

# 9th European Youth Pairs Championships



15-18 JULY 2008 - WROCLAW, POLAND



**Bulletin 1**

**Thursday 17<sup>th</sup> July 2008**

Editor: Peter Ventura. Co-Editor: Jos Jacobs. Layout: Jarek Zalewski, Artur Czyz. Pictures: Slawek Latala. Printing: Maciek Wreczycki.

## WROCLAW WELCOMES THE YOUNG BRIDGEPLAYERS OF EUROPÉ



324 young bridge-players from 22 countries of Europe gathered in Wroclaw yesterday for the Ninth European Youth Pairs Championship, but the first in which the Girls and Under 21 categories had their own event.

No-one is yet out of the hunt for medals, as both "B" semifinals qualify pairs to their respective "A" finals and in the Girls championship no cut was made.



## A PLAYER'S QUICK GUIDE TO THE NEW LAWS OF BRIDGE (2007)

**By Eitan Levy – Chief TD**

This tournament is being played under the new Laws of Duplicate Bridge 2007. Some of the changes which directly affect players are outlined below. These are not necessarily the biggest changes or the most important, but they are the ones that will have the biggest impact on the player at the table.

As before it is important to call the TD when there has been an irregularity and not to try to solve the irregularity by yourself. Failure to call the TD will often result in the loss of certain rights. And don't try to explain why the irregularity happened – you could be passing unauthorized information to your partner. Wait for the TD to ask the relevant questions.

**Drawing attention to an irregularity:** Any player, including dummy, may attempt to prevent another player committing an irregularity (that is before it happens), and any player may draw attention to an irregularity during the bidding. During the play, any player, except dummy, may draw attention to an irregularity (dummy may do so only after the play of the hand is concluded.)

**Looking at system cards:** After the bidding but before the opening lead is faced, both declarer and dummy (but NOT defenders) may look at their convention card, and inform the TD and opponents about a mistaken explanation.

**Insufficient bids:** Here there has been significant change, and, unlike the previous law, in certain circumstances artificial bids do not automatically silence partner from bidding. It is important to note, that if you make an insufficient bid, not to attempt to explain the bid or why you made the insufficient bid (“oops, I didn't see the overcall”) unless specifically asked by the TD.

**Dummy spreads his hand** in columns as before, but now it is now obligatory that the lowest ranked cards are towards declarer.

**“No hearts, Partner?”:** Declarer may ask a defender if he has a card of the suit led, and dummy may ask declarer but not a defender. The big change is that now defenders are allowed to ask declarer and also each other.

The automatic two trick transfer for an established revoke only applies when the revoker has won the revoke trick. Only one trick is transferred for other revokes subject to rectification. All this provided that the revoker has won trick/s after the revoke. The TD will still transfer more than the automatic transfer if the revoker has gained more by his revoke.

**“That was our trick!”:** A defender or dummy may draw attention to an incorrectly pointed trick, but only until the first card of the next trick is played. However, declarer may also draw attention to previous tricks incorrectly pointed.

**Shuffle your hand:** Before returning the cards to the board each player should count his cards and shuffle them.

**Change of call:** You are no longer allowed to change a call made intentionally, even if there was a “slip of the mind.” Under certain conditions you may change an unintended call (like pulling a wrong bidding card.)

**“Of course partner will keep the high spade”:** A defender should not claim based on his partner playing or not playing a specific card or cards from alternative normal choices.

The new laws now make it a little easier to withdraw an agreement to an opponent’s claim even after the round has ended.

**Special Partnership Understanding (SPU):** The term “convention” is no longer defined or used. Instead we have the concept of an SPU, which is a call whose meaning may not be readily understood or anticipated by a significant number of players. Unlike a convention, a SPU can also include natural bids, and regulating authorities are given broad powers to restrict the use of SPUs in a particular tournament.



Danish girls: Signe Buus Thomsen and Anna Christa Raulund Ege.

## The youngest ever in Denmark

By Peter Ventura

Anna Christa Raulund Ege, 13 years young, and Signe Buus Thomsen, 16 years, last week won the Danish Women Pairs.

In the final they outplayed 47 pairs containing players that could have been their mothers (in fact, one was) or grandmothers. The victory made them the youngest pair winning a Danish championship ever. Moreover, this was Anna Christa’s second gold in a Danish Championship. Just a few months ago she was crowned with the gold medal in the Danish Gymnastic Mixed Teams Championships.

Here in Wrocław the young Danish pair is playing in the Girls and your editor had a chat with them.

**Editor:** What are your expectations in these Championships?

**Danish girls:** We hope to reach the A-final on Friday.

**Editor:** And if you will make it to the A-final, how are your chances there?

**Danish girls:** It is difficult to say, but we will take it from there.

**Editor:** Do you enjoy playing Junior events more than Open ditto?

**Danish girls:** Yes.

**Editor:** Why?

**Danish girls:** Simply because it is more fun to meet other youngsters.

**Editor:** Have you participated in other Junior events.

**Danish girls:** Two years ago we were playing the Junior Pairs in Slovakia and last year we were in the Danish Girls squad in Lido di Jesolo. Earlier this year we played the Nordic Junior Championships in Sweden.

**Editor:** What do you know about Poland?

**Danish girls:** They have many very talented bridge players here. Compared to Denmark, where we have only a few young players, in Poland the game of bridge is very popular amongst the young population.

**Editor:** Finally, have you spotted any cute boys here in these Championships so far?

**Danish girls:** NO – not yet anyway... But we are still looking...



Irene Baroni, Italy.

## Watch out for the 'Bad-Ass'

By Peter Ventura

I am not sure if one of our contestants, Irene Baroni, has any relationship with 'The New York Bad-Ass' Phil Baroni, who has fought in the Ultimate Fighting Championship where he holds a record. He has developed a reputation for his boxing ability and knockout power. If there is a connection between Phil and Irene – be aware... In fact, the last time we saw her she was equipped with crutches...

However, here in Wrocław the Italian Pair of Irene Baroni and Alberto Sangiorgio kicked off slowly.

They were in the Italian silver squad last year in Lido di Jesolo, Italy, where the 21<sup>st</sup> European Youth Team Championships were played. At that time they were the sixth best pair in the Butler. Your editor put on the kneepads and followed the Italian pair during the first session.

In the very first board Baroni held this hand:

♠ K 8 7 5 3  
♥ 8 5 3  
♦ 5  
♣ 10 6 5 3

She listened to the following auction:

West	North	East	South
Sangiorgio	Betley	Baroni	Sikora
	1 ♠	Pass	2 NT*
4 ♦	4 ♥	All Pass	

\* 2 NT = Invitational with spade support and a shortness somewhere



Alberto Sangiorgio, Italy.

What is your lead?

Despite the fact North/South were playing in hearts, this was easy for Baroni. She only had to lead a spade for partner to ruff, since the opponents must have eight spades together. This was the whole layout – and it certainly not the one Baroni had expected:

### BOARD 1

N/None

♠ AQ1092  
♥ AKQ107  
♦ 10  
♣ 74

♠ J64	♠ K8753
♥ J4	♥ 853
♦ AKJ8432	♦ 5
♣ K	♣ 10653

♠  
♥ 962  
♦ Q976  
♣ AQJ982

Declarer won the opening lead in hand and eventually scored eleven tricks.

