## Daily Bulletin No. 2

Sunday 8 July 2001

## Austria on Course for Repeat Victory

After three sessions, Austria's Andreas Gloyer, one half of the winning partnership two years ago and Martin Schifko are poised to capture the title. However, their lead has been reduced and the Dutch combination of Bas Drijver and Sjoert Brink are whithin striking distance of the leaders.
Belgium and France occupy the next twi places, after which an unbroken wall of Polish contenders complete the top ten pairs from which the Champions will surely come.


Scores on the Board

Transfers and Departures
To arrange transportation to the airport you MUST talk to the secretary's office and let them know the time you are leaving. And you must do it BEFORE 14.00 today
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## Session One - Further Deals

Fortified by no more than a good nights sleep our roving reporter rounds up the first session that saw Andreas Gloyer and $M$ artin Schiffko storm into a lead that will make them hard to catch.

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul


| 86 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Q J 63 | ] AK 952 |
| K 8632 | \{ AJ94 |
| 53 | \} Q 42 |

[ AKJ
]
108

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pass | 2[ | D ble | 4[ |
| 5] | D ble | All Pass |  |

One of my pre-tournament picks to do well were Balschun and Linde of Germany. Julius Linde was on the Schools team that won in Cardiff and Raoul Balschun has been a regular member of the German Junior team. But on this deal they got distinctly the worse of it when Cullin took the excellent view to sacrifice over 4[ despite his awkward spade holding. (There might be case for trying 4NT to show a two-suiter and correcting a possible 5\} response to $5 *\{$, though as it happens 5] turned out to be an easier contract to play.) Cullin's partner came through with the goods by delivering a singleton in spades, but when hearts turned out to be 22 Cullin had to take the right view in diamonds to justify his sacrifice.

Correctly, he judged that if both red-suits were 22 he would have embarked on a phantom sacrifice and be on to a poor board whatever he did, so he finessed in diamonds and escaped for down one and a fine result.

Board 17. Dealer North. N one Vul.
$\left[\begin{array}{l}\text { J10 } \\ \text { ] K } 952 \\ \{ \\ 932 \\ \} \\ 983\end{array}\right.$

| Q 764 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| ] 84 |  |
| \{ 64 |  |
| \} J 7652 |  |
|  | A 983 |
|  | Q 1076 |
|  | A 1085 |
|  | 4 |


| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $2\{*$ | Pass | $2 N T$ |
| Pass | $3\}$ | Pass | $3]$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |



Joel W ooldridge and Joe Grue did not have a spectacular set, but here they stole the candy from out of the mouths of their Latvian opponents, via a Multi $2\{$. W hen East passed, preparatory to backing in to show his strong hand-type Joel relayed for game and bought the hand in 3]. Joel put
the gilt on the gingerbread by finding an unlikely overtrick in his 3] contract.

As you can see, on a club lead and continuation declarer might build an overtrick by playing on spades But on a diamond lead you can observe that if and when declarer returns the suit the defence might be able to cash one top club then work out to shift to spades (declarer would play on spades himself if he had the ace-queen). Joel put a spoke in the defence's wheel when he ducked the opening diamond lead, giving the defence a choice of dilemmas. If they pressed on with diamonds declarer could set one up in comfort, while on a spade shift declarer could set that suit up to get rid of his diamond loser.

Another pair of whom fine things were expected is Miltos and Philippos Karamanlis. I thought Miltos was rather unlucky here.

Board 22. Dealer East. E/W Vul
[ Q 106
] 43
\{ AJ10642
\} K 5

$\begin{array}{rlll}\text { W est } & \text { N orth } & \text { East } & \text { South } \\ & & 1[ & 4] \\ \text { Pass } & \text { Pass } & \text { Dble } & \text { All Pass }\end{array}$
Miltos had a tricky problem when he heard his partner double Kristiansen's 4] pre-empt. W hile he appeared to be
looking at two defensive tricks he had to determine how likely it was that 4[ would make. On the surface of it with the possibility of ruffs and the club king being offside 4[ is no great bargain.

As it happens though the defence has no way to unscramble itself. Best defence might be to take an early diamond ruff and then bash out the top hearts. East can ruff and then has to be careful to use the entry to dummy to play on trumps. After that he can cross back to dummy with the nine of spades and rely on the faint chance of finding the doubleton king of clubs onside -and today is his lucky day, as half the field discovered.

Mind you 4] should be down 300 for an average board. The defence can lead trumps effectively once, and now declare can ruff only one club in dummy, and is still left with five losers at the end. The defence lost their way to take only four tricks, and that was a fine result for the |N orwegians.

