 7 3 ♥ K J 10 5 ♦ A K 10 ♣ 10</p>
--	--

A high club followed by a small one would have had the same effect, but leading accordingly to his agreements was much more fun!

Out for the Count (MH)

From the Cavendish Teams ...

Everyone is aware of the situation where declarer, needing an endplay, cashes a top card in a suit at an early stage before a defender appreciates the importance of unblocking an honour. Declarer can also utilise this type of play early in the hand to obtain a count, as it will be hard for the defenders to realise that they must avoid playing a true card.

Board 17. Dealer North. Neither Vul.

♠ K 9 6 5 ♥ 8 7 5 ♦ 10 3 ♣ K 8 5 2	♠ 3 ♥ Q 10 6 3 ♦ K Q J 6 4 ♣ Q J 4
♠ 10 8 7 ♥ J 9 ♦ 9 8 7 2 ♣ A 10 9 6	♠ A Q J 4 2 ♥ A K 4 2 ♦ A 5 ♣ 7 3

Open Room

West	North	East	South
Gierulski	Fantoni	Skrzypczak	Nunes
—	Pass	1♦	Double
2♦	2♠	Pass	3♦
Pass	3♠	Pass	4♠
Pass	Pass	Pass	

East led the king of diamonds and declarer ducked, won the next diamond, cashed the ace of hearts: nine, seven, three, then followed with the queen and jack of spades, a spade to the king and a heart to the king. Confident that East would have unblocked with the queen-six-three of hearts (and being fairly certain that hearts were 4-2 anyway) declarer rejected any thought of trying to endplay East by exiting with a heart and simply played a club to the king. Bingo!

(Perhaps a partial elimination is even better: two rounds of trumps, then a heart to the king and a third heart (just in case East forgot to unblock from queen-third). A club to the king can come after the third round of trumps. - Ed.)

Closed Room

West	North	East	South
Helgemo	Schwartz	Helness	Fisher
—	Pass	Pass	1♠
Pass	2♠	Double	Pass
2NT	3♠	Pass	Pass
Pass			

West led a trump and declarer won, drew two more rounds ending in dummy and eliminated diamonds. He ducked the heart switch to West's nine and when a club came back he put up the king, plus 170, but 6 IMPs away. Not unimportant as the final score was 7-2 to Zimmermann.

The Teams Final (KT)

The field for the 2013 Cavendish Teams was perhaps the strongest ever. How strong? Ireland (John Carroll-Tommy Garvey, Tom Hanlon-Hugh McGann) met Kamras (Jan Kamras-Marion Michielson-Frederik Wrang, Fredrik Nyström-Johan Upmark) in the final,

while the remainder of the field battled on in the Swiss to settle the other rankings.

The list of teams that failed to make the final included the winners of the Vanderbilt (Welland), the Spingold victors (Bridge24), the winners of the Monaco Patton (Vitas), Lavazza, with most of the Bermuda Bowl winners, the silver medallists in Bali, (Monaco Z), the 2011 French Senior World Champions and an all-star team led by Zia.

The final comprised two sets of 10 boards each with the Swiss contestants playing the same set of deals for two more rounds. In the final, Kamras had begun with a 7-IMP carryover and had added 16 more to lead by 23 at the half. Ireland had pegged back 5 when...

Board 23. Dealer South. Both Vul.

♠ 10 4 ♥ 10 9 ♦ Q 10 9 2 ♣ A Q 5 4 3	♠ K 9 ♥ K 8 6 3 ♦ K J 6 ♣ 10 9 7 6
♠ A Q 8 7 3 ♥ J 7 5 2 ♦ A 8 7 5 ♣ —	♠ J 6 5 2 ♥ A Q 4 ♦ 4 3 ♣ K J 8 2

West	North	East	South
Nyström	Hanlon	Upmark	McGann
—	—	—	1♣ ¹
1♠	1NT ²	Double	3♣ ³
3♥	Pass	4♥	Pass
Pass	Pass		

1. Natural or 12-14/18-19 balanced
2. Clubs
3. 4-card club support and 12-14

As a single-dummy problem, West faces a difficult task on the nine of diamonds lead (from a doubleton or Rusinow, which could include an honour higher than the jack). Guessing that it was the former, Nyström rose with dummy's king and led a low heart. He was momentarily pleased when McGann won with the queen, drawing Hanlon's nine, but then a bit nonplussed when McGann's other diamond came back. Realising that he'd gone wrong at trick one, declarer won with his ace of diamonds and tried three rounds of spades - no luck there, as North ruffed in with the ten of hearts.

There was no way home from there (actually, after the play to trick one); Nyström overruffed in dummy with the king of hearts and played the jack of diamonds to North's queen. Hanlon continued with the ten of

diamonds, ruffed and overruffed and McGann got off play with his last heart. There were no trumps left in dummy to ruff a spade, so the Swedes were one off, minus 100.

West	North	East	South
<i>Carroll</i>	<i>Michielson</i>	<i>Garvey</i>	<i>Wrang</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1♠	Pass	1NT	Pass
2♥	Pass	3♥	Pass
4♥	Pass	Pass	Pass

Michielson led the ten of hearts to Wrang's queen. South shifted to the two of clubs, ruffed by declarer, who led a spade to the king and a low heart from the dummy. South won and played a third heart, exhausting declarer of the suit. Carroll played spades from the top, ruffing the suit good with dummy's last trump. A diamond to the ace for the fifth spade and a diamond finesse of the jack meant ten tricks to Ireland and a 12-IMP gain, narrowing the lead to 6 IMPs. (Two boards later, a bidding accident by Carroll-Garvey gave 10 IMPs back. Sweden won by 5.)

In the match that determined third place between Eidi (Michel Bessis-Thomas Bessis, Michel Eidi-Vassili Vroustis) and PRI Investment (Cezary Balicki-Adam Zmudzinski, Josef Blass-Jacek Pszczola, Bobby Levin-Steve Weinstein) ...

West	North	East	South
<i>T.Bessis</i>	<i>Levin</i>	<i>M.Bessis</i>	<i>Weinstein</i>
<i>Balicki</i>	<i>Eidi</i>	<i>Zmudzinski</i>	<i>Vroustis</i>
—	—	—	Pass
1♠	Pass	1NT	Pass
2♥	Pass	4♥	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Levin led the nine of diamonds. When the jack held in dummy, Bessis cashed the king and led a third diamond. Weinstein ruffed and led a club. Bessis ruffed and led a heart to the nine, king and ace. Weinstein continued the force on declarer with another club. When Bessis then played off the three top spades, Levin was able to ruff with the ten of hearts, and the queen of hearts to come meant one off.

Adam Zmudzinski showed the way. He won the ten of diamonds lead with dummy's jack and ruffed a club. He followed that with two more club ruffs, using the king of diamonds and the king of spades as entries. When he led the ace and queen of spades next, Eidi ruffed in with the ten, overruffed by the king.

Zmudzinski ruffed dummy's last club with the jack of hearts (his last trump) to leave the cards in the diagram at the top of the next column remaining to be played. He had taken the first nine tricks and needed just one more for his contract.

♠ —	♠ —
♥ 9	♥ 8 6 3
♦ Q 9	♦ 6
♣ A	♣ —
♠ 8 7	♠ J
♥ —	♥ A Q 4
♦ A 8	♦ —
♣ —	♣ —

Zmudzinski unerringly led a spade. North ruffed with the nine of hearts and declarer discarded dummy's diamond. On the diamond return from North, declarer ruffed with dummy's six of hearts and South was stymied - he could not prevent Zmudzinski from scoring one more trump trick, with either the six or the eight.

As in the other match, for the successful declarer, it was a Pyrrhic victory as PRI finished fourth to Eidi's third.

Child's Play - for a World Champion (MH)

Board 15. Dealer South. NS Vul.

♠ Q 9 7 3 2	♠ J 8 6
♥ 7 6 5 3	♥ J 9 4 2
♦ A Q 9	♦ 10 7 4 2
♣ 4	♣ Q 10
♠ A K 10 5	♠ 4
♥ Q	♥ A K 10 8
♦ 8 5	♦ K J 6 3
♣ A 9 7 5 3 2	♣ K J 8 6

West	North	East	South
<i>Campagnano</i>	<i>Smederevac</i>	<i>Arrigoni</i>	<i>Neve</i>
—	—	—	1♦
2♣	Double	Pass	2♥
2♠	3♥	Pass	4♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

West led the ace of spades and switched to a diamond. Joanna Neve won with dummy's queen and played a club to the ten, king and ace. West's diamond return went to the nine, ten and king and declarer ruffed a club, bringing down East's queen. She played a heart to the ace and ruffed a club. East could overruff, but declarer was in command. She could ruff the spade return, cross to dummy with a diamond and play a heart to pick up East's trumps for plus 620.