Baroni called for the Tournament Director and made a reservation concerning the auction. However, TD made no adjustment since the explanation was correct according to the convention card.

At most tables declarer emerged with ten tricks after a diamond lead.

An overtrick in 4♥ was nearly a top for the Polish pair, Betley/Sikora scored 97%.

## BOARD 2

E/NS

♠ 62  
♥ Q62  
♦ K9863  
♣ K83

♠ KQJ7  
♥ AK109  
♦ –  
♣ AQ764

♠ A105  
♥ J87  
♦ AQJ2  
♣ J92

♠ 9843  
♥ 543  
♦ 10754  
♣ 105

West	North	East	South
<i>Sangiorgio</i>	<i>Betley</i>	<i>Baroni</i>	<i>Sikora</i>
		1 NT	Pass
2 ♣	Pass	2 ♦	Pass
3 ♣	Pass	3 ♦	Pass
3 ♥	Pass	3 ♠	Pass
4 ♣	Pass	4 ♦	Pass
4 NT	Pass	6 ♣	Pass
6 NT	All Pass		

INT was 12-14 and after the Stayman sequence 3♣ was natural and 3♦, 3♥ and 3♠ showed values. 4♣ invited to

slam, 4♦ was a cue bid and 4NT asked for more information. Despite the void in diamonds Sangiorgio bid 6NT, knowing they were playing matchpoints. This time, the diamond void in dummy was the reason why declarer was doomed to go down. She could not either take any diamond finesse or squeeze North, so there were no more than eleven tricks and that was down one for 40% to the Italians.

This was not the best start for Baroni/Sangiorgio scoring close to 20% after the first round. Two average boards followed and on board 5 the Italians were lucky not to be doubled.

## BOARD 5

N/NS

♠ J95  
♥ AJ10  
♦ 986  
♣ J1052

♠ K103  
♥ Q976  
♦ J105  
♣ 987

♠ Q762  
♥ K85  
♦ A72  
♣ K64

♠ A84  
♥ 432  
♦ KQ43  
♣ AQ3

West	North	East	South
<i>Sangiorgio</i>	<i>Imsa</i>	<i>Baroni</i>	<i>Lauks</i>
	Pass	1 NT	All Pass

Here North/South missed a nice opportunity to double INT. Neither Adrians Imsa nor Lauks bothered to take a look at the opponents' conventions card, so they did not notice the weak no-trump opening. When they found out that the no-trump showed 12-14 – after the play – the Latvians called for the Tournament Director, claiming that West had not alerted. That was true.

However, the TD promptly replied: 'Did you not listen to the announcement some minutes ago, where you were told that weak no-trump openings must no longer be alerted due to the new law of bridge?'

Obviously the Latvians had not.

'Bad luck for us', they said.

Declarer went there off for a 47%-board. 53% must have been more than the Latvians would have expected.

Board 6 to 9 were not that exciting, Baroni/Sangiorgio scored average more or less. Then came:

## BOARD 10

E/All

♠ –  
♥ AJ9865  
♦ KQ94  
♣ K63

♠ A43	♠ KQJ96
♥ K1043	♥ Q
♦ J86	♦ A753
♣ 1097	♣ A84

♠ 108752  
♥ 72  
♦ 102  
♣ QJ52

West	North	East	South
Sangiorgio	Skorchev	Baroni	Vasilev
2♥*	3♥	1♠	Pass
		Dble	All Pass

2♥ showed either a weak hand with spade support or game forcing with diamonds. The double was for takeout. Sangiorgio hoped for 200 and passed.

East led her singleton heart queen to the ace and then declarer played a club to the queen, which held the trick. At this point declarer erred by playing the only card that gave the defence the chance to set the contract – the seven of hearts. West and North played

low and next came the diamond ten, to jack, king and ace. Declarer ruffed the spade return, and then played the king of clubs, correctly ducked by East, and another club to East's ace. This was the position:

♠ –	
♥ J98	
♦ K94	
♣ –	
♠ A4	♠ QJ9
♥ K10	♥ –
♦ 86	♦ 753
♣ –	♣ –
	♠ 10875
	♥ –
	♦ 2
	♣ J

Baroni now played a spade. This was exactly what Skorchev needed – to shorten his trump length. He could ruff and was now down to the same trump length as West, and then cashed two diamond tricks and exited with the last diamond. West had to give away a heart trick to declarer. 3♥ doubled was just made and that was N/S +730 and 96% for them.

If Baroni would have played a diamond instead, West always will have two trump tricks.

This was a very disappointing start for the Baroni/Sangiorgio as they kicked off very slowly. The good news was that there were still 50 boards to play in order to reach a qualifying spot.

## The U26 second session

by Jos Jacobs

After 10 boards, Cerek and Kaya from Turkey were proudly leading the field with a score of over 74%. Even when you take into account they only played 10 boards, this still is a fine performance. So I went to their table (they were sitting NS) to try and find out where their good scores were coming from.

When I saw board 20, I began to understand a little more:

**BOARD 20**

W/All

♠ –  
♥ 96  
♦ K1097643  
♣ AQ73

♠ AKQ4  
♥ K875  
♦ A  
♣ K842

♠ 8652  
♥ Q4  
♦ Q85  
♣ J1095

♠ J10973  
♥ AJ1032  
♦ J2  
♣ 6

West	North	East	South
Zepic	Cerek	Stanicic	Kaya
1♣	3♦	Pass	Pass
Dble	Pass	4♣	Pass
5♣	All Pass		

The leaders did not double the final contract which suggests they are not only talented bridge players but nice people too. The defence was impeccable, however: ♦10 lead to the ace, heart to the queen and ace, spade ruffed and ♦K which declarer had to ruff. Declarer now ruffed a heart and cashed the ♦Q which was ruffed by South with his singleton trump. Declarer overruffed and ruffed his last heart before playing a trump frok dummy. When South showed out, the roof fell in. North won, cashed the ♣A and forced declarer with another diamond. Down 5, +500 to the leaders.

Against one of the many Polish pairs here, Bob Drijver had a better idea: he overcalled 1♣ with 4♦ as he was fearing opponents would have a game in a major. He soon found out he was wrong (when dummy came down...) but when East did not find the virtually impossible trump lead but led a club instead, he immediately seized his chance.

♣QA and a club ruff, spade ruff, club ruff, another spade ruff and now a low diamond from hand, to prevent any trump promotion. Losing one heart and two trumps brought an even better score for NS here: +710.

Michal Kopecky found a surprising way to end up in the best contract on board 11:

**BOARD 11**

S/None

♠ A102  
♥ J3  
♦ J642  
♣ A1074

♠ J97653  
♥ 9  
♦ AK3  
♣ J62

♠ Q  
♥ AQ10854  
♦ Q98  
♣ Q8

♠ K84  
♥ K76  
♦ 1075  
♣ K953

West	North	East	South
Macura	Cerek	Kopecky	Kaya
			Pass
2♠	Pass	3♣	Pass
3♥	All Pass		

2♠ showed 5+ spades, 9-13 hcp and no fourcard hearts or fivecard minor. 3♣ was GF relay without trump support and 3♥ showed the singleton in the suit Kopecky was hoping for.