Board 25. Dealer North. E/W Vul
[ Q J 76
] A 32
\{ A Q 6542
\} 2

| - |  | A 1083 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 754 |  | K Q 106 |
| \{ 1987 |  | 102 |
| \} J 108764 |  | AK 5 |
| [ | K 9542 |  |
| ] | J 98 |  |
| \{ | K 3 |  |
| + | Q 93 |  |

$N$ ot all 630's are worth the same; after all, everyone can make ten tricks in 3N T from time to time. But a far more enjoyable way to collect 630 is to make a doubled overtrick in a partscore. There
were a lot of very greedy W ests on board 25 , who shot themselves in the foot by treating their opponents as idiots.

The typical auction saw East double a natural 1 \{ opening bid, and then $N / S$ bid on to 2[, after which W est protected with 3 . N ow when $N / S$ bid on to $3[$ East should ask himself why his partner with obvious distribution (short spades) should pass initially. Answer: because he has a very bad hand with a long suit - so the ace king of clubs are not going to be working on defence, and sometimes discretion is the better part of valour! W here $N$ ordstrom and Upmark were taking on a Czech pair, their opponents were affronted at the idea that 3 [ might be bid to make, and doubled firmly. A slight error in defence later, that was the magic number of 630 recorded.

## Sports News



Rain played havoc with the programme at W imbledon. Tim Henman lost a fourth set tie break 5-7 enabling Goran Ivanisevic to draw level. The final set has gone with service, the Croatian leading 32 when rain interrupted play once more. The Ladies Singles final between Venus W illiams and Justine Henin will probably have to be played today.

After rain delayed the start of the third days play, Australia lost no time in consolidating their overnight advantage against England They were finally dismissed for 576, a lead of 282, and immediately made inroads into the English second innings, dismissing Mike Atherton with only four runs on the board.
England's only hope is a torrential downpoor.


Sven-Goran Eriksson has claimed he has already picked his team for England's crucial W orld Cup qualifier in Germany in September. England travel to
Germany for their Group N ine clash on 1 September knowing that only a win will keep alive realistic hopes of automatic qualification for the finals in Japan and South K orea next year.

Australia bounced back from last week's defeat by the Lions to win the second Rugby Union Test 35-14 in Melbourne on Saturday and level the series.
The Wallabies, outplayed at the Gabba just seven days ago, showed why they're world champions with a superb secondhalf rally at the Colonial Stadium.

A First Ever Yellow Jersey for Festina marked the opening day of the Tour de France.
Despite their years of involvement, today's win by Christophe Moreau marks the first time in the history of the Tour that the Festina team has been able to win the yellow jersey.

## Championship Diary 7 July 2001

Herman de Wael's pictures are livening up the bulletin, so remember to smile if he passes your way!
Our reporters have noticed several players are very casual in the way they hold their cards. It is generally a good idea to try to hold your cards so that your opponents (and your partner in some cases!) cannot see them. Only Deep Finesse plays double dummy...

## Session 2

For the first round of session two I sat down to watch two pairs who might have been expected to be slightly higher up the leaderboard after the first session than they actually were. Brink and Groosman of the $N$ etherlands took on Medusei and Bianchi of Italy. The Dutch came out on top on both deals.

Board 1. Dealer North. N one Vul


Who needs to mention spades!
Medusei's decision to surpress his spade suit in the knowledge that the suit had to
be splitting badly even if there was a 4-4 fit is understandable, but it did not work out well. Brink however did not deliver the expected shape (as Groosman obviously considered possible, given his final pass!) and $3\{$ making 130 was poor return on the 420 available on careful play in $4[$. The hand was far easier to bid if N orth opened his three-card diamond suit, since the 1 [ response found the N/S fit at once

Board 2. Dealer East. N/S Vul

|  |  | 876 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [ 75 |  |  |  |
| ] 10 |  |  | AQ 754 |
| \{ 10 |  |  | K Q 83 |
| \} J 10 |  | d |  |
| [ A 10643 |  |  |  |
| 632 |  |  |  |
| A J 9 |  |  |  |
| K 5 |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Brink | Bianchi | Groosm | man M edusei |
|  |  | $1]$ | 1[ |
| Pass | 2\} | Pass | $2[$ |
| Pass | 3] | Pass | $3[$ |
| Pass | 4[ | All Pass |  |

Bianchi's failure to introduce no-trumps at some point in the auction - particularly after the rather unnecessary double of 3] gave him a third chance - looks wrong. In 4[ the defence played three rounds of hearts and Brink ruffed to shift to a low diamond to the queen and ace. The entry position to dummy meant Medusei needed a minor miracle in the black suits to come close. As it was, some inaccurate play by both sides in the ending meant that he should have gone two down when
he played to make the hand, but finished up down one. Still, a fine result for E/W.