Declarer could also have succeeded by taking one or two high trumps, then the diamonds, then cross-ruffing.

The Cavendish Invitational Pairs Top Auction Prices

	<u>Euro</u>
Fantoni-Nunes	57,000
Helgemo-Helness	52,000
Levin-Weinstein	47,000
Smirnov-Piekarek	34,000
Fredin-Fallenius	34,000
Grue-Moss	34,000
Buras-Narkiewicz	31,000
Kalita-Nowosadzki	27,000
Upmark-Nyström	26,000
Mahmood-Jansma	25,000

The Cavendish Invitational Pairs “A” Final (Top 12 Finishers)

	<u>Net IMPs</u>	
1	+283.39	Nanev-Gunev
2	+212.34	Martens-Filipowicz
3	+179.41	Helgemo- Helness
4	+162.46	Kwiecien-Pszczola
5	+160.43	Buras-Narkiewicz
6	+58.48	Gawel-Jagniewski
7	+5.00	Fantoni-Nunes
8	-2.01	Gromov-Dubin
9	-18.41	Berg-Simonssen
10	-105.88	Fredin-Fallenius
11	-118.31	Kalita-Nowosadzki
12	-509.86	Gladysch-Krasnoselskiy



This year, our Loiben tournament moved to Mautern, just two miles away. Loiben is on the north bank of the Danube, Mautern on the south. The event, held in the “Römerhalle” (the Romans had a castle in Mautern from the first to the fifth century at the northern border of the Roman Empire), was a success in spite of the great heat (up to 39° Celsius). The guests from 15 nations were very strong and took away most of the money prizes. Almost one quarter of the players came from Germany but strong players from Bulgaria, Hungary and The Netherlands were also present.

The Opening Tournament was won by HH Gwinner/ D Langer (GER/SWI). The Mixed Pairs was won by

Stigleitner/Stadler (AUT). This pair had previously won the Mixed in the year 2000. The ‘Mintteams’ (56 teams, 6 x 7 boards) was won by the Austrian team SIGMA (Fischer/Saurer, Simon/Wadl).

The main Team Tournament (75 teams) consisted of twelve rounds of eight boards each. After nine rounds the event seemed to be decided as the Austrian team LUPO VELOCE (H.Berger, Feichtinger, Jadali, Lauss, Obermair) led by almost 20VPs. However, the German team CLACHFRAX (Günther/Schlicker, Meuer/Wrobel) came from behind, beat LUPO VELOCE twice (19:11 and 21:9) and won in comfort. Second was a team from Prague (CZE).

The participation in the Pairs was also fine (148 pairs; more than 52% were guests!).

We can learn a lot from the following deal, a duel of two-suiters.

Dealer East. EW Vul.

	♠ A J 6 5	
	♥ J	
	♦ J 8 5 2	
	♣ J 10 8 4	
♠ K 8 4		♠ Q 10 9 7 3
♥ 8 5 2		♥ K Q 10 9 7 6 3
♦ 9 7 6		♦ K
♣ 9 7 6 2		♣ —
	♠ 2	
	♥ A 4	
	♦ A Q 10 4 3	
	♣ A K Q 5 3	

East, the dealer, wondered whether he should show both his suits at once (assuming he had a bid to do so). If he did show both suits with his opening bid, he occasionally received a surprise, sometimes pleasant, sometimes not ...

Two pairs landed in three hearts doubled (plus 930), four in four hearts doubled (plus 790, but could have been beaten on a spade lead). These results were a pleasant surprise for the opening side. Unpleasant surprises went to the pairs who lost 2300 for playing six spades doubled, minus 1400 for five spades doubled and minus 1190 for six diamonds doubled with an overtrick. Seven clubs was bid once, a small slam in a minor 23 times.

What can we learn from this? One thing is that a hand with 7-5 distribution is not a two-suiter if the long suit is strong and the short suit much weaker.

After the first day of the Pairs, it was clear that 2013 was not the year of the Austrians: Ranks 1 to 7 were occupied by guests. The winning pair was Danailov/ Videv with 65,7% followed by Gunev/Nanev with 63,4% and Marjai/Szegedi (Hungary) with 61,3%.

Mautern 2014 will take place from August 3rd to 9th.



OZ BRIDGE
Ron Klinger,
Northbridge, NSW
www.ronklingerbridge.com

The Best in the West

There were 96 entries in the 2013 Swan River Pairs, held in Perth in August. Peter Buchen of Sydney and Henry Christie of Perth had won the event in two of the three previous years and won it again this year. Second were Gerry Daly–Karol Miller, with Wendy Driscoll–Shizue Futaesaku third and Carol Cleeve–Martin Cleeve fourth. The format was ten 12-board matches, scored by IMPs. At the end of Round 4 Buchen–Christie were in front, with Daly–Miller second. They retained those positions for the final six rounds.

Dealer South. EW Vul.

<p>♠ K J 6 2 ♥ 10 2 ♦ A 9 6 3 ♣ A Q 4</p> <p>♠ 10 3 ♥ A K J 9 7 3 ♦ K 8 4 ♣ 7 2</p> <p>♠ 4 ♥ Q 6 5 ♦ Q J 10 7 2 ♣ J 8 5 3</p>	<p>♠ A Q 9 8 7 5 ♥ 8 4 ♦ 5 ♣ K 10 9 6</p>
--	--

West	North	East	South
—	Christie	—	Buchen
1♥	Double	1♠	Pass
2♥	3♦	Pass	Pass
Pass			

East-West might have done more in the bidding, but then there would have been no chance for Buchen to shine. West led the ten of spades, jack, queen, four. East returned the eight of hearts, low, jack, low. Back came the three of spades, two, seven, ruff. South played the queen of diamonds, king, ace, and the diamond three to the jack. The club three to the queen lost to the king and West won the heart return. West switched to the seven of clubs, four, nine, jack. South ruffed a heart, leaving this position (see top of next column).

The defence had already taken four tricks. Declarer now led the nine of diamonds from dummy to draw the last trump and he caught East in an entry-shifting trump squeeze.

<p>♠ — ♥ A 9 7 ♦ 8 ♣ —</p> <p>♠ — ♥ — ♦ 10 7 ♣ 8 5</p>	<p>♠ K 6 ♥ — ♦ 9 ♣ A</p> <p>♠ A 9 ♥ — ♦ — ♣ 10 6</p>
--	--

In the diagrammed position, if East throws the nine of spades, declarer lets the diamond nine win and ruffs the spade six. This sets up the king of spades with the ace of clubs as an entry.

In practice, East discarded a club. Now declarer played the ace of clubs, setting up the eight for South, with a spade ruff as the entry. Making three diamonds for plus 110 gave North-South 6 IMPs.

If East, when in with the king of clubs, exits with a low spade, declarer is forced to ruff high (West still has the eight of diamonds). Then a diamond to the nine, drawing the last trump, the ace of clubs, removing West's safe exit, and the ten of hearts from the dummy, forces West to lead another heart, squeezing East.



**THE PIGEON
 COUP**
Mark Horton,
Sutton Benger, UK

As declarer, when you decide that there is little or no chance of making your contract by legitimate means, then your only hope may be to paint a picture that gives the defenders a chance to go wrong. On this deal from the final of the Sierra KO Teams in Santa Clara, California, Valio Kovachev had to rely on a pseudo-squeeze that involved giving up a sure trick in the hope of hoodwinking a defender.

Dealer South. NS Vul.

<p>♠ K 10 8 7 6 ♥ Q J 4 ♦ 9 3 2 ♣ J 4</p> <p>♠ Q J 3 ♥ 9 2 ♦ A J 10 5 ♣ K 8 5 2</p> <p>♠ A ♥ A 10 8 7 6 ♦ K Q 7 6 ♣ Q 10 9</p>	<p>♠ 9 5 4 2 ♥ K 5 3 ♦ 8 4 ♣ A 7 6 3</p>
---	---

West	North	East	South
Venkatesh	Isporski	Rosenberg	Kovachev
—	—	—	1♥
Pass	2♥	Pass	2♠ ¹
Pass	2NT ²	Pass	3♣ ³
Pass	4♥	Pass	Pass
Pass			

1. Any game try
2. Relay
3. Asking for help in clubs

West led the nine of hearts. Declarer won with dummy's queen and considered his options. Counting the king of spades, he could see nine tricks, but where to find another? He could play a diamond, hoping to find East with the ace doubleton, but that seemed a remote possibility because West's failure to lead a diamond made it likely that he held the ace.