Just made, +140 to EW and a 65% score.

On the next board, EW were on their way to more than all the matchpoints when, all of a sudden, they had to be content with just 93%.

## BOARD 12

W/NS

♠ AQ62

♥ QJ6

♦ 6

♣ 65432

♠ J975

♥ 1095

♦ A4

♣ KJ109

♠ 103

♥ AK8742

♦ K109

♣ Q8

♠ K84

♥ 3

♦ QJ87532

♣ A7

West	North	East	South
<i>Macura</i>	<i>Cerek</i>	<i>Kopecky</i>	<i>Kaya</i>
Pass	Pass	2♥	3♦
3♥	3NT	Pass	Pass
Dble	All Pass		

2♥ showed about the same as 2♠ on the previous board. Four Diamonds would probably have gone one

off for either a magic +200 or a very poor +100 to EW. When nobody ran, a massacre was impending but the defence stopped halfway. East led three rounds of hearts (the ♥7 at the third round) and declarer went on to play ♥A and another. West rose with the king, swallowing his partner's queen and first cashed the ♦A. On the two clubs, East discarded the ♦10 and ♠10 but West, instead of continuing diamonds, led a low spade in spite of the discouraging signal. This meant down only two instead of six; 1700 thus was reduced to only 500. At pairs, things like this don't cost many mp...

On board 15, Rokas Blazeivicius from Lithuania played well but to no avail:

## BOARD 15

S/NS

♠ J8

♥ 8542

♦ 86

♣ KQ1093

♠ AKQ765

♥ K7

♦ A104

♣ 85

♠ 9

♥ AQ1093

♦ 73

♣ A7642

♠ 10432

♥ J6

♦ KQJ952

♣ J

West	North	East	South
<i>Vitkauskas</i>	<i>Cerek</i>	<i>Blazevicius</i>	<i>Kaya</i>
			Pass
1♠	Pass	2♥	Pass
3♠	Pass	3NT	All Pass



North leads the  $\diamond$ K and continues the suit. What now? Declarer decided to duck once more, having already given up the small chance of making all the tricks. On the 3<sup>rd</sup> diamond, North shows out. Next, you cash three top spades and find out that South holds four spades as well. Now, cashing the  $\heartsuit$ K and leading low to the ten is odds-on... Down three and +150 more for the leaders, another very good score.

### Qualification U26, session 3.

by Kees Tammens (coach, Netherlands)

Kibitzing a junior pairs event is amazing, funny and sometimes depressing. In this new format of short sessions of 10 boards with small breaks it seems even more exciting because you would discuss the boards just played during those breaks. I was wondering if the tactics and strategy would differ from longer sessions of 30 boards. Maybe, someone will have an answer after this championship.

I have to admit to be mainly following the juniors but seeing U21 and Girls in full-blooded action is a pure joy. So after 20 of the 60 boards many of the participants are looking at the leaderboard to find out about their chances for a semifinal berth. I believe this format is creating finals on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.

There we go again, here is board 26:

### BOARD 26 sess. 3

E/All

$\spadesuit$  K8653

$\heartsuit$  3

$\diamond$  1042

$\clubsuit$  A1098

$\spadesuit$  1074

$\heartsuit$  Q74

$\diamond$  AQ3

$\clubsuit$  7542

$\spadesuit$  J9

$\heartsuit$  K1062

$\diamond$  KJ65

$\clubsuit$  K63

$\spadesuit$  AQ2

$\heartsuit$  AJ985

$\diamond$  987

$\clubsuit$  QJ

West	North	East	South
		Pass	1 $\heartsuit$
Pass	Pass	?	

I would never allow them to play at the one-level so 1NT seemed to automatic bid. Dennis Stuurman of The Netherlands, however, thought too many spades were missing and, looking at the vulnerability, he passed. Right he was when declarer scrambled home with 7 tricks but a humble mp score as compared to the 140 available in spades.

A few boards later, Frank Visser showed courage and played skilfully to land his 3 $\spadesuit$  contract::

**BOARD 23 sess. 3**

S/All

♠ 6  
 ♥ AK965  
 ♦ AJ83  
 ♣ Q92

♠ K1093  
 ♥ Q104  
 ♦ KQ62  
 ♣ A10

♠ Q842  
 ♥ J873  
 ♦ 107  
 ♣ K65

♠ AJ75  
 ♥ 2  
 ♦ 954  
 ♣ J8743

West	North	East	South
Visser	Szymaszczyk	Stuurman	Butryn
INT	2♥	Dble	Pass
2♠	Pass	Pass	3♥
3♠	All Pass		

North led the ♥A and continued the suit. Visser ran this to his queen, throwing a diamond from dummy. The ♦K went to the ace and a low spade went to declarer's nine. The last heart was ruffed, the ♦Q and ♣A cashed and a club was led, won by South's king. South returned a club, ruffed by declarer who next ruffed another with the ace. A club was ruffed and overruffed with the ten and the last diamond was ruffed with the jack. South could overruff but declarer had made nine tricks.

On board 21, scoring -590 was worth about 33%:

**BOARD 21, sess. 3**

N/N S

♠ J952  
 ♥ 6  
 ♦ KQJ985  
 ♣ 109

♠ A1087  
 ♥ AK10832  
 ♦ A  
 ♣ K6

♠ 3  
 ♥ 974  
 ♦ 107642  
 ♣ 7432

♠ KQ64  
 ♥ QJ5  
 ♦ 3  
 ♣ AQJ85

Many South players could not refuse the opportunity given to them and thus doubled 4♥ only to learn that this could not be beaten. Careful defence holds it to ten tricks...

On the next board, Drijver-Groenenboom found a cheap save:

**BOARD 22 sess. 3**

E/EW

♠ 1085

♥ 5

♦ 1085432

♣ AJ8

♠ KJ9743

♥ Q10942

♦ 6

♣ K

♠ A

♥ AKJ876

♦ J7

♣ Q1042

♠ Q62

♥ 3

♦ AKQ9

♣ 97653

West	North	East	South
Clacey	Drijver	Angus	Groenenboom
		I♥	Dble
4♥	5♦	All Pass	

This went down three for 76% to NS. Had EW doubled, it would have brought them just 10% extra...

**The First Mini-Session****By Patrick Jourdain (Wales)**

The first international event to be played without screens under the 2007 Laws, and the first European Youth Pairs to have separate events for Under 26 Girls and Under 21, began with a field of ?? pairs in the U26.

Your reporter chose to follow the ten boards of the first mini-session at the table where Jacob Hop, 23, and Vincent de Pagter, 22, of the Netherlands were stationary. The pair was part of the Dutch team that won the gold medal in the last EBL Youth Teams in Lido di Jesolo.