At another table Ron Hoffman elected to respond 2NT to his partner's overcall, and that got his side to 3 NT , making 430. Perhaps a middle course with the North cards of cue-bidding and then trying notrumps might be less committal than either of these two approaches?

In the previous session I had seen Jelinek and Martinek suffer a little, however they more than got their own back against Toutenel and De Roos.

Board 7. Dealer South. All Vul

|  | $\begin{array}{ll} {\left[\begin{array}{ll} \text { A K J } 63 \\ ] & \text { K 7 } \\ \{ & 9543 \\ \} & \text { A } 10 \end{array}\right.} \end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 98 \\ & 986 \end{aligned}$ |  | [ 1052 |  |
|  |  | ] 10 | 52 |
| \{ A K J 10862 |  | \{ Q 7 |  |
| \} 2 |  | \} | J9765 |
|  | Q 74 |  |  |
|  | A Q J 43 |  |  |
|  | - |  |  |
|  | K Q 843 |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
| Toutenel | Martynek | De Roos | Jelinek |
|  |  |  | 1] |
| 3\{ | 3[ | Pass | 4\{ |
| D ble | Pass | Pass | Redble |
| Pass | 4] | Pass | 5[ |
| Pass | $6\}$ | Pass | 7[ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

W ell bid by the Czech pair. The decision to double $4\{$ by Toutenel as usual gave the other side more room to explore (careless talk costs matchpoints?) and they exploited it to the full. The 5[ bid suggested bad trumps, the 6\} bid showed
good trumps and a club control and now Jelinek felt obliged to bid the Grand Slam. On the next deal a maximal double worked well if slightly fortunately for the Czechs.


Els Toutenel makes the winning choice
Board 8. Dealer W est. None Vul.


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Toutenel | Martynek | De Roos | Jelinek |
| 1] | Pass | 2] | $2[$ |
| 3] | D ble | Pass | $4[$ |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

W as the double of 3] maximal or penalties - perhaps all things to all men! Jelinek knew what he thought it was so he tried $4[$ and on a low heart lead he ran it to his jack. So far so good,; declarer can now succeed by drawing trumps and using the club entry to dummy later on to take
his discards. In fact he tried a trump to dummy, which allowed him to pitch two diamonds away, but the bad club solit meant he still had problems with the fourth round of that suit. The natural play was to knock out the ace of trumps, and now the defence shifted to diamonds (a good idea since if Toutenel had played a heart might de Roos have let go of a club?). However she played the queen of diamonds, and when De Roos won his ace and played the nine of clubs, rather than the passive third trump the defence was in trouble. Best is for Toutenel to duck this, but the position was far from clear, and she won the ace to return the suit, making declarer's life very easy now.

Meanwhile the overnight leaders were starting to come back to the field, although this deal did them no harm:

Board 15. Dealer South. N/S Vul



Andreas Gloyer thinks it over
A bidding misunderstanding saw North/South arrive in a very undistinguished spot. W est led the four of hearts and declarer played low, allowing East to win with the queen. He had no chance at all and finished two down, -200 .
The second board of the round was more interesting:

Board 16. Dealer W est. E/W Vul


| West | North | EastSouth |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Shifko | Gorski | Gloyer Majckrowski |  |
| $1\{*$ | $2\{*$ | Pass | 2] |
| Pass | Pass | 3N T All Pass |  |

East asked about the meaning of Two Diamonds and was told it was spades and another suit. He knew that could not be correct when the dummy appeared, but rather than call the director, he won the opening heart lead in hand and cashed five
rounds of spades. South pitched a club, a diamond and a heart on three of those, while North parted with two hearts and one club.

Declarer crossed to dummy, cashed the winning hearts and played a club. He detached the jack, but eventually put up the king. W hen South discarded East thought it was time to call for the Director. For the moment the table result was +630 - and likely to be below average for East/W est.

Most of the field reached 4[ here and found that the defence were unable to cash their diamond winners in a hurry. At the table that I was watching declarer followed the routine line of winning the heart lead in hand and drawing two rounds of trumps. Then he crossed to a top trump in dummy and took the heart winners to throw diamonds.

At this point with South having pitched a low and encouraging diamond declarer exited with a low diamond, and eventually built a diamond winner so that he did not need the club finesse. All well and good, but many declarers drew the inference that diamonds might be 5-1 when South let go of one so comfortably.

That suggested an alternative approach of cashing off all the clubs and only then exiting with a diamond.

Success! North was well and truly endplayed, and the ensuing ruff and discard meant +680 and a $75 \%$ board instead of a $35 \%$ one.

This deal offered the opponents of various Israeli pairs a chance to do something clever - one as declarer, one on defence.

