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## 2005年省港澳三角賽 2005 FK－MACAO－GOANGEZFOO TRIANEGOLAB TOORJNAMEENI

一年一度的三角賽，今年因故推遲至十一月二十六，二十七日在澳門舉行。澳門隊由於每年特邀的主將：李勁，張孔武缺陣，故與香港，廣州相較整體實力有一定的距離。名列第五，第六不足為奇，廣州藍隊的四名隊員，你常在「橋牌」雜誌上見到，例如陳紀恩，黎永傳等，他們四場比賽的成績為八十九分，平均每場超過二十二分，戰勝香港的二場為 $23: 7$ 及 $25: 2$ ，香港二隊分別獲第二，三名，已經算是不錯。我手中的資料不多，只能憑我看到的部份牌例介紹給讀者，我想牌友們有權知道我們的代表隊比賽情形，雖然我這裡寫的基本上是缺點，但不能否認這是事實，我們都不是專業牌手，所以我寫的都是針對整隊的缺點，我並不提及具體個人的錯誤。如果你認為說得對，請你盡可能改正，因為你代表香港，打錯了牌，報導出來，使我們大家學習，牌友們也有權知道，我們香港隊現在的水平及成績。從另一角度講，你被選為代表，起碼在選拔時你比別人強（否則你就不會被選上），只是你在出征時失常而已；以後所以報導將不再作如上聲明。下面我主要講香港紅隊，香港藍隊對專業牌手廣州藍隊的二場比賽。

This annual event had been somewhat delayed to November 26， 27 this year．Host being Macau whose 2 teams came $5^{\text {th }}$ and $6^{\text {th }}$ as they were without their players Li Jin and H．M．Chang，as both were in Pataya，Thailand playing Asean instead．Guangzhou fielded a strong quartet including K．Y．Chen，Y．C．Lai，L．Lok，etc．familiar names that had appeared in the Chinese＂Bridge＂magazine，their scores of 89 VPs in 4 matches were formidable averaging 22 per match out of 25 ．They beat our 2 Hong Kong teams $23: 7$ and $25: 2$ who came $2^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ overall told much of the story．I have here only limited material basically on how our 2 teams fared，their usual weaknesses．I don＇t mean to pinpoint anyone or anything in particular，rather I am speaking out in a general and positive sense only．Afterall，we are amateurs only and easily prone to errors especially when under tight or tiring situations． Here are hands from out HK Red／Blue teams against the professional Guangzhou．

香港藍隊對廣州藍（開室是陳紀恩［西］和樓興成［東］）
HK Blue vs Guangzhou（Guangzhou K．Y．Chan，H．S．Lau were East－West）
（1）香港隊唯一得大分的牌 Our only big gain


5＊的意思，大概是問 的支持情況，邀請 6 ，現在北的 VA107 當然叫 $6 v$ ，如果北的 J107 而 A862，大概北也只好 pass，因為不知 \＄A 有無用，所以這様叫法一様會失去部份可以叫到最佳合約的機會。
5＊was probably an ask to slam if the $2 v$ support was good．North naturally obliged with A107．But what is he had J 107 and $\& \mathrm{~A}$ ，what would the bid not knowing if $\& \mathrm{~A}$ was useful？
（2）


開室叫牌
Bidding in Open Room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2＊ |
| pass | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 |
| X | pass | pass | pass |

首攻 $\boldsymbol{4}$ ，但因無法回到暗手（北）結果下一。廣州藍隊叫到最佳合約 6 ，輸 14 IMPs 。
－was led， 1 down when couldn＇t find a way back to finesse＊K（how about $\quad$ K from dummy at trick 2？）．Meanwhile，Guangzhou was in the comfortable contract， 14 IMPs．
（3）對配合的花色中 $Q$ 的價值認識不足 Insufficient appreciation of＂$Q$＂values in fit suits


南對同伴套中 $Q$ 和 $Q$ 的價值，估計不足，攤牌就成的小滿貫就這樣溜過去了。廣州藍隊叫到最佳合約6＊輸 12 IMPs 。
South apparently little appreciated the 2 red Queens，but North too，had hardly dedicted his monstrous hand，perhaps the partnership methods had a loophole here．Guangzhou bid to the accurate $6 \leqslant$ for 12 IMPs ．