For the first two boards they had been drawn against the Ellison brothers from Scotland but the brothers were one of the few “no-show”s of the event, so the Tournament Directors transferred a pair from another section. This proved to be Milan Macura & Michal Kopecky of the Czech Republic who had represented their country in Jesolo.

The table began with Board 3, and I will keep the narrative in that order. The auction had several points of interest:

**BOARD 3**

S/EW

♠ K4  
♥ Q87  
♦ AK72  
♣ A753

♠ 1085  
♥ AK106  
♦ J1095  
♣ K6

♠ A973  
♥ 5  
♦ 8643  
♣ QJ82

♠ QJ62  
♥ J9432  
♦ Q  
♣ 1094

West	North	East	South
<i>Macura</i>	<i>de Pagter</i>	<i>Kopecky</i>	<i>Hop</i>
			Pass
INT	Dble	Redbl	2♣
Pass	2♦	Pass	2♥
All Pass			

The Czech pair's system was called EHAA (Every Hand an Adventure). Macura's opening INT showed 12-14. de Pagter's double could be on as little as 13 points. East's redouble showed clubs and at least one other suit.

Hop wanted to play in a major suit so he began with a forcing bid and then bid a natural 2♥ over North's natural 2♦. De Pagter gave this considerable

thought as he was not sure whether his partner had been trying to create a forcing situation but it was pairs where the games are not as important as in teams and he chose to Pass.

This is the winning decision in the sense that a club lead from West can hold declarer to eight tricks because of the blockage in the diamond suit. However, the Dutch would have survived a raise to Three Hearts as West led ♦J.

Hop won the lead in hand and led a spade to the king and ace. East switched to a low club, won in dummy, and the two top diamonds disposed of South's losing clubs. Hop ruffed a club, cashed two top spades, and followed with his last spade. On this West correctly discarded his last diamond. Declarer was able to make a small trump, but still had to lose three trump tricks to West.

3♥+1 was 89% for North-South.

**Board 4**

W/All

♠ QJ974	♠ 85
♥ KJ	♥ 9654
♦ K103	♦ 42
♣ J83	♣ Q10942
♠ K10	♠ A632
♥ AQ87	♥ 1032
♦ Q975	♦ AJ86
♣ A76	♣ K5

West	North	East	South
<i>Macura</i>	<i>de Pagter</i>	<i>Kopecky</i>	<i>Hop</i>
1♦	1♠	Pass	2NT
Pass	3♠	All Pass	

1♦ was alerted as possibly short. 2NT by South showed a 4-card spade raise, at least invitational, and North signed off.

East led a diamond which was ducked round to North's ten. A trump finesse lost and the low heart switch gave declarer a worry, but he could not guess wrong. When the king won declarer drew another round of trumps, tested the diamonds, and when they did not break ruffed the fourth round. He then exited with a heart. Macura had been correctly counting declarer's shape so knew it was safe to exit with a high heart. Declarer ruffed but had to open up the clubs himself and so Three Spades just made, a very common result one would expect.

The next pair to arrive at the table was one of the best known Polish Junior pairs, Piotr Wiankowski & Michal Nowosadzki, who had also represented their country in Jesolo.

**Board 5**

N/NS

♠ J95  
♥ AJ10  
♦ 986  
♣ J1052

♠ K103  
♥ Q976  
♦ J105  
♣ 987

♠ Q762  
♥ K85  
♦ A72  
♣ K64

♠ A84  
♥ 432  
♦ KQ43  
♣ AQ3

West	North	East	South
<i>Wiankowski</i>	<i>de Pagter</i>	<i>Nowosadzki</i>	<i>Hop</i>
	Pass	1♣	Dble
1♦	INT	All Pass	

East opened a Polish Club and West's response showed hearts. de Pagter bid what must have been the most popular contract throughout the field. In teams this board would be of no importance but in Pairs the battle for overtricks can be as important as making a slam.

East led a heart to the queen and ace. The jack of clubs won the next trick and the defence gave a Smith Peter rather than count. De Pagter was unsure whether he should use his penultimate lead from hand

to take another club finesse, or to use it to lead towards dummy's diamond honours.

In practice he chose to lead a diamond to the king and then cashed the club ace and cleared the suit. He now knew he had unnecessarily lost a club trick, but may be it had made no difference. The defence switched to spades, won by West's king, and then West continued with the ten. Declarer covered, winning in dummy, and set up his heart trick. However, this was won by West who cleared the third round of spades. This meant declarer had a heart and club to cash, but when he played the second diamond, East had the ace and a winning spade to cash.



Eight tricks was about average on the board, but declarer can make nine if he concentrates on the clubs.

Suppose after three rounds of clubs declarer plays a top diamond from the dummy. Then the defence can set up a heart trick, but declarer can cash the last club and establish a second diamond trick before the defence have made a spade. Declarer makes four clubs, four red tricks and the spade ace.

## Board 6

E/EW

♠ AJ6  
♥ 52  
♦ A62  
♣ KJ832

♠ K942

♠ Q108

♥ AK

♥ QJ8643

♦ KJ8

♦ 743

♣ A1097

♣ 6

♠ 753

♥ 1097

♦ Q1095

♣ Q54

West	North	East	South
<i>Wiankowski</i>	<i>de Pagter</i>	<i>Nowosadzki</i>	<i>Hop</i>
		Pass	Pass
1♣	Pass	2♥	Pass
4♥	All Pass		

The Polish Club was followed by a weak jump response. (Yes, a Passed hand in Polish can contain a weak Two in a major because the opening Two bids are two-suited.) West raised to the universally popular game.

This deal hinges on the jack of spades. Hop, South, led the nine of diamonds (zero or two higher). The jack fetched the ace and another diamond removed dummy's king. Declarer unblocked the hearts and led a spade to the queen at once.

The queen of spades held, the last trump was drawn, but then the spade finesse lost. The defence cashed another diamond and made the ace of spades for one off.

Declarer could have delayed the spade decision but to no obvious advantage. His actual line gave the chance of an overtrick when South has the jack of spades, and North holds the ace and only two diamonds.

The next pair to arrive was Vaidotas Vitkauskas & Rokas Blazeivicius of Lithuania. The first deal must have been played in a heart partscore making nine tricks at almost every table so let us move on to Board 8:

### Board 8

W/None

♠ 109  
♥ Q7543  
♦ 63  
♣ Q972

♠ KQ72  
♥ A109  
♦ AKQ5  
♣ 63

♠ J543  
♥ KJ82  
♦ 1092  
♣ 104

♠ A86  
♥ 6  
♦ J874  
♣ AKJ85

This deal is an exercise in bidding.

Seven Diamonds makes fairly easily and the Daily Bulletin would like to see the auction of any pair that reached it.

So far, we've found two of them already:

### Groenenboom Drijver

1♦	2♣
2♦	2♥
2NT	3♣
3♥	3♠
3NT	4♣
4♦	4♥
4♠	4NT
5♦	5♥
5♠	6♣
7♦	Pass

2♣ showed diamonds, inverted, and 2♥ was relay. 2NT then was 18-19. The three-level was used for showing stoppers, as slam was not an issue yet. Over 3NT we saw some cuebids and 5♥ asked for the trump queen, confirming the presence of all aces. 5♠ showed the king of that suit as well and 6♣ asked for 3<sup>rd</sup> round control of that suit. Well done.