Board 9. Dealer North. E/W Vul

| $[$ | $K 10$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $]$ | 432 |
| $\{$ | A K Q 10 |
| $\}$ | A Q 86 |

[ Q 7643 [ A 82
] K 765 ] 18
\{ 543 \{ 98762
\} 9
\} K 73
[ J 95
] AQ 109
\{ J
\} J 10542

## West North East South 1NT Pass 3NT

All Pass
Playing against Jakub and Krzysztof Kotorowicz on a highly uninformative defence Noga Tal led a passive diamond and declarer passed the club jack, which Noga ducked. On the next club Dana Tal pitched a suit preference seven of hearts. So Noga took her club winner and played ace and another spade. Dana knew to duck this, and now declarer cashed off the diamonds and all but one of the clubs ending in hand. Now he had to decide whether to take the heart finesse or not; if it worked he would collect +460 and an excellent result, but if it lost he would have only +400 and a moderate result. Had he known how many matchpoints +430 would heave been worth he might have settled for that. But he took the heart finesse and let Dana cash her remaining spade winner for nine tricks and only 70/216 for N/S.
Pekny and Vozabal of the Czech Republic did even better on defence against Reshef and Ginossar. On amore informative auction ( $1\{-1]-2 N T-3 N T$ ) Pekny elected to lead a low spade from his ace. Ginossar did the best he could by putting up his jack but Vozabal ducked, contributing an
encouraging spot, and Pekny got in with his king of clubs to cash out the spades. For down one.

Board 10. Dealer East. All Vul

| $\begin{array}{ll} {[ } & - \\ \text { ] } & \text { A } 92 \\ \left\{\begin{array}{l} 97652 \\ \} \end{array}\right. & \text { K } 1094 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Q } 9 \\ ] \\ j 432 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 1087 |
|  |  |  | 75 |
| \{ Q 1093 |  | \{ | Q J |
| \} A | A 93 | \} | 53 |
|  | [ K Q 64 |  |  |
|  | ] QJ83 |  |  |
|  |  | K 108 |  |
|  |  | \} 16 |  |
| West | t North | East | South |
|  |  | $1\}$ | D ble |
| 1[ | 4] (!) | Pass | Pass |
| D ble | All Pass |  |  |

This board did nothing for the leading Netherlanders' chances of success.
Defending 4] Drijver chose to lead a top diamond and continue the suit rather than attack clubs - which would have been many people's choice. Declarer Jorge Perez won in dummy and passed the queen of hearts then guessed well to lead a low heart to his ace and draw the last trump before clearing the diamonds. N ow a club to the ace saw Drijver return the suit. That let declarer hop up with the king and pitch dummy's club loser on the diamonds, with a ruffing finesse to come for ten tricks. Drijver had missed his chance to shift to a spade when in with the ace of clubs - which dislodges declarer's trump prematurely and prevents him from enjoying the long club. Bas got it all back on the next deal where an awkward 4-3 fit played like a dream.

Board 11. Dealer South. None Vul

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K } 10742 \\ & 1065 \\ & 65 \\ & 642 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Q 9 |  | 5 |
| ] J432 |  | K 97 |
| \{ Q 1093 |  | A KJ874 |
| \} A 93 |  | KJ 8 |



| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $1[$ |
| Pass | $3[$ | Dble | Pass |
| $4]$ | Pass | Pass | Dble |
| All Pass |  |  |  |

Best defence is to lead spades till the cows come home and force declarer, but N orth led a top spade and shifted to a club, letting D rijver win in hand and lead a heart to the nine and queen. Back came a second spade, ruffed in dummy, and south then won his ace of hearts to lead a third spade. But Drijver ruffed and drew trumps and then had the rest. N ote though that South might have had a resource; perhaps he should have ducked the nine of hearts - a lot easier to do in theory than at the table. But since declarer has the spade loser left he cannot draw trumps, and if he plays to ruff a spade then when South gets in in trumps the defence have control to force declarer again.

## The scoreboard

Have we ever played a championship in such a splendid venue as this?
Last night, the stands were almost packed. We have seen people waving banners and flags, and generally cheering their players. Super zoom lenses galore, and loud cheering when the particular favorite executed a double squeeze in the center of court. Everything could also be followed closely on the scoring boards. The remaining time was clearly indicated, in minutes,

## Anna's Dream Team?

seconds and tenths of seconds. Imagine the excitement in the crowd when the local favourite did the grand slam dunk in the last half second of the third overtime period.
The Directors were in charge of the scoring board, and near the end we could see the personal fouls stacking up. One player actually had five of them, and was obliged to be dummy for the remainder of the session.
The hooter that is used to signal the end of a basketball match is geared to a volume loud enough to be heard over and above the fans of Real Madrid, and so it was certainly sufficient to replace the familiar 'change for the next round, please'. On Friday, it served a dual purpose. Those youngsters whose bedtime had long since passed were in no danger of dozing off and missing the start of the next round.