缺少二個 A 的東西牌居然叫到 6NT，就算防守錯誤，首攻送你—墩，你都不夠十二墩，是不是賭得太厲害了，輸 11 IMPs 。
Bidding to 6NT but off 2 Aces could hardly be a good gamble， 11 IMPs away．
（5）滿貫6＊已在望的牌，可惜只停在 3 。請看廣州隊叫牌
Stopping in 3 when 6 could be made． Watching Guangzhou＇s bidding：

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pass | pass | $1 *$ | $1 *$ |
| $X$ | $2 *$ | $3 *$ | $3 *$ |
| $5 *$ | pass | pass | pass |

照牌的分配，任意首攻， 5 是鐵牌，港藍
隊停在 3 ，二桌都取得十二墩，輸 10 IMPs 。
5 ＊was good on any lead here， 10 IMPs． 12 tricks in both rooms．
（6）


被廣州藍隊在小合約中雙得分的牌有三副，舉其中一牌為例
開室由香港藍隊北主打 2 下一，-50 。
閉室由香港藍隊西主打2 下二，－200。輸6 IMPs。


Open room HK Blue team North was $2 \boldsymbol{*}, 1$ down，-50 ． Closed room HK West was $2 \uparrow 2$ down，$-200,6$ IMPs．

十六副牌輸 63 IMPs 不算少了（ $15: 78$ 即 $2: 25 \mathrm{VPs}$ ）
Altogether，in 16 boards we lost 63 IMPs （ $15: 78$ means to $2: 25 \mathrm{VPs}$ ）
香港紅隊對廣州藍隊（開室：陳紀恩［西］，樓興成［東］）
HK Red vs Guangzhouu（Open room GZ East－West K．Y．Chan，H．S．Lau）
（7）

| Game NS | ＊QJ764 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Dealer N | －AQ |
|  | － 9643 |
|  | ＊ 72 |
| － 93 | ＊ 8 |
| － 108753 | W－ 6 |
| － 852 | S E KJ107 |
| ＊ 854 | ＊AKJ10963 |
|  | －AK1052 |
|  | －KJ942 |
|  | －AQ |
|  | $\because Q$ |


| West |
| :---: |
| pass |
| pass |
| $5 \stackrel{4}{2}$ |
| pass |
| pass |
| pass |


| North | East |
| :---: | :---: |
| pass | 24 |
| 3 | $4 \vdots$ |
| $4 \%$ | pass |
| $5 *$ | pass |
| 5 | pass |
| 64 | pass |

South
$X$
4
$4 N T$
$5 *$
$6 \$$
pass

W．K．Chan 坐北主打 6 ，首攻 \＃A，轉攻 J ，你如坐北你是放 $Q$ 還是 A？因為只要•4－2 分配，可以墊去手中三張 ，Chan 想了好久，最後放 $Q$ 。事後我問 Chan 你不打外面 4－2 分配？他說：東開叫 2 再叫 4，如沒有 ＊K 似乎不可能；答得好。
W．K．Chan was North and declarer．
\＃A was led and switched to ruffed．Anyway，Chan thought long and played Q．I asked why afterwards，he said：the bidding 2＊and could hardly be justified without 4 K！I had no information of Open room result on this hand．
（8）


香港隊叫牌

| Hong Kong bidding： |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| West | North | East | South |
|  |  |  | 1 ＊ |
| 14 | pass | pass | X |
| pass | 30 | pass | 40 |
| pass | pass | pass |  |

北的 和同伴牌力重複（因西開叫14），所以不宜叫 3－如果 K 換成 K ，同樣那麼多分，完成 $4 v$ 就易如反掌。現在 $4 v$ 當然一下啦。
I do not concur with North＇s $3 v$ bid after West overcalled $1 *$ ，wasted value．If K became $\quad$ K then $3 \boldsymbol{*}$ would be perfect，while now $4 \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ ，one down．
（9）給我印象最深刻的是這副牌的防守，居然給廣州隊摸到一局 Imperfect defence resulted inGuangzhou＇s gain here

| Game All | ＊ 76 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Dealer N | －KJ6 |
|  | －K95 |
|  | \＆A10872 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Q5 } \\ & \text { 10843 } \\ & \text { AJ6 } \\ & \$ \text { KQ54 } \end{aligned}$ | N AKJ103 |
|  | N／E 752 |
|  | －Q872 |
|  | 49 |
|  | － 9842 |
|  | －AQ9 |
|  | － 1043 |
|  | ＊J63 |


| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 *$ | $1 *$ | pass |
| 2NT | pass | $3 N T$ | $X$ |
| pass | pass |  |  |