There was also the problem that even a favourable diamond position might not be enough, especially against such a formidable opponent - for example East could win the first round of diamonds and return a diamond and if the club honours were split, then East would be sure to get a ruff or a trump trick.

Realising that there was no legitimate line to success, declarer formulated a plan based on the fact that the opponents had no idea of his distribution. Trying to create the impression he was in need of a club ruff, he

played a club to the ten. West took the king and played a second heart, which ran to declarer's ten. The nine of clubs went to dummy's jack and East won with the ace and returned the king of hearts, declarer winning with the ace as West discarded a club.

On the next trump West parted with the five of diamonds as declarer pitched the two of diamonds from dummy and East discarded the six of clubs. On the last trump West, imagining declarer's shape was something like 2-5-3-3, discarded the ten of diamonds. Now declarer could knock out the ace of diamonds and score three diamond tricks to bring home the contract.

At the other table South played in two hearts and was held to eight tricks, so plus 620 was worth 11 IMPs.

If West had known how many spades East had had, then he would have been able to part with a spade, but from East's point of view, if South had the ace-three of spades, then West held the queen-jack and he had to keep all his spades to prevent the suit from running.

I first saw this type of coup in Terence Reese's [Play These Hands with Me](#) in a story entitled [Lonely on a Rock](#). Apparently Benito Garozzo has described it as the Colpo di Piccione - the Pigeon Coup.



JURMALA 2013

Karlis Rubins, Riga

Board 26. Dealer East. Both Vul.

	♠ K 10 6		
	♥ A K Q 4		
	♦ 6		
	♣ Q 5 4 3 2		
♠	Q 9 8 2	♠	A J 5 4 3
♥	10 8 7 6 5	♥	2
♦	Q 8 3 2	♦	K 10 9 7 4
♣	—	♣	10 6
	♠ 7		
	♥ J 9 3		
	♦ A J 5		
	♣ A K J 9 8 7		

West	North	East	South
Wenneberg	Goldberg	Leandersson	Eisenberg
—	—	2♠ ¹	3♣
3♠	4♠	Pass	6♣
Pass	Pass	Pass	

1. Spades and a minor

Connie Goldberg and Billy Eisenberg from the USA won the Invitational Pairs tournament in Jurmala, Latvia, this summer. Twenty-four pairs played seven rounds (four boards per round) and on the last round Goldberg-Eisenberg played against Swedish pair Björn Wenneberg and Per Leandersson. The result of the event was decided mainly on the penultimate board.

Good bidding led to an easy 13 tricks after a diamond lead and plus 11 IMPs on the board, because only three pairs bid the slam. Goldberg/Eisenberg won the event with 51 IMP, followed by V.Gonca-O.Antonkov (Latvia/

Estonia) with 37 IMPs and P.Zatorski-M.Klukovski (Poland) with 29 IMPs.

There were 23 entrants in the Teams event. All the results were very exciting: a Polish-Lithuanian team (ERA - E.Vainikonis, A.Orlovich, P.Zatorski and M.Klukovski) beat the Latvian-Icelandic-Danish team Eyjafjallajokull (M.Lorencs, J.Bethers, J.Sigurjonsson and D. Ostergaard) by 21-19 in the final. The playoff for third place was won by an even lesser margin: on the last board, the Latvian-Russian team Ksenia (U.Bethers, A.Imsa, K.Nekrasova and I.Volozenin) beat a Swedish-Russian-Israeli team (B.Wenneberg, P.Leandersson, A.Erastova and L.Fisher) by one overtrick IMP: 27-26.

The Open Pairs tournament was contested by 59 pairs. The winners, with 63.0%, were M.Klukovski-A.Orlovich.A.Erastova-L.Fisher finished 2nd with 61.7% and B.Gierulski-J.Skrypczak were 3rd with 61.2%. The bid of the day was made by Billy Eisenberg on the last board of the tournament. (See next page.)

There was once a bridge tip to the effect of never putting an eight-card suit down in the dummy, but as I had nine cards in clubs, I was secure of the result!

Board 27. Dealer West. Both Vul.

```

♠ 10 9 8
♥ 10 9 2
♦ K J 9 8 7 3
♣ 4

♠ 7 3 2
♥ 4
♦ —
♣ A Q J 10 9 8 7 5 2

♠ A K Q J 6
♥ J 6 3
♦ A 10 4
♣ K 3

♠ 5 4
♥ A K Q 8 7 5
♦ Q 6 5 2
♣ 6
  
```

West	North	East	South
<i>Rubins</i>	<i>Parviainen</i>	<i>Eisenberg</i>	<i>Nokka</i>
5♣	Pass	6♣	6♥
Pass	Pass	6♠	Pass
Pass	Pass		

Six spades helped us finish in fourth place.

Details and results can be found at www.rigainvites.lv.



THE FURTHER ADVENTURES OF MR. BADHIR

Anant Bhagwat
Thane, Maharashtra, India

Mr. Badhir was in a buoyant mood. At last he had found a player who was as bad as, if not worse than, he. The club members who were watching the play were in splits. Gaffe after gaffe was being witnessed and there was much merriment around the club. But one thing was evident: Mr. Badhir's partner was well versed in the Laws of Bridge and time and again he proved it. When this deal came along, both of them were losing badly and were examining their wallets, readying payment of their debts.

```

♠ A Q 3 2
♥ A K 7 5 3
♦ A K Q
♣ 6

♠ J 9 7 6 5
♥ Q J 10
♦ 10 8 7 5
♣ J

♠ 8 4
♥ 8 4
♦ J 9
♣ A K 9 7 5 4 2

♠ K 10
♥ 9 6 2
♦ 6 4 3 2
♣ Q 10 8 3
  
```

Mr. Badhir was South and was the dealer. He flippantly opened three clubs, confident that he would not have to play the hand. His partner had other ideas: he jumped straightaway to six clubs. East doubled in a voice of thunder, basically because one always doubled when Mr. Badhir, who unerringly managed to make two tricks fewer than the average player, was playing a slam. Mr. Badhir nearly suffered apoplexy when he heard his partner's bid.

West led the heart queen. Mr. Badhir won with the ace and cashed the king as well. Then he played a third heart and ruffed it in hand. His partner asked him, "No hearts, partner?" Mr. Badhir looked frantically among his cards and was visibly relieved to find no more hearts. He replied, "No hearts," whereupon his partner said, "Please look among your diamonds." Neither Mr. Badhir nor his partner had noticed that all 13 hearts were accounted for.

The kibitzers erupted into laughter and Mr. Badhir looked crestfallen. Rather angrily, he plunked down the

Continued on page 12 ...



IBPA Column Service

Tim Bourke, Canberra

Members may use these deals as they wish, without attributing the author or IBPA.

685. Dealer North. NS Vul.

<p>♠ A 5 2 ♥ A K 6 4 ♦ J 5 ♣ K Q J 7</p> <p>♠ K J 10 7 4 ♥ 8 3 ♦ A K 10 7 ♣ 10 4</p> <p>♠ Q 8 6 3 ♥ Q J 10 9 7 ♦ — ♣ A 5 3 2</p>	<p>♠ 9 ♥ 5 2 ♦ Q 9 8 6 4 3 2 ♣ 9 8 6</p>
--	--

West	North	East	South
—	1♣	Pass	1♥
1♠	2♠	Pass	3♣
Pass	4♥	Pass	5♥
Pass	5♠	Pass	6♥
Pass	Pass	Pass	

The five-heart bid asked North to bid six with a spade control; South cue bid five spades to show first-round control.

West led the ace of diamonds. Declarer ruffed and drew trumps in two rounds, ending in dummy. The lucky 2-2 trump break gave declarer a chance to make his slam and he took it. His ruffed dummy's remaining diamond and followed with four rounds of clubs. With the minor suits eliminated, declarer played the three of spades from hand and put the two of spades on it from the dummy.

It did not matter which defender won this trick. If West had that honour, he'd have had no safe exit: he would have had to return a spade away from the king or concede a ruff-and-discard. In the latter case, declarer would have discarded the remaining low spade from dummy and ruffed in hand.

The defence would have fared no better if East had won the first round of spades with his singleton nine; he would have had to return a diamond, allowing declarer to ruff in hand with his last trump and discard the five of spades from dummy.

So, declarer would make four trumps, two diamond ruffs, four clubs and either two spades or the ace of spades and a third ruff in hand for twelve tricks.