## THE BIG NAMES By Peter Gill

Just in case you were not scared enough of the opposition already, Peter Gill has been ransacking his recent editions of WBF News to bring you details of the achievements by various of the players present at this event.

The current leaders, Andreas Gloyer and Martin Schifko from Austria, were certainly one of the pre-tournament favourites. Gloyer is the defending champion, having won this event in 1999 with Bernd Saurer. He was in the Austrian team that won the first $W$ orld Universities Cup in Maastricht and Gloyer-Schifko were in the Austrian Open team in the recent European C hampionships in Tenerife.
They have also competed in major overseas events such as the NEC W orld Cup. The good news is that you should all come back for the 2003 world Junior Pairs Championships because GloyerSchifko will be too old by then.
USA has brought most of its two teams that are heading to the W orld Junior teams in Brazil next month.
Joel W ooldridge has a silver medal from the 1999 W orld Junior teams, and came $7^{\text {th }}$ in the last W orld Pairs. The sub-50\% scores in the first set by W ooldridgeGrue and Kranyak-Mignocchi show just how tough this event is, because both pairs are in the USA team which is expected to be one of the main contenders in Brazil. That is based on their good results against star-studded teams on the American circuit.
The Dutch team, also respected to do well in Brazil, are here too. O ne of their pairs - S. Brink/B. Drijver are amongst the leaders, but a below-par game by one of the Dutch junior team's top pairs again emphasises how tough an event we are witnessing.

Miltos Karamanlis won the $1^{\text {st }}$ Generali Junior Individual Championship in 2000; he and his brother scored 52\% in the first session.

N ystrom and Upmark from Sweden have many good previous results -such as Fredrik's $6^{\text {th }}$ in the world Junior Pairs two years ago. Godefroy de Tessieres from Martinique represented the Central American Zone5 with distinction in the 1999 W orld Junior Teams. His partner is Olivier Bessis of France, and they are amongst the leaders here. Of course Bessis comes from a family of famous Bridge players, on both sides.

Italy has two current W orld champions from the 1999 W JTeams in Fort Lauderdale. Furio and Stellio di Bello are not playing together here, but both pairs are still in contention. Haraldsson of Iceland is another player with good form in junior events -he was fifth in the pairs last year.

0 ne of the toughest teams of players to assess - and pronounce - is guaranteed to be Poland. W ith home advantage it would be a foolish man who would bet against seeing at least a handful of Polish players in the top ten at the end of the day. And if you want a darker horse to put your money on, patriotism (misguided maybe) tells me not to disco unt the winners of the Australian Youth pairs, David W iltshire and Joshua W yner.

As for a sentimental favourite; well, the Shah brothers of England, by way of Kenya, will have made an impression on all of us. If there were an age handicap factor built in they would be doing very nicely indeed. In fact their first two sets were respectably close to average, and in a few years' time I predict great things for them.
4th W orld Junior Pairs
Championship - after three sessions
name mp \%