可能令北家誤會的是＂X＂表示有 ，還是希望首攻 $\boldsymbol{*}$ ，或者是憑實力。實戰中首
次機會，莊家不動 表示 已有五墩，北拿三張 ，基本上莊家有三墩剩下不知莊家的牌力在 還是－思考良久，最後選定出 7 ，結束防守。 Perhaps North／South had different meanings on South＇s double．Asking for lead or just strength．At the table $\uparrow 7$ was led，dummy $\quad K$ won and $\uparrow 2,3, J$ to you King One more，perhaps last chance after the vain lead，what？Declarer probably had 5 spades after partner＇s signal， 3 diamonds．Anyway North thought for long and returned \＄7， 9 tricks．

另一方面，北開叫 $1 *$ 後，西跳 $2 N T$ ，應該在 上有防守力量，如首攻 \＆在 －進手後出－，回攻 ，全部打對的話，防守方將得四墩 あ，三墩－和一墩 ，來回相差 20 IMPs 以上。
On the other side of perfect thinking，after North opened $1 \$$ and West＇s 2NT，he should have strength there，with $\cup A, 9$ tricks were quite inevitable．In any case，had there been a lead and perfect reading in hearts，the defence could come to 4 clubs， 3 hearts， 1 diamond and a swing of 20 IMPs，+1100 instead of -750 ．

在我看到來說，廣州隊的防守比香港隊好，叫牌相對來說，廣州隊叫得還是比較准的，他們拿冠軍也是順理成章的事，我希望香港的隊員能從中學到一些有用的東西。
From what I have observed，Guangzhou defended better than Hong Kong，and on bidding more accurate．Their winning was a well deserved one．

香港公開隊制賽決賽
The F．K．Oper Tieams，Fipal
Team of Four 比賽，是香港最重要的比賽之一，經過四次預賽，於十月八日及九日進行半決賽，決賽，共打 48 ＋64 副牌，我觀看了其中 104 副牌，並且還記錄了開室的叫牌，也許是唯一最有興趣觀看比賽，最有興趣了解目前香港水平的觀眾吧。

This is one of the major tournaments in Hong Kong．After 4 rounds of preliminaries，the semi and finals were held on October 8，9； $48+64$ boards．I watched 104 of those boards in the open rooms，witnessing perhaps the present level of H．K．bridge．I made some records of the bidding．

近幾年，香港年輕選手進步很快，主打水準已經相當不錯，但防守的錯誤仍然較多，特別是首攻。另外是有些＂對＂默契不夠表演在叫牌上，參加決賽的二隊出場的九名隊員中，除 Derek Zen，I．L．leong 外，其他七人都可稱得上是近年進步很快的「青年」選手，當然打得好的隊很多，例如：Ringo Lee Team，S．K．Luk Team，Cheung Lik Team，S．S．Yeh Team，Bell Tam Team 等等，這是香港可喜的現象，可惜所有的選手都是業稌的，也許只有我是業稌的＂專業＂牌手。好了，我這裡就以冠亞軍決賽的牌例，說明還有許多不足的地方，如能改進，才能與亞洲的專業牌手相抗衡。

In recent years，young players here have made significant improvement in declarer play especially in defence though．There are errors still，leads in particular and bidding mishaps 9 players in the final，apart from Derek Zen and I．L．leong，the other 7 were all fast coming young stars．Of course，there are other teams of good players such as Ringo Lee＇s，S．K． Luk，Cheung Lik，S．S．Yeh，Bell Tam，etc．Nonetheless we are all amateur players though I pride myself as a full－time player now．Below are some of the hands I sampled with areas for improvement and hope we could better other amateurs in time．

首先我要祝賀 I．L．leong 隊（下稱 \｜隊）和 Derek Zen 隊（下稱 D 隊）一路過關斬將，分別獲得本次比賽的冠亞軍。在九人二隊的四對半選手中，只有二對的默契比較好，請看叫牌：