Bessis Volcker

1♦ 2♣  
 2NT 3♦  
 3♠ 4♥  
 4NT 5♥ (Dble)  
 5NT 6♣  
 7♦ Pass

2NT was either 12-14 or 18-19 but it did no longer matter once Volcker showed his heart control . The ♣K was all Bessis needed after RKC. Well done, too and...a shorter auction.

The most popular slam was probably Six Notrumps. Superficially this is beaten by a heart lead, but declarer's spade pips are just good enough to pick up four tricks in the suit. Suppose declarer ducks the heart lead, wins the next heart throwing a diamond from the East hand and takes the club finesse. When the suit does not break he throws a heart from hand, cashes four diamonds throwing a club from dummy, and then tests the spades: king (unblock the eight), low to the ace and a third spade, the six. South follows small and the key moment has arrived. North is known to have the last club. If you can read him for a heart as well, then a finesse of the seven of spades will bring home the slam.

At the table where your reporter was seated the Lithuanians were playing a 15-18 notrump and they bid unopposed:

1NT-2♠; 3♣-6♣; Pass

2♠ was a transfer and 3♣ showed 17-18 points without any comment on the strength of West's trump support.

Six Clubs has one advantage over 6NT. It is a simple make whatever the lead.

Next up was a Romanian pair, Andrei Sechelea & Lavinia Constantin. Their unopposed auction on Board 9 revealed a difference of opinion about the final bid in this sequence:

**BOARD 9**

N/EW

♠ Q987  
 ♥ A76  
 ♦ K65  
 ♣ J86

♠ A43	♠ KJ5
♥ 10	♥ K9853
♦ QJ109	♦ 743
♣ KQ742	♣ A9
♠ 1062	
♥ QJ42	
♦ A82	
♣ 1053	

1♥-1NT; 2♦-3♣; Pass

1♥ showed five, 1NT was a forcing relay (they play 2 over 1 game force), and 2♦ was better minor.

Responder, who held a good 12 points and 3-1-4-5 shape, intended 3♣ as forcing but opener, quite



reasonably in my opinion, interpreted it as a weak hand with long clubs and passed.

The good news for them was that 3NT actually looks a poor contract, the more important bad news was the cards lay well for declarer and the normal notrump contract makes an easy nine tricks.

As luck would have it on the next deal they did bid game only to run into a 5-0 trump break against them:

## Board 10

E/All

♠ –  
♥ AJ9865  
♦ KQ94  
♣ K63

♠ 108752  
♥ 72  
♦ 102  
♣ QJ52

♠ A43  
♥ K1043  
♦ J86  
♣ 1097

♠ KQJ96  
♥ Q  
♦ A753  
♣ A84

West	North	East	South
<i>Sechelea</i>	<i>de Pagter</i>	<i>Constantin</i>	<i>Hop</i>
		1♠	Pass
2♠	3♥	4♠	All Pass

The raise to 2♠ showed three-card support with about 7-10 points. East's jump to game over north's Three Hearts, looks a little ambitious to me. Double, where there is no room to make any other game try, should be just that.

In fact North can make Three Hearts so declarer would have been happy to lose 100. Double dummy the defence can hold declarer to seven tricks but in the real world South led a heart. North won and switched to a club. Declarer let the jack win and took the second club. When she cashed a top trump from hand, North showed out.

Declarer cashed two more trumps ending in dummy, made the top heart, throwing a club, and ruffed a club to make her nine of spades. This added up to eight tricks but as declarer was vulnerable that was still a good score for the Dutch of +200.

But can 3♥ be made? You can so easily go down, as was proved when Drijver-Groenenboom played Guła-Stefanów:

West	North	East	South
Groenenboom	Stefanów	Drijver	Guła
		1♠	Pass
2♠	3♥	Dble	All Pass

Double was of course a game try for 4♠, as suggested earlier. Groenenboom however quite happily sat it and Drijver led a top spade, ruffed by declarer. The ♦Q won the next trick and a low club went to dummy's queen. The ♦10 was covered by jack, king and ace and another spade came back, declarer ruffing again. Michal now cashed his ♦9 and ruffed the last diamond with dummy's ♥7, West overruffing with the ten. Another spade was ruffed in hand and a club came next, East winning his ace. Now west could throw his last club on the 4<sup>th</sup> round of spades and thus declarer had to go one down for the magic +200 to the Dutch.

The last round of the mini-session saw a return to Boards 1 & 2 with Vjekoslav Zepic & Ognjen Stanicic of Croatia in the East-West seats:

**Board 1**

N/none

♠ AQ1092

♥ AKQ107

♦ 10

♣ 74

♠ J64

♥ J4

♦ AKJ8432

♣ K

♠ K8753

♥ 853

♦ 5

♣ 10653

♠

♥ 962

♦ Q976

♣ AQJ982

West	North	East	South
Vjekoslav	de Pagter	Stanicic	Hop
	1♠	Pass	3♣
3♦	3♥	Pass	4♥
All Pass			

Hop's 3♣ response was invitational with at least six clubs. He gave some thought to Passing 3♥, but knowing partner was likely to have five he eventually raised to game.

East led a diamond to West's jack and then came the ace.

De Pagter gave this a long look but as East could well have doubleton decided to ruff low. East over-ruffed and led a club. The finesse lost to the bare king but when West led another high diamond declarer ruffed high, drew trumps in two rounds, and was able to ruff out the clubs and return with a spade ruff to enjoy the last two clubs and ten tricks.

It was galling to find twelve tricks can be made if declarer guesses both hearts and clubs, but I suspect ten tricks was normal enough.

At another table, Thomas Bessis was defending as West after exactly the same auction. Frédéric Volcker led his diamond, Thomas winning the jack and returning an innocent-looking trump. Declarer won the ace and unsuccessfully finessed the ♣Q. Bessis returned the ♦2, ruffed with the seven and overruffed with the eight. Volcker returned a club, declarer put up the ace only to see it ruffed by Bessis. Another diamond was ruffed high but with the entry in clubs gone, declarer could ruff some spades in dummy but had to lose the last spade to East's king for down two!

At yet another table, declarer put in the ♣9 when a club was returned for west to ruff and thus escaped for one down, the 3<sup>rd</sup> heart being the entry to enjoy the remaining clubs.



The mini-session for the Dutch pair ended with perhaps the most talked-about deal of the set:

## Board 2

E/NS

♠	KQJ7	♠	A105
♥	AK109	♥	J87
♦	—	♦	AQJ2
♣	AQ764	♣	J92
♠	62		
♥	D62		
♦	K9863		
♣	K83		
♠	9843		
♥	543		
♦	10754		
♣	105		

West	North	East	South
Vjekoslav	de Pagter	Stanicic	Hop
		1♣	Pass
2♣	Pass	2NT	Pass
3♣	Pass	3♦	Pass
3♥	Pass	3♠	Pass
6♣	All Pass		

East's 1♣ was Polish style and West's 2♣ was natural and game-forcing. East's 2NT showed a weak notrump

hand with no major. West now knew he had no major suit fit. Furthermore in Polish Club, with a weak notrump hand and five diamonds the opening is 1♦. So if this pair had the same agreement West now knew the opener had at least three clubs.