| 1 | GLOYER A-SCHIFKO M | AUT | 11402.2 | 62.27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | BRINK S-DRIJVER B | NTH | 11309.6 | 61.76 |
| 3 | CORNELIS T-DE DONDER S | BEL | 10993.2 | 60.03 |
| 4 | BESSIS T-GAVIARD J | FRA | 10855.6 | 59.28 |
| 5 | BREDE L-KUCHARSKI P | POL | 10834.5 | 59.17 |
| 6 | JANISZEWSKI-WITTENBECK | POL | 10708.1 | 58.48 |
| 7 | LULA R-SWIATEK P | POL | 10697.4 | 58.42 |
| 8 | KASPRZAK J-NOWOSADZKI | POL | 10664.1 | 58.24 |
| 9 | GALEK P-SYNOWIEC R | POL | 10598.9 | 57.88 |
| 10 | 0 GRUNT A-SARNIAK A | POL | 10565 | 57.69 |
| 11 | UPMARK J-NYSTROM F | SWE | 10545.1 | 57.59 |
| 2 | DI BELLO S-GUARIGLIA | ITA | 10507.4 | 57.38 |
| 13 | MARCINIAK J-SKALSKI A | LPO | 10487.5 | 57.27 |
| 14 | BERG M-CULLIN | SWE | 10457.4 | 57.11 |
| 15 | BRUGGEMAN SCHOLLAARDT | NTH | 10435.3 | 56.99 |
| 16 | 6 MAZZADI F-LO PRESTI F | ITA | 10414.1 | 56.87 |
| 17 | LUKS I-NABER | EST | 10405.6 | 56.82 |
| 18 | 8 BIRDSALL G-BURGESS 0 | ENG | 10351.1 | 56.53 |
| 19 | 9 ZAROWSKI W-CHOYNACKI | POL | 10350.2 | 56.52 |
| 20 | 0 BAR-YSOFEF MUNNEN ISR | H | 10328.2 | 56.40 |
| 21 | 1 RESHEF O-GINOSSAR E | ISR | 10324.9 | 56.38 |
| 22 | 2 ERICSSON SALOMONSSON | SWE | 10322.1 | 56.37 |
| 23 | 3 DIALYNAS A-DIALYNAS M | GRE | 10296 | 56.23 |
| 24 | 4 KONOPKO G-SKORSKI M | POL | 10255.7 | 56.01 |
| 25 | 5 KALITA J-SIKORA J | POL | 10243.4 | 55.94 |
| 26 | 6 GULA A-TACZEWSKI M | POL | 10211.3 | 55.76 |
| 27 | 7 BESSIS O-DE TESSIERES | FRA | 10204.9 | 55.73 |
| 28 | 8 BARENDREGT E-DIRKSEN G | NTH | 10184.1 | 55.61 |
| 29 | 9 TIHANE A-MATISONS M | LAT | 10145.5 | 55.40 |
| 30 | 0 NIZIOL F-NAWROCKI | POL | 10123.4 | 55.28 |
| 31 | 1 ALDI M-TORIELLI V | ITA | 10090.1 | 55.10 |
| 32 | 2 DI BELLO F-UCCELLO S | ITA | 10084.8 | 55.07 |
| 33 | 3 KARLOWICZ W-ZIELINSKI | POL | 10039.3 | 54.82 |
| 34 | 4 LUTOSTANSKI NARKIEWICZ | POL | 10035.6 | 54.80 |
| 35 | 5 BOOTSMA M-WAELE R de | NTH | 10033.9 | 54.79 |
| 36 | 6 ANDRALOJC DEMIANCZUK | POL | 10026.1 | 54.75 |
| 37 | 7 JOHANSSON P-MORIN H | SWE | 10016.8 | 54.70 |
| 38 | 8 WYNER J-WILTSHIRE D | AUS | 10002.7 | 54.62 |
| 39 | 9 HOFFMAN R-LELLOUCHE D | ISR | 9987.9 | 54.54 |
| 40 | 0 MINARIK A-MINARIK G | HUN | 9970.4 | 54.45 |
| 41 | 1 MALESA M-SIKORA M | POL | 9969.6 | 54.44 |
| 42 | 2 CAMPBELL B-FELDMAN J | USA | 9956 | 54.37 |
| 43 | 3 KRANYAK J-MIGNOCCHI K | USA | 9951.2 | 54.34 |
| 44 | 4 HARALDSSON EINARSSON | ISL | 9941.6 | 54.29 |
| 45 | 5 NICOLODI F-SBARIGIA M | ITA | 9937.8 | 54.27 |
| 46 | 6 HODOSI P-SZURDI M | HUN | 9932.7 | 54.24 |
| 47 | 7 BRZUSTOWSKI WESOLOWSKI | POL | 9912.3 | 54.13 |
| 48 | 8 REMPOLA K-SZCZEPANSKA | POL | 9907.4 | 54.10 |
| 49 | 9 KOUSSIS KARAPANAGIOTIS | GRE | 9905.8 | 54.10 |
| 50 | O KOTOROWICZ KOTOROWICZ | POL | 9898.5 | 54.06 |
| 51 | 1 GRUMM JEROLITSCH-BIND | AUT | 9870.1 | 53.90 |
| 52 | 2 KORNEK A-SMIRNOV A | GER | 9867.9 | 53.89 |
| 53 | 3 ZHUKAVEL V-ZHUKOV A | BLR | 9854.1 | 53.81 |
| 54 | 4 KARANOWSKI R-MICHALSKI | POL | 9849.5 | 53.79 |
| 55 | 5 DE ROOS D-DE ROOS S | BEL | 9843.4 | 53.75 |
| 56 | 6 HENRIKSEN MARQUARDSEN | DEN | 9818.8 | 53.62 |
| 57 | 7 SVENSSON D-WESTMAN T | SWE | 9810 | 53.57 |
| 58 | 8 GRENTHE G-GRENTHE J | FRA | 9807.1 | 53.56 |
| 59 | 9 VENSSON V-DISCHLER J | SWE | 9802 | 53.53 |
| 60 | 0 LINERUDT G-SIVELIND D | SWE | 9706.7 | 53.01 |
| 61 | 1 LASOTA T-SOKOTOWSKI G | POL | 9690.5 | 52.92 |
| 62 | 2 BURAS K-KAPALA S | POL | 9688.9 | 52.91 |
| 63 | 3 WOYNA M-ROZANSKI M | POL | 9682.1 | 52.87 |
| 64 | 4 HEIKKINEN AIRAKSINEN | FIN | 9677.4 | 52.85 |
| 65 | 5 RYMAN J-JANSSON T | SWE | 9655 | 52.73 |
| 66 | 6 GOGOMAN A-GOGOMAN A | AUT | 9645.1 | 52.67 |
| 67 | 7 TOWALEWSKI J-KRAWCZYK | POL | 9641.4 | 52.65 |
| 68 | 8 MOLLER M-SAUTER A | GER | 9617.4 | 52.52 |
| 69 | 9 RABBE J-COMBE C | FRA | 9615.4 | 52.51 |
| 70 | 0 CRISTINA M-MUZZIN F | ITA | 9611.9 | 52.49 |
|  | 1 MRUZ M-SZEGEDI B | HUN | 9611.1 | 52.49 |


