

Bulletin number 3 – SABF Mixed Teams November 2024

NATIONAL MIXED TEAMS EVENT

Some observations on this inaugural event!

For some time, Bernard and I have been keen to organise a Mixed Pairs Event. When serving on the GBU Committee together we had our first thoughts about running a face-to-face event at The Links Bridge Centre in Johannesburg but somehow, we never did. Holding Mixed Trials and sending an S A team over to Buenos Aires has added interest, I am sure, to mixed pairings. Bernard would like to have staged the event face-to-face, but this seemed impractical in the current economic climate with so many of our players being retired folk and not having spare money for travelling to a bridge centre. To encourage all regions of the country to enter, it was decided to hold it online with RealBridge, the best platform for a Teams Event. It was advertised as a red points event which would have entailed a few centres being set up with monitors (and possibly cameras). Some of our centres do not have the Wi-Fi capabilities to cope with the bandwidth required to connect multiple users playing RealBridge. For this reason, it was decided to allow people to play unsupervised from home. To my knowledge one player was still in South America and another played from Linksfeld Clinic. (Neville we all wish you well, think you were very brave to play at all, and want to see you back on your feet as fast as possible!) In accordance with SABF policy, no red points can be awarded for online unsupervised bridge. It was a concern that if not giving red points for this new event would lead to team withdrawals but no team did.

As always, Steve Bunker as our tournament director and organiser, came up trumps with his slick organisation! His attention to detail is impressive. He ran a Whats App group to keep us informed, puts all the stuff you need to know out clearly on email too, and even those not experienced with RealBridge soon realised how everything goes. He is both courteous and helpful with the problems which inevitably occur. Some comments I heard included was the time allowance too much which led to waiting around. However, you could use this 'in between" time to discuss problems with partner and socialise with the opposition, so all fine. A few people wondered if the matches could be longer than 12 boards but I suspect this was probably the maximum which would fit in the allotted time. A full round robin seems fair to me, which is what we did.

One important point to consider. UNDOS were allowed in the bidding but not in the play. Maybe in the play this could be rephrased to say that in play if this happened the TD should be called and if it was an obvious misclick then an UNDO should be permitted. The TD could use his own judgment.

Congratulations to the Donde team - Bernard Donde, Tas Nestoridis, Larry Chemaly and Nicola Bateman- on winning the event. Well done to Vanessa Armstrong and Mark Oliff who got the best butler scores. My team finished last but we thoroughly enjoyed the chance to play against top players and would definitely do it again. We have to learn that a very expensive error costs dearly! And a double swing is a real disaster! Hopefully the next time this event is staged, be it online or face-to- face, it will attract a greater number of teams.

Submitted by Deirdre Ingersent

Results at the End of Play

SABF National Mixed Teams - Session 6

Overall scores

Pos	No	Team	Score
1	2	DONDE	151.13
2	10	HINGLE	140.46
3	8	EBER	132.52
4	4	STERN	124.01
5	3	KAPREY	121.03
6	6	CAMPBELL	112.21
7	9	ALEXANDER	109.85
8	11	VAN NIEKERK	94.40
9	5	ZIMET	94.34
10	1	PINCUS	92.34
11	7	BEINART	85.57
12	12	INGERSENT	57.14