West duly set clubs as trumps and the next three bids merely showed values in the suit bid.



With the heart finesse losing a passive lead against Six Clubs or Six Notrumps can hold declarer to 11 tricks. However, playing third and fifth leads South led the five of diamonds. Declarer threw a heart from dummy and it mattered not what North did. Another heart was going on the second diamond winner and declarer lost only a club. The Dutch had a score of -1370, perhaps their worst matchpoint score of the ten. They finished with ?? for the session.

## Qualification U26, session 4.

by Jos Jacobs

The big question in session 4 was if the halftime leaders Cerek and Kaya would be able to keep up with the pace set by the best placed Polish pair of Artur Guła and Michał Stefanów.

On board 2, they managed to produce another setback for the Italian mixed pair of Baroni and Sangiorgio as this was the layout:

**BOARD 2**

E/NS

♠ AKQ10853

♥ AQ10

♦ K

♣ KJ

♠ 94

♥ 652

♦ QJ874

♣ 1083

♠ J2

♥ J9873

♦ 1053

♣ A96

♠ 76

♥ K4

♦ A962

♣ Q7542

West	North	East	South
<i>Sangiorgio</i>	<i>Guła</i>	<i>Baroni</i>	<i>Stefanów</i>
		Pass	Pass
Pass	1♣	1♥	1♠
2♥	6NT	All Pass	

1♠ was a transfer to INT, showing basically the same hand type and denying four spades. Knowing his partner was likely to hold the ♥K, Guła did not bother about possibly missing two aces and left everybody in the dark with his direct jump. This worked even more to his advantage when he won the heart lead with the ace, unblocked the ♦K and next ran the ♣J. When this held, he cashed the ♠A and claimed all 13 tricks.

This good board proved the overture to a series of five boards on which their opponents made mistake after mistake (not worth showing) so it did not come as a big surprise to see them at the top of the table after 40 boards.

They gave their future opponents some hope, however, as this was board 9:

**BOARD 9**

N/EW

♠ QJ76

♥ KQJ

♦ 984

♣ QJ3

♠ 98

♥ 8432

♦ AQ73

♣ AK6

♠ 54

♥ 10965

♦ J62

♣ 10982

♠ AK1032

♥ A7

♦ K105

♣ 754

West	North	East	South
<i>Gogoman</i>	<i>Guła</i>	<i>Islam</i>	<i>Stefanów</i>
	1♣	Pass	1♠
Dble	2♠	Pass	4♠
All Pass			

Well, this is a pretty normal contract and if you go down one, you will score just under average. When I was looking at the board, however, I wondered if NS might be able to end up in 3NT in view of the double by West. As you can see, there is no defence against 3NT...In fact, even without the double 3NT seems a better place to be.

## The last train to the semifinals

by Kees Tammens

Gerbrand Hop and Aarnout Helmich made it to the semis on their last board of the day. They were playing Turkey's Cerek and Kaya who had been leading the field for most part of the day. Here is that board:

West	North	East	South
G. Hop	Cerek	Helmich	Kaya
1♠	Dble	2♠	Pass
Pass	Dble	Pass	3♦
Pass	Pass	3♠	4♣
Dble	4♦	Dble	All Pass

The usual partscore battle drove the bidding to the four-level and, of course, the double was automatic. The defence was merciless. ♠A, club to the ace and ♦7 to king and ace. As it happened, this gave declarer the impression that he could pick up the trumps by finessing through west again. So he ruffed a spade and took a diamond finesse, losing to the jack for down one and the magic +200 for all the matchpoints to EW. By the way, topscore in NS was 4♥ making.

### BOARD 28

W/NS

♠ J96

♥ AKQ3

♦ AQ108

♣ 95

♠ AK732

♥ 965

♦ K2

♣ KJ7

♠ Q854

♥ 1084

♦ J7

♣ A1032

♠ 10

♥ J72

♦ 96543

♣ Q864



### Qualification U26 Results

#	PAIR	CNTRY	C/O	RESULT	TOTAL
1	ARTUR GULA MICHAL STEFANOW	POL	59.82	59.36	59.59
2	STEFAN SKORCHEV NIKOLAY VASILEV	BUL	56.80	59.80	58.30
3	JACCO HOP VINCENT DE PAGTER	NED	54.27	59.56	56.92
4	QUENTIN LEVOY LANDRY ANDREA	FRA	54.81	58.97	56.89
5	DANNY MOLENAAR TIM VERBEEK	NED	56.17	57.55	56.86
6	MICHAL KOPECKY MILAN MACURA	CZE	56.66	56.62	56.64
7	ANDREA MANNO EUGENIO MISTRETTA	ITA	51.62	60.83	56.23
8	MUHARREM CEREK EMRE KAYA	TRK	61.07	50.64	55.85
9	MICHAL NOWOSADZKI	POL	57.51	54.12	55.82
10	MATEUSZ GACKOWSKI	POL	49.53	60.25	54.89
11	DENNIS STUURMAN	NED	55.25	53.87	54.56
12	ARRIGO FRANCHI MATTEO MONTANARI	ITA	55.26	53.68	54.47
13	CHRISTOPHE GROSSET	FRA	48.55	59.56	54.06
14	OGNJEN STANICIC VJEKOSLAV ZEPIC	CRO	43.90	63.04	53.47
15	PRZEMYSŁAW PIOTROWSKI	POL	54.47	52.01	53.24
16	PIOTR NAWROCKI JAN SIKORA	POL	51.30	55.05	53.18
17	PETERIS BETHERS JURIJS BALASOVŠ	LAT	53.89	52.25	53.07
18	MASSIMILIANO DI FRANCO	ITA	57.03	49.07	53.05
19	ALEXANDRE KILANI	FRA	54.78	51.08	52.93
20	RALUCA DOBRESCU	ROM	45.94	59.66	52.80
21	LAURIS LAUKS ADRIANS IMSA	LAT	54.15	50.54	51.93