|  | BOS H-DIJK | 9598 | 52.41 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73 | BRINK N-GROOSMAN | 9567.5 | 25 |
| 74 | DELMAS T-NAYNAUD F FR | 9530 | 52.05 |
| 75 | MULLER M-ODI | 9527 | 52.03 |
| 76 | PULKRAB P-SIDLOVA V CZ | 9525. | 52.02 |
| 77 | JONGE M SCHENK BRILL NTH | 9515.7 | 51.96 |
| 78 | EG | 9507.2 | 2 |
| 79 | KARAMANLIS KARAMANLIS GR | 9503.7 | 51.90 |
| 80 | RNE M-MORRIS A ENG | 9496.8 | 51.86 |
| 81 | VOZABAL D-PEKNY P CZ | 9491.4 | 51.83 |
| 82 | DERBA | 9485 | 80 |
| 83 | MARJAI G-SURANYI M HUN | 9484 |  |
| 84 | DOMAGALA M-HOLOWACZ POL | 9455. | 51.64 |
| 85 | MACIELAK M-BEDNARCZUK POL | 9455.5 | 64 |
| 86 | ANGENENDT P-OEVER J t NTH | 9453.9 | 51.63 |
| 87 | BIANCHI S-MEDUSEI A | 9453.7 | 51.63 |
| 88 | NEILL D-FISHER C US | 9448.9 | 51.60 |
| 89 | A'KIEWICZ DAJNOWICZ L PO | 9447.7 | 51.59 |
| 90 | KUIVENHOVEN VREESWIJK NT | 9437.6 | 51.54 |
| 91 | OFIR G-ASSARAF O IS | 9436.1 | 51.53 |
| 92 | LARSSON T-ANDERSSON T SK | 9421 | 51.45 |
| 93 | SCHWERDT A-PAHL A | 9403.6 | 5 |
| 94 | NEGOESCU A-DONCIU S RO | 9402.3 | 51.35 |
| 95 | SHAH J-COWLING B ENG | 9394 | 51.31 |
| 96 | FARINA N-IAVICOI | 93 | 17 |
| 97 | GEORGOPOULOS G-NTALAS GR | 9366. | 5 |
| 98 | BABOURINE D-IVANOV I RUS | 9360.1 | 12 |
| 99 | BLOMSTER M-JOHANSSON SW | 9359.2 | 51.11 |
| 100 | ARASZKIEW WITTENBECK POL | 9356.2 | 51.09 |
| 101 | PAVAN V-ISRAELEWICZ FR | 9355.2 | 51.09 |
| 10 | BALSCHUN R-LINDE J GER | 9353.3 | 51.08 |
| 103 | K' TIANSEN STANGHEL | 935 | . 07 |
| 104 | OWCZAREK P-STRACK R POL | 9330.7 | 50.95 |
| 10 | MOLENAAR D-VERBEEK T NTH | 9 | 95 |
| 106 | VEIRE P vd-VEIRE S NTH | 932 |  |
| 107 | KAZALICKI M-PRALJAK MCRO | 9324.4 | 50.92 |
| 108 | DESMOULINS ABECASSIS FRA | 9324.3 | 50.92 |
| 109 | BRGULJAN K-ZORIC V CR | 932 |  |
| 110 | R | 9317.9 |  |
| 111 | MICHALEK W-GUMULA S PO | 9314 | 7 |
| 112 | HANDLEY-PR B-PROBST RENG | 9313 | 50.86 |
| 113 | BOUWMAN E-RITMEIJER R | 9305 | 81 |
| 114 | EKNER M POL | 9259. | 57 |
| 11 | DOMALAZEK L-OBORSKI MPOL | 9257.5 | 50.55 |
| 116 | KRAEMER D-SCHUELLER MGER | 9241. | 50.47 |
| 117 | GARAUD R-BIDET | 228 |  |
| 118 | SIVELIND S-THALEN B SW | 9222 | 50.36 |
| 11 | UITS S-TOOMERE | 9220.5 | 50.35 |
| 120 | GREEN B-ATTHEY J EN | 9216 | 33 |
| 121 | GROENENBOOM M-JANSEN NT | 9199 | 4 |
| 122 | AL N-TAL D ISR | 9198.9 | 50.23 |
| 123 | B?CC P-KEIL B HUN | 9198 | 23 |