Six clubs would have been a far easier contract to play. There were ten top tricks and two diamond ruffs would have seen declarer home.

686. Dealer North. Both Vul.

<p>♠ A 2 ♥ A K ♦ A 8 5 ♣ A K 8 6 4 2</p> <p>♠ 10 9 8 5 ♥ 9 7 4 2 ♦ K J 10 ♣ Q 10</p> <p>♠ K J 7 ♥ Q J 10 5 ♦ Q 7 3 2 ♣ 7 3</p>	<p>♠ Q 6 4 3 ♥ 8 6 3 ♦ 9 6 4 ♣ J 9 5</p>
--	--

West	North	East	South
—	2♣	Pass	2NT
Pass	6NT	Pass	Pass
Pass			

The out-of-fashion two-notrump response to the strong, artificial two-club opening promised eight to ten points.

West led the ten of spades and declarer played low from dummy without any apparent thought. The upshot of this was the 'free' finesse in spades meant there was no longer any way to take twelve tricks.

Declarer should have won the first trick with dummy's ace of spades. His next move should have been to cash the ace and king of hearts. Then, declarer should have continued with ace, king and another club. As the clubs were 3-2, this would have seen declarer using the king of spades to cash his two heart winners and the ace of diamonds as an entry to the three established clubs. Declarer would have made two spades, four hearts, one diamond and five clubs bringing his total to twelve tricks.

687. (See top of next page.)

As his side was vulnerable against not, East rather prudently decided not to enter the auction, even to raise partner to the two level or, heaven forbid, a modern pre-emptive jump to three spades, as his side could have been held to five tricks in a spade contract.

Dealer South. EW Vul.

♠ K 7 ♥ Q J 6 2 ♦ K 7 2 ♣ K 7 5 2	♠ 8 5 4 2 ♥ 9 7 5 4 ♦ Q J 5 ♣ 6 3
♠ Q J 10 9 3 ♥ A 10 8 ♦ 10 4 ♣ Q J 10	♠ A 6 ♥ K 3 ♦ A 9 8 6 3 ♣ A 9 8 4

West	North	East	South
—	—	—	1♦
1♠	Double	Pass	2♣
Pass	2♠	Pass	2NT
Pass	3NT	Pass	Pass
Pass			

The result was that North-South landed in a rather tricky three-notrump contract on the lead of the queen of spades from West. Declarer counted six tricks on top from his three ace-kings and saw that if he played on diamonds immediately the defenders would knock out his second spade stopper. As the defence would have the ace of hearts as an entry to cash three spade tricks, declarer would be held to eight tricks.

After placing West with the ace of hearts, declarer saw the winning line. He took the first trick in hand with the ace of spades and then led the three of hearts. This gave West no winning option; if he rose with the ace of hearts, declarer would make three heart tricks, enough for his contract. When West played a low card, declarer had his seventh trick with the queen of hearts. All he had to do was play ace, king and another diamond to set up two long cards in that suit for his eighth and ninth tricks.

688. Dealer South. Both Vul.

♠ 9 6 5 ♥ Q 6 ♦ J 10 8 5 ♣ 8 7 5 3	♠ 2 ♥ J 10 7 4 ♦ 9 6 3 2 ♣ J 9 4 2
♠ K Q J 10 8 ♥ K 9 3 2 ♦ 7 4 ♣ 10 6	♠ A 7 4 3 ♥ A 8 5 ♦ A K Q ♣ A K Q

West	North	East	South
—	—	—	2♣
Pass	2♦	Pass	3NT
Pass	Pass	Pass	

South promised a balanced hand of 25-27 HCP with his jump rebid of three notrump.

West led the king of spades, which declarer allowed to hold. West continued with the ten of spades and when East discarded a diamond, declarer paused to think. He had eight top tricks in his hand and he saw that his only chance for a ninth was that the queen of hearts would prove to be a winner.

The only way that could occur was if West held the king of hearts. Accordingly, declarer took steps to endplay West. After taking the ace of spades at trick two, declarer cashed all of his winners in the minor suits and then played a spade. West could take three more spade winners but then, at trick twelve, he had to play a heart. This meant that the queen of hearts would score a trick no matter whether West exited with the king or a low card.



www.ibpa.com

This Bulletin:

You can access an electronic copy of this Bulletin at www.ibpa.com/586kw.pdf

Subscriptions:

You can apply to join the IBPA or renew your subscription on the website by clicking on the appropriate button on the top of the homepage.

Members' Addresses:

You can find fellow members' contact details at: www.jannersten.org. If you have forgotten your access code: jdhondy@gmail.com

The 2010 Handbook:

To access the electronic version of the Handbook, please follow the emailed instructions.

Personal Details Changes:

Whenever your contact details change, please amend them as appropriate in the database found at: www.jannersten.org or inform the Membership Secretary, Jeremy Dhondy: jdhondy@gmail.com

club ace. Then he played the diamond nine to the queen and played another heart. Since, as a matter of principle, he never looked at his opponents' cards, he failed to notice East discarding a diamond, and ruffed in hand. Then he cashed the diamond ace and king, discarding a spade from hand and played another heart. East's expression was slowly becoming graver. He discarded a spade this time. Again Mr. Badhir ruffed in hand with a low club. At this point he counted his tricks and nodded sagaciously. This was the position:

♠ A Q 3 2	
♥ —	
♦ —	
♣ —	
♠ J 9 7	♠ K
♥ —	♥ —
♦ 10	♦ —
♣ —	♣ Q 10 8
	♠ 8
	♥ —
	♦ —
	♣ K 9 7

Now Mr. Badhir played a spade to the ace and another spade. With a flourish, he ruffed in hand with seven of clubs. As he was about to spread his cards, claiming the king of trumps, his partner stopped him. "Partner, you cannot claim. It is East's turn to play."

Mr. Badhir said in an injured voice, "How can it be? I have ruffed." His partner pointed out that East had ruffed with the ten of clubs and Mr. Badhir had actually undertruffed.

Mr. Badhir was contrite. He said, "I am sorry, I shall take it back and ruff with the king." However, his partner said, "Sorry, partner, you cannot change a played card. You have to play the seven."

Mr. Badhir was incensed. He bitterly complained about the cruelty of the Laws and questioned his partner's loyalty, but the Director was called and ultimately Mr. Badhir had to play the seven of clubs. When East continued with eight of clubs, Mr. Badhir followed with the nine, saying to West, "You can take your queen. That will teach my partner to support me."

But to Mr. Badhir's great surprise, his partner got up and embraced him, saying, "Well played." The kibitzers were clapping loudly and Mr. Badhir looked bewildered. He asked East, "Why did you throw away the queen of clubs? You could have defeated the contract."

East was fuming. He had, after all, noticed too late that he could have defeated the contract by ruffing in earlier with the queen of clubs or indeed, by discarding two diamonds on the hearts. That he had assisted the hapless Mr. Badhir in executing a trump coup would haunt him for a long time to come.



BEIJING HUA YUAN CUP

WANG Zhige, YU Le, LI Zhenpeng, Beijing

Eight national women's teams were invited to Beijing to play in the 2013 Beijing Hua Yuan Cup Women's Elite Bridge Tournament. The teams played a round robin of 16-board matches. The medal winners were: China 93.12, England 90.66, and Poland 74.76.

The twenty-four pairs then competed in the Capital Cup Pairs, resulting in the podium of Anna Sarniak-Cathy Baldysz, Poland; Sun Yanhui-Feng Xuefeng, China; and Sally Brock-Nicola Smith, England.

Prizes were also on offer for the best overall performance (China) and the best-bid, best-defended and best-played deals.

\$2000 Lost?

Board 13. Dealer North. Both Vul.

♠ Q 7 6	
♥ K 10	
♦ A J 4 2	
♣ 7 6 5 3	
♠ A 9 4 3	♠ J 10
♥ A 4 3	♥ 9 5 2
♦ K Q 9	♦ 10 6 5
♣ A J 2	♣ K Q 10 9 8
	♠ K 8 5 2
	♥ Q J 8 7 6
	♦ 8 7 3
	♣ 4

West	North	East	South
—	Pass	Pass	Pass
1♣ ¹	Pass	1♦ ²	Pass
1NT ³	Pass	3NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

- 11-14 balanced / 15+ natural / any 18+
- 0-7 HCP
- 18-21 balanced

One pair missed a chance to win the best defence award on this board from the third round.

All six East-West pairs who declared three notrump made the contract. It was difficult for North to lead a heart, and a spade or diamond lead would have been quite helpful to declarer.