Top Butler Scores

SABF National Mixed Teams - Session 6						
Cross-IMPs						
Sort by: <input type="text" value="Score"/>						
Pos	Team	Pair	Average	Total	Bds	
1	HINGLE	Vanessa Armstrong & Mark Oliff	+0.96	+1377.8 / 1430	130	
2	ZIMET	Paul Reynolds & Lorraine Weers	+0.88	+233.5 / 264	24	
3	EBER	Neville Eber & Val Bloom	+0.88	+933 / 1056	96	
4	DONDE	Nicola Bateman & Larry Chemaly	+0.81	+1179.5 / 1452	132	
5	DONDE	Bernard Donde & Tas Nestoridis	+0.53	+771.1 / 1452	132	
6	EBER	Hennie Fick & Janne Masojada	+0.52	+571.1 / 1100	100	
7	EBER	Claire Whitburn & Christopher Bosenberg	+0.41	+161 / 396	36	
8	CAMPBELL	Diana Knowler & Wilf Sperryn	+0.38	+546.8 / 1452	132	
9	STERN	Jude Apteker & Zela Stern	+0.38	+544.5 / 1452	132	
10	PINCUS	Nancy Minwalla & Diniar Minwalla	+0.37	+532.5 / 1452	132	
11	ZIMET	Martin Grunder & Erica Zimet	+0.25	+360.7 / 1452	132	
12	ALEXANDER	Glen Holman & Michele Alexander	+0.18	+264.9 / 1452	132	
13	EBER	Christopher Bosenberg & Christopher Bosenberg	+0.18	+48 / 264	24	
14	INGERSENT	Myron Elias & Deirdre Ingersent	+0.17	+67 / 396	36	
15	KAPREY	Kevin Smith & Merle Bracher	+0.16	+226.5 / 1452	132	
16	STERN	John Bryant & Sue Botha	+0.15	+211.9 / 1452	132	
17	KAPREY	Imtiaz Kaprey & Jill Rabie	+0.11	+155.5 / 1452	132	
18	HINGLE	Greg Hingle & Maureen Holroyd	+0.04	+55.3 / 1452	132	

Oponents Interfere After Our Strong 2♣ Opening

Bd 13, Dlr N 4♠ X-1 E		♠ 3 ♥ AKQ ♦ AKQ763 ♣ Q104	N Bernard Donde Other table 5♦ X-1 N
W Michael Alexander ♠ KQ4 ♥ 2 ♦ 9542 ♣ AKJ83		E Maureen Narunsky ♠ A108752 ♥ J96 ♦ 8 ♣ 972	
0 0 < > ↻	♠ J96 ♥ 1087543 ♦ J10 ♣ 65	W N E S 2♣* 2♠ X* 4♠ X P P P	
Tas Nestoridis S			

Playing at the local club or BBO online, interference over a game forcing 2♣ opening is very rare. Playing internationally, the opposite is true especially when not vulnerable. Experts see the 2♣ opening as a red flag to enter the bidding. It's important for aspirant world experts to have clear understanding of what bids mean when their opponents come into the bidding on these auctions.

My 2♣ opening with the North hand is marginal but I felt with 9 likely tricks, an outside Q and a 21 count, this bid was justified. It's interesting to note that most pairs opened the North hand 1♦ but I secretly admire their choice (very secretly).

The first challenge is what to do when the next bids a suit. We play that a double shows a maximum of 6 HCP but denies an Ace or King and Pass promises at least 1 Ace or King. The requirements for bidding a suit should now be relaxed and any good 5 card suit or moderate 6 card suit should be bid immediately. When the bidding came round to me in 4♠, I was regretting my opening. I now knew we could not make a 5-level contract and in addition, I was not confident that we could beat 4S (on a bad day, opponents could be laydown for 6). In this situation it is important to have good agreements. Firstly, pass is 100% forcing and is actually the equivalent of a takeout double. Secondly double is for penalties. Normally we play it the other way round but here because pass is forcing, this takes the place of a takeout double. It says to partner I am happy to hear you bid. Because I knew a 5-level contract was unmakeable, I decided to double. When dummy came down after partner's J♦ lead, things looked bleak but we had just enough to beat 4♠ by 1 trick and we couldn't make any 5-level contract.

Consider adopting this rule – in the direct seat, whatever the level, pass by the strong hand is the equivalent of a takeout double and a double is for penalties or the equivalent of a strong NT hand 22+. Obviously, if the strong hand is in the pass-out seat, you have to play that double is takeout.

If anyone out there has other ideas of how to cope with interference, I would be very interested to hear them. Expert partnerships need to fully discuss these auctions.