| 124 | EPROVOST N-CHAPELLE FRA | 9185 | 50.16 |
| 125 | BACZEK M-GRZEJDZIAK SPOL | 9143.8 | 49.93 |
| 126 | SORLING B-HED S SWE | 9142 | 49.93 |
| 127 | KUPIECKA M-PAWEL M POL | 9133. | 49.88 |
| 128 | DEKKER A-SALM C vd NTH | 9118 | 49.79 |
| 129 | NORDSTROM C-ANDERSSONSWE | 9090.4 | 49.64 |
| 130 | SUKNIAK M-SUKNIAK K POL | 9078.3 | 49.58 |
| 131 | DE LOUBENS G-BENARD TFRA | 9075 | 49.56 |
| 13 | WESIERSKA O-DYKIER A POL | 9047.8 | 1 |
| 133 | BARANOWSKISTRZEMECKI POL | 9034.4 | 49.34 |
| 134 | KOLWAS R-SASAL L POL | 9032 | 49.33 |
| 135 | FLIRSKI M-POTZ M POL | 9016 | 49.24 |
| 136 | PEDERSEN B-KROGSGAARDDE | 8992.1 | 49.11 |
| 137 | LINDHOLM O-OLOFSSON HSW | 8987.5 | 49.08 |
| 138 | GLICKMAN M-SLATER USA | 8965.4 | 48.96 |
| 139 | KARPALA M-KUC-DZIERZ POL | 8950 | 88 |
| 140 | JELINEK P-MARTYNEK J CZE | 8928.2 | 48.76 |
| 141 | KLESK P-WASZYNSKI A POL | 8923.7 | 48.73 |
| 142 | PIOTRWOSKI-POPIELARCZPOL | 8922. | 2 |
| 14 | DMOGILNICKI D-SAMSON POL | 8903.4 | 48.62 |
| 144 | KOSSUT J-KRZYZANOWSKIPOL | 8892.3 | 48.56 |
| 145 | DORABIALA M-WOLANSKI POL | 8874.9 | 48.47 |
| 146 | GROOT N de-MEURS J NTH | 8868.6 | 48.43 |
| 147 | TURANT M-SENDACKI P POI | 8860.2 | 48.39 |
| 148 | BRUNO G-ANDERSEN S DEN | 8849.1 | 48.32 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| 8831.6 |  |
| 8830 | 48.22 |
| 8825.6 | 48.20 |
| 8820 |  |
| 8799 | 05 |
| 8783.6 |  |
| 8776.6 |  |
| 876 |  |
| 875 |  |
| 87 |  |
| 864 |  |
| 8625.7 |  |
| 861 |  |
| 860 | 46.99 |
| 859 |  |
| 856 | 46.78 |
| 8562.1 | 46.76 |
| 8534.4 | 46.61 |
| 85 |  |
| 850 | 46.47 |
| 850 |  |
| 849 | 42 |
| 848 |  |
| 8459.8 |  |
| 844 |  |
| 8437 | 46.07 |
| 8436 | 46.07 |
| 841 | 96 |
| 8410.3 |  |
| 8408.5 |  |
| 9 |  |
| 839 |  |
| 839 | 85 |
| 8380 |  |
| 8327.9 | 48 |
| 8313.7 |  |
| 828 |  |
| 8276.2 |  |
| 8258 | 45.10 |
| 8253 | 45 |
| 8235. | 44.97 |
| 8229.5 |  |
| 8221.5 |  |
| 8220.7 | 44.89 |
| 8202 | 44.79 |
| 811 |  |
| 8008.2 | 43.73 |
| 800 |  |
| 7949.6 |  |
| 788 |  |
| 7867. | 42 |
| 7855 |  |
| 7633.2 |  |
| 7613.3 |  |
| 7612.9 | 41.57 |
| 752 | 41.10 |
| 751 |  |
| 7486.5 | 40 |
| 742 | 40.54 |
| 7292.6 | . 82 |
| 7256.8 |  |
| 7180.4 | 39.21 |
| 7162 | 39 |
| 7145.3 | 39.02 |
| 7019.5 | 38.33 |
| 6944.9 | 37.93 |
| 6931.8 | 37.85 |
| 6777.9 | 37.01 |
| 6269.2 | 34.24 |
| 6184.3 | 33.77 |
| 6143.4 | 33.55 |