In the open room of the match between Poland and China, the North led a club and was close to beating the contract, but missed the chance to be the only winning defender in the field. Declarer won the club lead in dummy and played a diamond to the king. Ducking this trick smoothly could have lured the declarer into a trap by her repeating the finesse, but North decided to take it and led back another club.

Running out of entries to the dummy, declarer ran all her club winners, discarding a spade and a heart from hand. The challenge for North-South was to choose which cards to discard. South threw one spade, two hearts and one diamond. North only had to discard once and her choice was a diamond. It came to this situation:

	♠ Q 7 6	
	♥ K 10	
	♦ J 4	
	♣ —	
♠ A 9 4		♠ J 10
♥ A 4		♥ 9 5 2
♦ Q 9		♦ 10 6
♣ —		♣ —
	♠ K 8 5	
	♥ Q J 8	
	♦ 8	
	♣ —	

Declarer played a spade from dummy and ran it to North's queen. At this point, declarer could duck North's heart return, take the second heart, then play the queen of diamonds and another diamond, forcing North to lead a spade. On the last diamond, South has to release the heart guard or bare the king of spades, solving declarer's blockage problem.

If North had discarded a spade instead of a diamond and South had kept another heart, the endplay would not have worked.

In the previous diagram, had North kept one fewer spade and one more diamond, declarer could have played a heart after cashing all her clubs, ducking it if

South played the eight and winning otherwise. Then, on a low spade from hand, North must win and declarer must gain an extra trick in either spades, hearts or diamonds, depending upon the defence.

Shortness: Good or Bad?

The Netherlands team reported one of their bidding triumphs to us. In the first round, they were the only pair who bid the fine slam on ...

Board 15. Dealer South. NS Vul.

	♠ 5 3	
	♥ K 8 7 5 2	
	♦ Q J 10 4	
	♣ Q 8	
♠ 9 7 6		♠ A K Q J 10
♥ J 4 3		♥ A Q 10 9
♦ A 2		♦ K 6 5
♣ A J 10 5 2		♣ 3
	♠ 8 4 2	
	♥ 6	
	♦ 9 8 7 3	
	♣ K 9 7 6 4	

West	North	East	South
<i>Simons</i>	—	<i>Pasman</i>	Pass
—	Pass	1♠	Pass
Pass	Pass	4♣ ²	Pass
2♣ ¹	Pass	4NT ⁴	Pass
4♦ ³	Pass	6♠	Pass
5♥ ⁵	Pass		
Pass	Pass		

1. Drury: 3-card support, invitational
2. Splinter, slam interest
3. Control
4. Roman Key Card Blackwood
5. 2 key cards, no trump queen

At other tables, the pairs who played strong club systems found some difficulties on this board. After partner's one-club opening, most Wests had to bid two clubs to show the suit and strength. Then the club shortness became discouraging for East to bid any higher than the game level.

The Killing Shift

Dealer South. Neither Vul.

	♠ 9 5	
	♥ J 10 7	
	♦ A 9 3 2	
	♣ 10 5 4 3	
♠ J 2		♠ Q 8 4 3
♥ K 8		♥ A Q 9 5 4
♦ Q 7 5		♦ 10
♣ A K Q J 9 7		♣ 8 6 2
	♠ A K 10 7 6	
	♥ 6 3 2	
	♦ K J 8 6 4	
	♣ —	

West	North	East	South
—	Kazmucha	—	Zmuda
3♠ ¹	Pass	3NT	Pass
Pass	Pass		

1. Bid 3NT with a spade stop

This board didn't need the players to fight until the last trick. Instead, they had their only chance at the beginning.

Justyna Zmuda passed the first test by leading the ace of spades to have a look at dummy; partner followed with the five of spades. Now the second critical point had come. According to the auction, the declarer must have had at least one stopper in spades, so Zmuda figured out the five of spades might be a suit preference signal. In addition, she needed less in partner's hand from diamonds than from hearts. She found the solution: the jack of diamonds for two down!

This is an excellent example of making the signal you think partner needs.

The Best Partnership Bidding Prize

Winners: *Kristina Wahyu Murniati–Suci Amita Dewi, Indonesia*

In the Hua Yuan Teams, Board 12 of Match 7 provided a chance for Kristina Murniati and Suci Dewi to show their skill not only in finding the right contract, but also placing the declaration on the right side.

Board 12. Dealer West. NS Vul.

	♠ Q J 10 6 2		
	♥ A 3 2		
	♦ 5		
	♣ K 10 7 6		
♠ A		♠ K 4	
♥ Q J 9 5		♥ K 4	
♦ A Q J 8		♦ K 10 9 7 6 3	
♣ A Q 3 2		♣ J 9 8	
	♠ 9 8 7 5 3		
	♥ 10 8 7 6		
	♦ 4 2		
	♣ 5 4		

West	North	East	South
Dewi		Murniati	
1♣ ¹	1♠	2♣ ²	Pass
2♦	Pass	3♦	Pass
3♠ ³	Pass	3NT	Pass
4♣ ⁴	Pass	4♥ ⁴	Pass
4♠ ⁵	Pass	5♣ ⁶	Pass
6♦	Pass	Pass	Pass

1. Precision
2. Transfer to diamonds
3. Asks for stopper
4. Cue bids
5. RKCB for diamonds
6. 1 or 4 keycards

Placing the contract on the right side did not mean automatic success. Declarer still had work to do after the opening lead of the queen of spades.

Having won the first trick in hand, Dewi led the trump queen to dummy's king and discarded a low club on dummy's king of spades. A low diamond to the ace drew the last trump, and a low heart was led to dummy's king, North withholding the ace. When declarer then led a heart to the queen and ace, North was endplayed. She had either to lead a heart into the jack-nine or a club into the ace-queen.

"Main bagus (Well played)!" Murniati smiled happily.

The Best Partnership Defence Prize

Winners: *Emma Sjöberg–Sandra Rimstedt, Sweden*

From the pairs event:

Board 19. Dealer South. EW Vul.

	♠ Q		
	♥ K 6 2		
	♦ A 10 4 2		
	♣ J 9 7 5 3		
♠ K 10 9 8 7 4 2		♠ A	
♥ Q		♥ 9 7 4 3	
♦ 7 6		♦ Q J 9 8 5	
♣ K 8 6		♣ A 10 2	
	♠ J 6 5 3		
	♥ A J 10 8 5		
	♦ K 3		
	♣ Q 4		

West	North	East	South
—	Rimstedt	—	Sjöberg
3♠	Pass	Pass	INT ¹
			Pass

1. 9-12 HCP balanced

Rimstedt led a heart to Sjöberg's ace. Declarer has one loser in trumps, one in the hearts and two in diamonds. She had enough entries to set up a diamond to pitch her club loser and make the contract. However, the Swedish pair figured out a way to give declarer an opportunity to go wrong.

At trick two, Sjöberg led an imaginative queen of clubs, taken by the king. Declarer cashed the ace of spades, ruffed a heart and played two more rounds of trumps to Sjöberg's jack. South played the king and another diamond to North's ace. Knowing Sjöberg's plan, Rimstedt shifted back to clubs. Declarer played the ace, hoping to pitch a club on the established queen of diamonds. Sjöberg could ruff this with her remaining trump to beat the contract.

Should declarer have made the winning play? Perhaps - with, for example, queen-jack-nine of clubs, South could have led a diamond to North's ace for a club through the ace-ten before the king of diamonds was dislodged.

The Best Declarer Play Prize

Winner: *Fiona Brown, England*

Board 9. Dealer North. EW Vul.

♠ 10 5 2 ♥ Q 5 ♦ K J 7 6 4 3 ♣ 4 3	♠ 9 ♥ K J 10 9 3 ♦ 10 5 2 ♣ A Q 10 7
♠ K 8 4 ♥ A 8 7 2 ♦ A Q 9 ♣ 9 8 2	♠ A Q J 7 6 3 ♥ 6 4 ♦ 8 ♣ K J 6 5

West	North	East	South
<i>Stockdale</i>		<i>Brown</i>	
—	2♦	2♥	2♠
3♠	Pass	4♥	Pass
Pass	Pass		

The winner of the best declarer play grabbed the award with no serious challenge. It took the panel less than a minute to reach a decision in favour of Fiona Brown's fabulous play on this board from Round 5 of the team event:

South led her singleton diamond. Brown put on dummy's ace and cashed the ace and king of hearts. On the ace of hearts, she carefully played the nine. Then she played her singleton spade, taken by South, who had no choice but to continue with the queen of spades. Brown won with the king, pitching a diamond, played the last spade from the dummy and ruffed it with the jack of hearts.