22	KAROL GALAZKA	PIOTR KRUSZEWSKI	POL	45.15	58.58	51.86
23	WOJCIECH GAWEL	PIOTR ZATORSKI	POL	47.15	56.47	51.81
24	KONSTANTINOS DOXIADIS	KONSTANTINOS KONTOMITROS	GRE	51.18	52.40	51.79
25	BOB DRIJVER	MERIJN GROENENBOOM	NED	55.51	47.70	51.60
26	JANIS BETHERS	MARTINS LORENCIS	LAT	50.80	52.16	51.48
27	NICOLAS LHUISSIER	AYMERIC LEBATTEUX	FRA	48.34	53.87	51.11
28	PIOTR BUTRYN	PAWEL SZYMASZCZYK	POL	51.55	50.39	50.97
29	THOMAS BESSIS	FREDERIC VOLCKER	FRA	53.55	47.94	50.75
30	MARIA WÜRMSEER	RAFFAEL BRAUN	GER	46.30	55.15	50.72
31	PAUL KAUTNY	RICHARD BINA	AUT	52.25	47.75	50.00
32	JAN BETLEY	MACIEJ SIKORA	POL	55.79	43.97	49.88
33	AARNOUT HELMICH	GERBRAND HOP	NED	47.62	52.01	49.81
34	MARKETA DUDKOVA	ONDREJ BAHNIK	CZE	50.26	49.31	49.79
35	IRENE BARONI	ALBERTO SANGIORGIO	ITA	46.13	53.43	49.78
36	ANDRZEJ BERNATOWICZ	MICHAL WOSIK	POL	44.23	55.29	49.76
37	DAMIAN ĆWIRKO	MACIEJ BIELAWSKI	POL	54.59	44.80	49.70
38	ANTOINE BERGE	TIMOHTEE BOEKHORST	FRA	48.99	51.08	49.62
39	EMMETT DAVIS	RICHARD BOYD	IRE	55.65	42.89	49.27
40	PAWEL JAWORSKI	ROBERT RYCHLICKI	POL	49.42	48.92	49.17
41	ADELE GOGOMAN	JEFRI ISLAM	AUT	49.67	48.43	49.05
42	VINCENT VIDALAT	SIMON POULAT	FRA	48.83	49.26	49.05
43	ERIK AHLGREN	SIMON GRANATH	SWE	47.46	50.39	48.93
44	DIETER SCHULZ	PIOTR OWCZAREK	AUT	55.11	42.55	48.83
45	JANKO KATERBAU	MARTIN REHDER	GER	48.95	48.28	48.62
46	ANDRAS HONYEK	GERGELY SZENTANDRASI	HUN	56.35	40.88	48.61
47	ROBERT TORMA	KORNEL LAZAR	HUN	47.80	49.36	48.58
48	EDWARD JONES	THOMAS PASKE	ENG	47.94	49.17	48.55
49	BARTLOMIEJ IGLA	ARTUR MACHNO	POL	56.32	40.59	48.45

50	ROBIN PENDRIGH	ANTOINE PAMELARD	FRA	46.17	50.39	48.28
51	BOGDAN AGICA	CSABA DADAY	ROM	47.69	47.89	47.79
52	ELZBIETA DLUTOWSKA	JAN GRZESZCZAK	POL	45.79	49.02	47.41
53	TOMISLAV GRACIN	LUKA DONDIVIC	CRO	41.99	52.06	47.02
54	FELIX ZIMMERMANN	THOMAS GOTARD	GER	44.69	49.26	46.98
55	PIOTR JASSEM	PAWEL MALECKI	POL	53.29	40.49	46.89
56	MATEUSZ MAGDON	MARCIN OSMANSKI	POL	49.32	43.77	46.55
57	ŞEHMUZ ERCAN	GUNEY GUNDOGDU	TRK	45.19	47.70	46.44
58	ADAM MICHALAK	MAREK JAROSZ	POL	42.35	50.15	46.25
59	GRIMUR FREYR KRISTINSSON	JOHANN SIGURDURSON	ICE	46.06	44.85	45.46
60	KSENIA NEKRASOVA	IVAN VOLOZHENIN	RUS	44.10	46.42	45.26
61	VAIDOTAS VITKAUSKAS	ROKAS BLAZEVICIUS	LIT	44.89	45.25	45.07
62	CEDRIC MARGOT	JEROME AMIGUET	SUI	48.83	40.83	44.83
63	IAN ANGUS	JOE CLACEY	ENG	49.21	39.51	44.36
64	LEONARDO FRUSCOLONI	GIANCARLO TRIMARCHI	ITA	37.96	50.10	44.03
65	DENIS DOBRIN	ANTON OSIPOV	RUS	47.31	40.00	43.66
66	GIUSEPPE DELLE CAVE	ROBIN FELLUS	ITA	44.92	41.47	43.20
67	BENCE BOZZAI	LEVENTE KADERJAK	HUN	49.24	36.03	42.63
68	ANDREI SECHELEA	LAVINIA CONSTANTIN	ROM	37.85	46.37	42.11
69	ADRIAN BAKALARZ	MARCIN MAJAK	POL	39.25	40.59	39.92
70	JAROSLAW KASPRZYK	GRZEGORZ KRAWCZYK	POL	41.82	37.30	39.56



### Qualification U21 Results

#	PAIR	CNTRY	C/O	RESULT	TOTAL
1	LUKAS TEICHMANN KAMIL ZYLKA	CZE	60.58	58.13	59.35
2	ROBERT MYERS BENJAMIN PASKE	ENG	57.55	60.24	58.89
3	PAWEL JASSEM PIOTR TUCZYNSKI	POL	61.33	56.42	58.88
4	JAMES THROWER SHIVAM SHAH	ENG	62.73	52.72	57.73
5	IGOR LOSIEWICZ LUKASZ WITKOWSKI	POL	54.51	59.31	56.91
6	GABRIELE ZANASI RICCARDO RUBINO	ITA	57.61	55.66	56.64
7	WOJCIECH RACZ MICHAL WIETESKA	POL	51.24	61.15	56.19
8	ERIK VERBEEK ERNST WACKWITZ	NED	52.27	59.30	55.78
9	STANISLAU KARBANOVICH JAN SZPUNTOV	BLR	60.76	50.35	55.56
10	MICHAL KANIA ALEKSANDER KRYCH	POL	49.60	60.97	55.29
11	JAMES PAUL GRAEME ROBERTSON	ENG	58.79	51.66	55.23
12	KRZYSZTOF MIELNIK BARTOSZ STEPIEN	POL	51.45	58.11	54.78
13	TOMASZ JOCHYMSKI WOJCIECH KAZMIERCZAK	POL	55.98	53.05	54.52
14	MATEUSZ MROCZKOWSKI ADAM SMIESZKOL	POL	55.31	53.42	54.37
15	VACLAV FRANK MATEJ PETRASEK	CZE	53.24	55.42	54.33
16	ARTHUR COHEN OSCAR COHEN	FRA	52.16	56.50	54.33
17	OSHRI DAMTY EYAL EREZ	ISR	59.39	48.61	54.00
18	LUKASZ GAWEL MICHAL MAJ	POL	50.94	54.99	52.96
19	JUDITH NAB VINCENT NAB	NED	53.12	52.69	52.90
20	MICHAL GULCZYNSKI JAN PEDZINSKI	POL	54.25	51.32	52.78
21	SLAWOMIR NIAJKO JAKUB WOJCIESZEK	POL	53.77	50.95	52.36
22	FABIO GHIEMMETTI MARC FLURY	SWI	50.45	54.25	52.35
23	JAKUB TARNAWSKI BARTLOMIEJ OKOPINSKI	POL	47.07	57.37	52.22
24	JAMILLA SPANGENBERG SIGRID SPANGENBERG	NED	49.40	54.18	51.79
25	LUKASZ GOLDER TOMASZ KAPERA	POL	53.89	49.63	51.76