ANOTHER ONE GOT AWAY

<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> ✕ pos 🗑️ </div>		♠ J4		N John Bryant																	
Bd 12, Dlr W 6♠+1 E		♥ 109874 ♦ QJ9 ♣ 1098		Other table 4♠+3 W																	
W Mark Oliff		Vanessa Armstrong E																			
♠ AK875 ♥ A2 ♦ K107542 ♣ —		♠ 9632 ♥ Q ♦ A3 ♣ J76543																			
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">0</div> </div>		♠ Q10 ♥ KJ653 ♦ 86 ♣ AKQ2		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>W</th> <th>N</th> <th>E</th> <th>S</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1♦</td> <td>P</td> <td>1♠</td> <td>2♥</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4♣*</td> <td>P</td> <td>4♦</td> <td>P</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6♠</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> <td>P</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		W	N	E	S	1♦	P	1♠	2♥	4♣*	P	4♦	P	6♠	P	P	P
W	N	E	S																		
1♦	P	1♠	2♥																		
4♣*	P	4♦	P																		
6♠	P	P	P																		
Sue Botha S		Paul Reynolds S																			

Well done to Mark Oliff/ Vanessa Armstrong and Michael Alexander/Maureen Narunsky for being the only pairs to get to 6♠ on the auctions shown above. They made all thirteen tricks on a combined 21 count. The key to bidding this slam is for West to appreciate the strength of his hand and to try visualize partner's hand. As little as the A♦ and Q♠ (6 HCP) or a 5th spade will often make the slam an excellent proposition. Without the Q♠, the slam is reasonable but does need a little luck.

Most of the players had no chance to reach this slam when they decided to open 1♠.

Before I decide to break the rule of bidding my longest suit first, I assess whether the hand has reversing values. If the answer is 'yes', I will bid my longest suit first. The West hand has only 14 HCP but has enormous playing strength if a fit is found. I would definitely reverse with this hand and therefore I believe it should be opened 1♦. The main disadvantage of opening 1♦ is that it might give away too much information to the opponents but on this hand, the slam potential is just too great to distort the shape.

Overcall or Double?

Board 5	♠ AK63	
Dealer N	♥ 108732	
NS Vul	♦ K	
	♣ J86	
	♠ Q75	♠ J1094
	♥ J96	♥ A
	♦ Q72	♦ AJ10984
	♣ KQ43	♣ A9
	♠ 82	
	♥ KQ54	
	♦ 653	
	♣ 10752	

Most of the pairs opened the anaemic North hand (I approve and opened it myself- bridge has become a very aggressive game). What should the East hand do? The options are a takeout double or a 2♦ bid. You would like to bring the spade suit into the picture which makes a double attractive but strangely, most of the time you would be able to describe your hand better by overcalling and then making a takeout double.

As it happened on the hand, after 1♥ - D - 3♥ (weak) passed back to you, you now haven't got across your diamond suit and you are at a very high level. Most of the pairs who did double, now bid 4♦. This shows a very good hand, about 18+ HCP and does not promise spades at all. Contrast this with overcalling 2♦ and now when 3♥ gets back to you can double showing a good hand with interest in spades, heart shortage and a good diamond suit. Much better in my opinion. I am not concerned that 2♦ will be passed out and if it is, game for our side is highly unlikely. If you think the East hand should double and then double again when 3♥ is passed back to you, I don't agree. Partner will pass too often and you will either get -530, miss a game or get an inadequate penalty that way.

Weak Two openings

Board 10	♠ QJ943		
Dealer E	♥ K2		
All Vul	♦ QJ6		
	♣ AJ2		
	♠ 7	♠ K108652	NT ♠ ♥ ♦ ♣
	♥ J76	♥ Q985	N 7 7 6 7 8
	♦ AK1094	♦ 8	S 8 7 6 7 8
	♣ 9743	♣ K10	E 5 6 6 6 5
			W 5 6 6 6 5
	♠ A		Par +120 1NT+1 S
	♥ A1043		NS: 14+10=24HCP
	♦ 7532		EW: 8 + 8 =16HCP
	♣ Q865		

Many pairs opened the East hand with a weak 2 or a multi. This resulted in them playing in 2♠ going down 2 or 3 for minus 200-300. My main objection to the opening is that the suit is too poor to act at the 2 level. The presence of 4 hearts is a minor objection, relatively. I know – you're going to tell me that preemptive actions make life difficult for opponents and this is certainly true.

However, I believe that when you play teams you must be concerned and careful not to give away big penalties. The presence of 2 minuses, a poor suit and a hand that is very playable in hearts, makes me unkeen to roll the dice in 1st position, vulnerable.

The minus 200 should not have been a disaster but many pairs who were left to play in 1NT, after East passed, managed to go 1 down.

Submitted by Bernard Donde