Only then did Brown use the three of hearts to enter the dummy and played a club to the seven. South won with the jack, but the defence was over. South could concede a ruff-sluff, leading to another endplay in clubs, or lead a club immediately, eliminating the second loser there. Congratulations to Fiona!

Comparative 2013 Bermuda Bowl Rankings for the Top 12 Teams

Rank	Team	2013VP ¹	2012VP ² (Rank)	1964VP ³ (Rank)	IMPVPs ⁴ (Rank)	W-L-T ⁵ (Rank)	4-3-2-1-0 ⁶ (Rank)	Net IMPs +/- ⁷ (Rank)
1	USA 1	293.89	408(1)	120(2)	1453(1)	15-6-0(=2)	62(2)	+411(1)
2	Italy	284.59	391(2)	123(1)	1391(3)	18-3-0(1)	70(1)	+347(3)
3	Monaco	280.70	390(3)	106(3)	1400(2)	15-6-0(=2)	61(3)	+367(2)
4	Poland	257.63	382(4)	96(5)	1281(4)	14-6-1(5)	57(5)	+241(4)
5	Netherlands	254.23	363(=5)	97(4)	1253(5)	13-8-0(=8)	53(8)	+203(6)
6	England	252.84	363(=5)	95(6)	1251(6)	13-7-1(7)	54(7)	+209(5)
7	China	246.55	348(8)	92(7)	1225(7)	15-6-0(=2)	58(4)	+195(7)
8	Canada	243.22	351(7)	90(8)	1204(8)	14-7-0(6)	55(6)	+148(9)
9	USA 2	239.57	344(9)	87(9)	1192(9)	13-8-0(=8)	52(9)	+177(8)
10	Indonesia	229.15	336(10)	86(10)	1130(10)	13-8-0(=8)	50(10)	+80(12)
11	Japan	223.64	330(11)	79(11)	1123(11)	10-11-0(12)	41(12)	+94(10)
12	Germany	214.34	313(12)	73(12)	1076(12)	10-10-1(11)	43(11)	+83(11)

Notes:

1. Actual rankings of the top 12 teams (those above average) from Bali.
2. Scores and rankings according to the old WBFVP scale, in use from the late 1960s until this year.
3. The original VP scale used, for example, in the 1964 Olympiad Teams (18-board matches): 18+ IMPs = 7-0VP; 10-17 IMPs = 6-1VP; 4-9 IMPs = 5-2VP; 0-3 IMPs = 4-3VP. IMP ties were broken by (i.) most boards on which IMPs were won, then (ii.) total points.
4. IMPVPs are calculated on a 1-to-1 basis (IMPs to VPs) to a maximum of 100VPs per match, i.e., 50 IMPs is a blitz (100-0). For this type of scale approximately 3 IMPs per board could be the standard for a blitz.
5. Most professional sports use a win/loss system to create their ranking table - here are the results if bridge did the same.
6. Ameliorating win/loss is the 1 = win by 5 or more IMPs; $\frac{3}{4}$ = win by 1-4 IMPs; $\frac{1}{2}$ = tie; $\frac{1}{4}$ = lose by 1-4 IMPs; 0 = lose by 5 or more IMPs. Fractions from the basic 1 - $\frac{3}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{1}{4}$ - 0 schema are made into whole numbers by multiplying by 4. The range for a fractional win or loss ($\frac{3}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$) is calculated at approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ IMP times the number of boards in the match.
7. If one were to consider the Round Robin as one long continuous match, it could be scored at raw IMPs without resorting to Victory Points at all. This may be visually a little hard on the teams at the bottom of the table (places 13-22) which are all net minus in IMPs. This method is the same as IMPVPs without results beyond +50 or -50 being negated.



Correspondence

The Editor reserves the right to abridge and/or edit correspondence.
Email: ibpaeditor@sympatico.ca

The Great Victory Point Debate

It's fair to say that I've received more correspondence (both in terms of frequency and volume!) on this issue than on any other since I began as editor. If we published it all, it would consume more than a normal month's Bulletin - I've added four pages this month to deal with it. The next few pages will try to present both sides fairly. Even so, I've had to abridge the correspondence to make it fit our space. The unabridged versions of both Ron Klinger's and Ernesto d'Orsi's texts can be found on the IBPA website and the links have been emailed to members.

First, Ron Klinger asks some penetrating questions about the scale. The responses come from a bridge theorist in Sydney (hereafter SBT), Michael Wilkinson, and the WBF Scoring Committee (hereafter WSC). The WBF Scoring Committee consists of: Henry Bethe, Bart Bramley, Peter Buchen, Mauricio Di Sacco, Manolo Eminent, Max Bavin (co-chairman), Ernesto d'Orsi (chairman). Their response was prepared by Peter Buchen.

1. Why have we decided to add to the complexity of scoring by introducing a scale with two decimal places? How does the average bridge player make any sense of this approach? Almost all would consider it incomprehensible? Would we report a cricket match as one side being 7.43 wickets for 286.79 runs? Or a football match as 3.72 goals to 1.68? Or a rugby match as 33.55 to 12.31? Or a tennis match as 3.52 sets to 1.44?

SBT: It's difficult to come up with any vaguely sensible rebuttal to this.

WSC: It is somewhat disingenuous to select cricket, football, rugby and tennis to argue the inappropriateness of decimal scoring in sports. Such cherry-picking ignores the whole gamut of sports, many of them Olympic, which already use decimal scoring. Snow-boarding and skydiving contests employ scoring to one decimal place; running, swimming and high diving to two decimal places; gymnastics to three decimal places; motor racing to four decimal places.

IBPA Ed.: Some of the examples from WSC are times or distances expressed as decimals and are thus easy to understand.

2. Why is the first IMP in a match worth twice as much as the 22nd? Why is it more meritorious to win 10 matches by 5 IMPs (118.5 VPs) than five matches by 10 IMPs and 5 draws (117.15 VPs)?

SBT: To my mind there is something more meritorious about winning all your matches by a small margin than drawing some matches (or indeed losing them by a small margin) and thrashing some of the weaker teams - so the current WBF scale does to a small extent reduce the importance of bunny bashing. See below though - my suggested scale does a far better job of achieving this goal.

WSC: The Scoring Panel has taken the reasonable view that winning a match, by whatever margin, should be rewarded with a higher VP score. This was not the case for the old WBF scales where a draw could be awarded even if there was a 3 or 4 IMP difference.

3. A slam on a finesse is a 50-50 bet. This is recognised in basic duplicate scoring (480 vs 980, 450 and -50, 500 in each case and 11 IMPs in each case; 680 vs 1430 or 650 and -100, 750 in each case and 13 IMPs in each case). Under the new VP scale the strategy for a team trailing, by 20, 30, 40 or 50 IMPs is to bid all slams on a finesse, since the reward for making exceeds the loss for losing. Similarly, the strategy for a team ahead by the same margins is not to bid a slam on a finesse; the potential loss is greater than the potential gain. The new scoring scale thus impacts on the mathematics of the game. To a lesser extent, the same applies to bidding or not bidding games on a finesse.

SBT: It's difficult to come up with any vaguely sensible rebuttal to your underlying point. The scale I suggest does have an element of this problem - but it's less clearcut than with the WBF scale. Incidentally, this is my main objection to Butler scoring - it distorts the basic odds for bidding decisions. Interestingly, you are wrong though on your statement about the strategy for a team in the lead - knowing that their opponents will bid all slams on a finesse they should in fact also bid the slam on a finesse to flatten the board and retain their lead - and then we're playing poker.

WSC: There is nothing new in a bidding strategy that adopts an odds-against action when down a significant margin in a match. The new WBF scale does indeed impact on the odds for a given tactical action dependent on the current IMP

margin. For the case of the 11 IMP slam swing above, when both teams employ an optimal game-theoretic strategy (ie. they both bid the slam half the time) the expected VP gain for the team behind is positive, while for the team ahead it is negative. The maximum difference is less than 0.25 VPs on the new scale, so such considerations should have little impact. Incidentally, even on the old scale there would be similar tactics in play, with variable differences in VPs.

4. Why is the cut-off for a 16-board match deemed to be worth 3.75 IMPs per board, but for a 10-board match, it is 4.8 IMPs per board?

SBT: This one actually makes a lot of sense - there have been studies done which show that the variance at IMPs is proportional to the squareroot of the number of boards being played - so for a longer match the cutoff should indeed be lower in IMPs/board terms.