26	ADAM WASZKIEWICZ	JAKUB KWIECIEN	POL	50.85	51.51	51.18
27	KRZYSZTOF GAJDA	LUKASZ CHRZANOWSKI	POL	44.25	57.68	50.96
28	ILIA SZPUNTOW	KACPER WILCZAK	POL	47.66	54.24	50.95
29	VINCENT BROERSEN	JORIS VAN LANKVELD	NED	51.13	50.34	50.73
30	TAMAS HOFFMANN	PETER SINKOVICZ	HUN	53.07	48.35	50.71
31	KAROL KROL	PIOTR WITASZEK	POL	51.80	48.76	50.28
32	ZHIVKO SIDEROV	DEAN SPASOV	BUL	52.43	47.29	49.86
33	MACIEJ DABROWSKI	ARKADIUSZ MAJCHER	POL	46.25	52.74	49.49
34	MICHAL IGLA	ARTUR JANECKO	POL	42.91	55.32	49.12
35	DVIR HERSFANG	DAN HERSFANG	ISR	44.66	52.97	48.82
36	FABRICE CHARIGNON	GREGOIRE LAFONT	FRA	56.46	41.09	48.78
37	MOSHE MEYUCHAS	ALON LAZAR	ISR	47.12	50.13	48.63
38	TOKE HOFFMEISTER	ALONA RUDOLPH	GER	43.38	53.39	48.39
39	GRZEGORZ JARZABEK	PAWEL PODOLSKI	POL	50.82	45.83	48.33
40	ANDRZEJ TERSZAK	ROBERT PALUBA	POL	45.08	51.19	48.14
41	NIKO ERTEL	KATHARINA KAEPPEL	GER	47.93	47.74	47.84
42	CLEMENT THIZY	THIBAUT COUDERT	FRA	50.37	45.22	47.80
43	GAL GERSTNER	LEE ROSENTHAL	ISR	47.59	47.93	47.76
44	LIAM JONES	DAVID FARIA	ENG	50.85	43.26	47.05
45	THOMAS RAINFORTH	PHILIP RAILING	ENG	43.26	50.16	46.71
46	RAFAL PARKITNY	PAWEL KALETA	POL	48.91	44.06	46.49
47	RAMUNAS GRIGORAITIS	JUSTAS CEPONKUS	LIT	50.65	42.13	46.39
48	DAAN KARMAN	KOEN STREEKSTRA	NED	50.43	41.95	46.19
49	RENS PHILIPSEN	THIJS VERBEEK	NED	44.48	46.37	45.42
50	GINTA GARKAJE	EDGARS CIZEVSKIS	LAT	41.64	48.33	44.99
51	MICHAL WOJCIECHOWSKI	MICHAL ZIMNIEWICZ	POL	45.09	44.15	44.62
52	FRANCESCO DE LEO	SIMON BALESTRA	ITA	41.43	46.65	44.04
53	MICHAL KLUKOWSKI	TOMASZ TRZEWIK	POL	49.27	38.29	43.78
54	LUCA DELLA CA	URSIN EBERHARD	SWI	41.05	45.95	43.50
55	GIANLUCA MARUZZELLA	FRANCESCO PALERMO	ITA	44.90	40.10	42.50

56	DOMINIC KAEPPPEL	MAX ELLERBECK	GER	42.27	41.35	41.81
57	JAMES HARRIS	JONATHAN RICHARDS	WAL	47.06	33.01	40.04
58	ALEKSANDRA GORSKA	MATEUSZ ANDRZEJEWSKI	POL	39.36	40.24	39.80
59	CLAIRE EVANS	REBECCA WATKINS	WAL	35.67	35.90	35.79

### Qualification Girls Results

#	PAIR		CNTRY	C/O	RESULT	TOTAL
1	MAGDALENA TICHA	SONA HEROUTOVA	CZE	57.13	63.33	59.61
2	ROSALINE BARENDREGT	MARLEEN VAN GELDER	NED	57.24	61.85	59.08
3	MARION CANONNE	LAURE FAVARD	FRA	58.10	58.33	58.19
4	MARTA MAJ	KAMILA SZCZEPANSKA	POL	54.99	61.00	57.39
5	PAULINA JATCZAK	KATARZYNA TYSZKIEWICZ	POL	51.87	61.33	55.66
6	SUSAN STOCKDALE	FIONA BROWN	ENG	54.44	57.33	55.60
7	KATARZYNA GORNIAK	URSZULA KEDZIERSKA	POL	52.43	59.17	55.12
8	MARLEEN BEUGER	LISANNE SANDERS	NED	57.68	49.67	54.48
9	ALICJA DYKIER	EWA GRABOWSKA	POL	48.99	61.50	53.99
10	SIGNE BUUS THOMSEN	ANNA C RAULUND EGE	DEN	49.54	59.33	53.46
11	MARGHERITA KAIFMANN	GIORGIA BOTTA	ITA	44.10	66.67	53.12
12	ANNA ROWOLD	ANNE HEIM	GER	48.46	58.00	52.28
13	KAMILA WESOLOWSKA	JUSTYNA ZMUDA	POL	54.24	48.33	51.88
14	PAVLA HODEROVA	JANA JANKOVA	CZE	52.43	50.33	51.59
15	EWA MAKSYMIOUK	MONIKA MAKSYMIOUK	POL	49.24	54.50	51.34
16	KATARZYNA DUFRAT	ANGELIKA FERRER-LOPEZ	POL	47.54	56.50	51.12
17	ANNA SZTYBER	MARIA ZADROZNA	POL	56.01	43.33	50.94
18	JOANNA KRAWCZYK	NATALIA SAKOWSKA	POL	53.13	46.50	50.48
19	DANUTA KAZMUCHA	JOANNA MALECKA	POL	54.93	42.83	50.09
20	KATERINA TICHA	HELENA NOVOTNA	CZE	45.35	53.17	48.48

21	EDYTA JURKIEWICZ	JOANNA PRZYTYCKA	POL	50.13	45.67	48.34
22	NATALIA BANAS	ANNA MAREK	POL	50.35	44.00	47.81
23	CAROLE PUILLET	JESSIE CARBONNEAUX	FRA	51.00	42.83	47.73
24	CLAUDIA BECCARINI	ELEONORA IACOPINI	ITA	45.24	50.83	47.48
25	LOTTE LEUFKENS	JANNEKE WACKWITZ	NED	47.24	46.00	46.74
26	LISA MATTHIAS	MARIE EGGELING	GER	54.99	33.67	46.46
27	AURELIE THIZY	CLAIRE CHAUGNY	FRA	41.01	52.67	45.72
28	KATARZYNA BAK	AGNIESZKA KAMINSKA	POL	44.21	47.67	45.59
29	SINEAD BIRD	JENNIFER MARVIN	ENG	47.78	41.33	45.20
30	LAURA DEKKERS	MARION MICHIELSEN	NED	48.54	38.83	44.66
31	DACE CIMOKA	ILDZE ERKENA	LAT	44.76	37.83	41.99
32	ZUZANNA MOSZCZYNSKA	ANNA PUCZYNSKA	POL	45.46	34.83	41.21
33	JOVANA TOMIC	JOVANA MARINKOVIC	SER	41.24	31.00	37.14