WSC: Consider a long 96-board match (as is played in the Bermuda Bowl final and other major events). A team that wins such a match by 144 IMPs say would rightly be regarded as having trounced its opponents. Now consider a four board play-off where one team wins by 6 IMPs. No-one would consider this to be a big win, because it might have been gained on a single lucky deal. Yet both results average 1.5 IMPs per board. Clearly a blitz win should not be based on a constant number of IMPs per board, but rather: the more boards in play, the lower the number of IMPs per board for a blitz. The Scoring Panel defines the blitz win as roughly two standard deviations above the expected mean for two equally matched teams. About 96% of all results will fall within two standard deviations. Based on a large data set, the standard deviation was found to be about 7.5 IMPs per board. Statistical theory then predicts that two standard deviations for N boards will be $15\sqrt{N}$ IMPs and the average IMPs per board for a blitz will then be $15/\sqrt{N}$. This formula yields the following results:

<u>No. Boards = N</u>	<u>Blitz IMPs/Board</u>
4	7.50
10	4.74
16	3.75
96	1.53

5. Why are we adopting a scale incomprehensible to the public, when we can achieve the same (or perhaps better) by means of a straightforward and understandable scale, one where every IMP counts and every IMP is equal? Attached are three files which cover the qualifying rounds of the 2013 Bermuda Bowl, Venice Cup and D'Orsi Trophy. (These are not reprinted here, but are in Ron's document on the website. - Ed.) The left hand column contains the finishing order of the teams using the new WBF scale. The right-hand column has the total VPs for each team based on a VP scale of 100, where each side starts with 50 VPs. A tie is 50-50. Winners add their nett IMPs to 50, cut-off at 100. Losers deduct their IMPs from 50, minimum 0. You will see that the top eight places are exactly the same under both scales (with a slight shuffle) and the total finishing order of the 22 team is almost the same. When reporting the results under such a scale, it would be easy for the public to understand a 73-27 or 91-9 or 54-46 win. Given that the outcome of both scales is effectively the same in selecting the quarter-finalists, what benefits do the new VP scale provide? (Incidentally, it would be prudent to check my maths!)

SBT: There is a good reason for not capping the score for the losers - the reason you outlined above about it changing the bridge maths - once you are trailing by 50 IMPs there is no downside at all in taking a "swingy" action - you are getting 0 anyway. I for one would heartily approve of your scale so long as the negative cap was removed.

Although you would perhaps dislike the added complexity - I think a slightly better approach is:

1 IMP = 1 VP for the first n IMPs (where n is dependent on the length of the match)

1 IMP = 0.5 VPs for the next n imps

1 IMP = 0.1 VPs for the next n IMPs for the winners, but with no cap on the losers' score.

In the case of a 16 board match n = 25 feels about right to me.

WSC: There are two reasons that the suggested 100 VP scale above should be rejected. First, it makes no allowance for the number of boards in play and as we saw in our reply to Q4. above, this is an important element in any IMP to VP conversion. How many scores of 100-0 would you see in a 10 board match requiring an average of 10 IMPs per board? Correcting this anomaly would mean having the highly undesirable feature of a different blitz VP for each match with a different board quota. Secondly the proposed linear scale implies each IMP up to the maximum is worth the same increment in VPs. We have explained in our response to Q2. why this is also undesirable.

BPA Ed.: No one is suggesting that the 0-100 scale be used for all matches regardless of length. For example, a 10-board match might use a 0-60 VP scale with 30 IMPs a blitz.

6. Someone might care to conduct the same exercise for previous World Championships by scoring the qualifying rounds under both the new WBF scale and the suggested 100 VP scale.

SBT: At some point I might rescore some events but not at 12.30 a.m.

WSC: The WBF Scoring Panel are currently conducting statistical analyses of past World Championships with a view to perhaps fine tuning some of the parameters of the new WBF scale. For the reasons stated above, it is unlikely that the WBF would adopt a scale on the basis suggested by Ron Klinger.

Curiosities in the New WBF VP Scale (from Ron Klinger)

16 teams, 15-match round-robin, Teams A-J all score net 50 Imps, but their VP total varies. Results of 12 teams and hypothetical results based on the 16-board VP scale:

Team A	Win 10 x 1 Imp	Win 5 x 8-Imps	Net 50 Imps	VP Total on new scale
16-board scale VPs		103.1	61.45	164.55
Team B	Win 10 x 2 Imps	Win 5 x 6 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		106.1	58.80	164.90
Team C	Win 10 x 5 Imps	5 x 0 draw	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		114.8	50.00	164.80
Team D	Win 10 x 6 Imps	Lose 5 x -2 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		117.6	46.95	164.55
Team E	Win 10 x 8 Imps	Lose 5 x -6 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		122.9	41.2	164.10
Team F	Win 10 x 10 Imps	Lose 5 x -10 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		128.0	36.00	164.00
Team G	Win 10 x 12 Imps	Lose 5 x -14 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		132.8	31.25	164.05
Team H	Win 10 x 15 Imps	Lose 5 x -20 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		139.7	25.00	164.70
Team I	Win 10 x 18 Imps	Lose 5 x -26 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		146.0	19.55	165.55
Team J	Win 10 x 20 Imps	Lose 5 x -30 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		150.0	16.35	166.35
Team K	Win 10 x 25 Imps	Lose 5 x -40 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		159.2	9.55	168.75
Team L	Win 10 x 35 Imps	Lose 5 x -60 Imps	Net 50 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		174.5	0.00	174.50

Although all teams scored the same number of net Imps, the semi-finalists would again be Teams L, K, J, I. It's not the number of Imps you score, but how you score them that counts.

Team X	Win 10 x 24 Imps	Lose 5 x -40 Imps	Net 40 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		157.4	9.50	166.90
Team Y	Win 10 x 23 Imps	Lose 5 x -39 Imps	Net 40 Imps	
16-board scale VPs		155.6	10.15	165.70

Thus Team X, with net 40 Imps, again finishes third, ahead of many teams that scored 50 Imps, but in different fashion. Team Y, with net 35 Imps, comes fourth ahead of many with net 50 Imps.

Dilip Gidwani wades in much more succinctly:

Dear John,

The conversion of IMPs to VPs is a formula that has been in practice over years. The scales of 25-5 and 20-0 are an outcome of this factoring process. Factoring IMPs to a VP scale seemingly favours teams who lose by huge margins but still have a chance to recoup from one bad session. Once applied uniformly, factoring is a fair measure of reward for victory and penalty for loss. Nevertheless ... the ease of the 25-5 scale for journalists is without any doubt, but the 0.00-20.00 scale, although difficult for journalists (and players alike) to remember (as it involves four digits) is however, a fairer scale in terms of reward/penalty for win/loss. This aspect has been researched extensively by statisticians the world over. However, it would be interesting to see how our executive debates this matter.

Dilip Gidwani, Mumbai

The IBPA Executive discussed the matter at its meeting in Bali and in the AGM. Our conclusion was that the new scale, however fair and accurate, is not good for bridge and especially not good for bridge reporting. These views have been made known to the WBF. - Ed.



Euro 2014

The 52nd European Team Championships will be held in Opatija, Croatia, from Saturday 21st June to Wednesday 2nd July 2014. Information will be published on the EBL Website at www.eurobridge.org.

1st Autumn Women's Online Festival

Anna Maria Torlontano, Chairperson of the WBF Women's Committee reports that players from all WBF Zones are invited to participate in Pairs and Individual Championships ...

Date: 11th – 17th November

Tournaments: Individual & Pairs every day

Time schedule: 10.00; 13.30; 15.10; 19.00; 23.40 GMT

Format: 10 boards for each tournament

Master Points: WBF Online

Information: www.wbfwomensbridgeclub.org

The overall winner, together with a partner of her choice, gains free entry to the World Women's Pairs Championship to be held in Sanya, China, together with accommodation in a twin room for the period of the Pairs Championship.

Tom Townsend

IBPA member Tom Townsend of the England team has succeeded Tony Forrester as Daily Telegraph bridge columnist Monday to Friday. Forrester continues as the Saturday bridge columnist and columnist for the Sunday Telegraph. Patrick Jourdain continues as Daily Telegraph bridge correspondent responsible for news.

World Online University Bridge Championships

Geert Magerman reports that the 4th World University Online Bridge Championships will commence in January 2014 on Bridge Base Online. These championships are organized by FISU (International University Sports Federation) and the WBF (World Bridge Federation).

Entries: Before December 1, 2013.

Send to kubakasprzak@o2.pl

(with a copy to geert.magerman@telenet.be)

Teams: 4, 5, or 6 university players

No country quota

Competition: Group play and a 32-team knockout

Information: www.unibridge.eu



IBPA PRESIDENT'S REPORT FROM BALI 2013

IBPA had a successful Bali, principally from the point of recruitment of members. The Membership Secretary's report to the AGM had shown a small decline in numbers since last year but by the time we left Bali the deficit had been more than made up, particularly from Australia (see list below) with Ron Klinger active in this area.

The Press Room was spacious, busy, and well-managed, as usual, by Jan Swaan. The meetings of your Executive were well-attended. We launched a Facebook page for IBPA and there was an excellent social evening jointly hosted by the Indonesian Federation and the WBF. A report of our AGM and Awards is elsewhere. We welcomed two new sponsors to our 2013 Awards, in Chen Yeh and Margaret Parnis England, bringing the total to six plus the WBF grant. We paid out more than \$2000 in prizes to Award winners.

New or rejoining members we welcome are: Peter Buchen (Australia); Patrick Choy (Singapore), Chris Depasquale (Australia); Ishmael Del'Monte (Australia); Simon Fellus (Italy); Ben Green (England); Bob Hamman (USA); Simon Hinge (Australia); Mario Kaifmann (Italy); Marshall Lewis (Croatia); Jerry Li (China); David Lindop (Canada); Pierre Schmidt (France); Barbara Travis (Australia).

Bill Jacobs (Australia), winning author of the Book of the Year had part of his prize applied to making him a member.

Since Bali, Tom Townsend (England) has joined. I also hear that website applications have come from Martin Lofgren (Sweden) and Nicholas Hammond (USA).

**Patrick Jourdain, IBPA President
Cardiff, Wales**

World Bridge Calendar

DATES	EVENT	LOCATION	INFORMATION
2013			
Nov 4-10	2 nd Città di Napoli/23 rd Chiaradia	Naples, Italy	www.soloitaliabridge.it
Nov 11-17	Women's Online Bridge Festival	Online	www.worldbridge.org
Nov 14-17	12 th European Champions Cup	Opatija, Croatia	www.eurobridge.org
Nov 14-24	19 th Red Sea International Festival	Eilat, Israel	www.bridgeredsea.com
Nov 16-23	XII International Bridge Festival	Havana & Varadero, Cuba	www.festivalbridgecuba.com
Nov 22-24	Ashok Kapoor Memorial Tournament	Mumbai, India	Arvind Paranjape 098203 94717
Nov 27-Dec 1	35 th ASEAN Bridge Club Championship	Makati City, Philippines	www.asean@bridge.org.ph
Nov 28-Dec 8	Fall NABC	Phoenix, AZ	www.acbl.org
Dec 5-8	International Babenberger Bridge Week	Klosterneuburg, Austria	www.bridgeaustria.at
Dec 8-16	SportAccord World Mind Games	Beijing, China	www.worldbridge.org
Dec 13-15	Città di Milano Internazionale Squadre	Milan, Italy	www.federbridge.it
Dec 16 & 18	WBF Pairs to Support Youth Bridge	Clubs Worldwide	www.worldbridge.org
Dec 17-23	55 th Indian Winter Nationals	Ahmedabad, India	www.bfi.net.in
Dec 29-Jan 5	Rome New Year's Festival	Rome, Italy	www.soloitaliabridge.it
2014			
Jan 14-26	Summer Festival of Bridge	Canberra, Australia	www.abf.com.au
Jan 20-25	WBF Pairs for UNICEF	Clubs Everywhere	www.worldbridge.org
Jan 23-16	Reykjavik Bridge Festival 2014	Reykjavik, Iceland	bridge@bridge.is
Jan 24-31	XXXVII International Festival	Budapest, Hungary	www.bridzs.hu/ibbf2014
Jan 25-31	Bermuda Regional	Southampton, Bermuda	www.bermudaregional.com
Feb 4-10	EBU Overseas Malta Congress	Sliema, Malta	www.ebu.co.uk
Feb 7-9	V Open Internacional de Bridge	Barcelona, Spain	www.aebridge.com
Feb 11-15	24 th Sun, Sea & Slams	Bridgetown, Barbados	www.barbadosbridge.org
Feb 11-16	19 th NEC Festival	Yokohama, Japan	www.jcbl.or.jp
Feb 22-1	Gold Coast Congress	Surfer's Paradise, Australia	www.qldbridge.com
Feb 24-Mar 2	Winter Festival	Biarritz, France	www.biarritz-bridge.com
Feb 26-Mar 2	International Festival des Jeux Bridge	Cannes, France	www.festivaldesjeux-cannes.com
Mar 9-16	Dead Sea Festival	Dead Sea, Israel	birman@inter.net.il
Mar 20-23	Tasmanian Festival of Bridge	Tainceston, Tasmania	www.abf.com.au
Mar 20-30	Spring NABC	Dallas, TX	www.acbl.org
Mar 23-29	XXVII International Festival	Tenerife, Canary Is., Spain	www.aebridge.com
Mar 24-30	11 th Meeting of Bridge Morocco	Agadir, Morocco	www.bridgeagadir.com
Mar 25-30	Kitzbüheler Bridge Week	Kitzbühel, Austria	www.bridgeaustria.at
Mar 30-Apr 4	White House Junior International Teams	Amsterdam, Netherlands	keestammens@gmail.com
Apr 5-9	Bangkok Bridge Festival	Bangkok, Thailand	chodchoy7@gmail.com
Apr 15-20	119 th Canadian Nationals	Toronto, ON	www.unit166.ca
Apr 25-May 4	Jersey Congress	Jersey, Channel Is.	www.ebu.co.uk
Apr 27-May 4	SABF National Congress	Port Elizabeth, South Africa	www.sabf.co.za
May 2-4	German Bridge Team Trophy	Berlin, Germany	www.bridge-verband.de
May 17-24	5 th Open S. American Championships	Santiago, Chile	http://santiago2014.csbnews.org
May 18-25	German Bridge Festival	Wyk-auf-Föhr, Germany	www.bridgeverband.de
May 23-Jun 5	International Festival Juan-les-Pins	Juan-les-Pins, France	www.festivalsdusoleil.com
May 25-Jun 1	Torneo de Bridge Costa Cálida	Murcia, Spain	www.aebridge.com
Jun 5-9	Grazer Bridge Week	Graz, Austria	www.bridgeaustria.at
Jun 6-9	Barrier Reef Congress	Townsville, Qld., Australia	www.abf.com.au
Jun 7-13	2014 Calvi Tournament	Calvi, Corsica, France	www.bridgecalvi.com
Jun 21-Jul 2	52 nd European Teams Championships	Opatija, Croatia	www.eurobridge.org
Jul 1-13	International Festival	Biarritz, France	www.biarritz-bridge.com
Jul 12-19	12 th European Youth Pairs & Camp	Burghausen, Germany	www.eurobridge.org
Jul 12-24	2014 ANC	Sydney, Australia	www.abf.com.au
Jul 17-27	Summer NABC	Las Vegas, NV	www.acbl.org
Jul 25-Aug 3	20 th Swedish Bridgefestival	Örebro, Sweden	www.svenskbridge.se/festival
Jul 26-31	Chairman's Cup	Örebro, Sweden	www.svenskbridge.se/festival
Aug 1-9	Norwegian Bridge Festival	Fredrikstad, Norway	www.bridge.no
Aug 8-17	Summer Meeting	Brighton, England	www.ebu.co.uk
Aug 13-17	Coffs Gold Coast Congress	Coffs Harbour, Qld., Australia	www.coffsbridge.com.au
Aug 13-24	15 th World Youth Championships	Istanbul, Turkey	www.worldbridge.org
Aug 22-24	Festival de la Côte Basque	Biarritz, France	www.biarritz-bridge.com
Aug 23-31	Festival du Soleil la Grande Motte	La Grande Motte, France	www.festivalsdusoleil.com
Aug 27-31	Territory Gold Bridge Festival	Darwin, NT, Australia	www.ntba.com.au/tgfbf14.html
Sep 5-7	Isle of Man Congress	Douglas, Isle of Man	www.ebu.co.uk
Sep 8-13	4 th Commonwealth Bridge Championship	Glasgow, Scotland	www.commonwealthbridge-scotland.com
Sep 12-21	Confiance Congress	Guernsey, Channel Is.	www.ebu.co.uk
Sep 27-Oct 4	31 st NZ National Congress	Hamilton, New Zealand	www.nzcba.co.nz
Oct 10-25	15th World Bridge Series	Sanya, China	www.worldbridge.org
Nov 27-Dec 7	Fall NABC	Providence, RI	www.acbl.org