Congratulations to I．L．leong and Derek Zen＇s teams who came out first and second in the tournament．Of the 9 players and 4 and a half pairs，only 2 pairs emerged as good bidding partnerships：
（1）

| Game NS | ＊J109 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Dealer W | － 82 |
|  | －KQ10642 |
|  | \％K7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { K8 } \\ & \text { AJ3 } \\ & 975 \\ & \div \text { QJ1064 } \end{aligned}$ | －Q6532 |
|  | WN－K1097 |
|  | W－E－J |
|  | $\pm 832$ |
|  | －A74 |
|  | －Q654 |
|  | －A83 |
|  | ＊A95 |

## West 1NT 2

pass

## North pass <br> X <br> 2＊ <br> 

 passSouth pass 3NT pass

D 隊東西方給了｜隊機會，如果東決定叫 2 轉移 ，不知北還會叫 3 否？此牌 l 隊勝 9 IMPs 。
Derek＇s East－West had given leong＇s North－South a chance to shine；but suppose East had bid $2 v$ for transfer，I wonder if North would come up with a $3 *$ bid or South to balance，anyway， 9 IMPs won．
（2）

West
$1 *$
$2 *$
$3 \%$
4
5
6
pass

| North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| pass | $1 *$ | pass |
| pass | $2 *$ | pass |
| pass | $3 *$ | pass |
| pass | $4 N T$ | pass |
| pass | $5 *$ | pass |
| pass | $6 *$ | pass |
| pass |  |  |

另一桌叫到不可能成功的 7NT。D 隊勝 17 IMPs 。
7NT was somehow reached in the other room．Derek＇s won 17 IMPs．
叫得不好的合約，極需改進，例如 Few samples with areas for improvement：
（3）D 隊叫牌
Derek＇s bidding：

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1 *$ | pass |
| $1 *$ | pass | $1 N T^{*}$ | pass |
| $2 *$ | pass | $2 N T$ | pass |
| $3 *$ | pass | $3 *$ | pass |
| $3 *$ | pass | $4 *$ | pass |
| $6 *$ | pass | pass | pass |

1NT＝15－17
西的6是很差的合約，最佳是由東主
打6•或6NT。另一桌也是叫到由西做


莊的 6都沒有攻出－平牌一副。
6 －by West was not ideal yet both teams reached it by same declarer and neither North found the killing lead！
（4）極差的叫牌但運氣好，仍然嬴牌。I隊叫牌 Bad bids but good luck．leong＇s bidding

| West | North | East | South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $1 *$ |
| pass | $2 *$ | pass | $3 \%$ |
| pass | $4 *$ | pass | $5 \%$ |
| pass | $6 \%(?)$ | pass | $7 \%$ |
| pass | pass | pass |  |

5 是問除 外的關鍵張，6是什麼，南不懂，只好叫7\％。因為 $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ 對位而打成了。另一桌叫到正確的 ，還輸 11 IMPs 。如果 K 在西，則此牌相差 25 IMPs。
5．was supposedly exclusion blackwood，6as a reply misunderstood but good stroke of luck to the forced grand slam．Had the $\$ \mathrm{~K}$ been wrong，a swing of 25 IMPs！ Winning 11 instead of losing 14 ！
（5）

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Game All } \\ & \text { Dealer S } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ax } \\ & \text { AQ10xx } \end{aligned}$ | 開室叫牌 Open room bidding |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | －109xxx | West | North |  | South |
| -J10 | －KQxxxxxx | $1 *$ | 10 | 1. | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { pass } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| －AK7xx | E ${ }^{\text {Q }}$ | pass | $4 \cdot$ | $4{ }^{\circ}$ | pass |
| ＊7xxx | ＋109x | pass | 54 | pass | 5 |
|  |  |  | pass | pass | pass |
|  | －Jx ${ }^{\text {dxx }}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | ．AKQ8x |  |  |  |  |

持東的牌，無防守力量，不如第一聲即叫 4 ，也許南仍會叫 50 。持西的牌，開叫1＊在北叫10 之後，牌值已經叫足，實不應再加倍，即使要加倍，都應由東決定，不是嗎？結果東首攻 Q 西未超吃，5 加倍還超一。
East has no defensive power and might as well preempt 4 on his $1^{\text {st }}$ bid warning partner， if slam is on，partner won＇t miss it．West on the other hand，should depreciate his defensive values once North overcalled in and on the present bidding，leave East to decide instead of telling him to stop．This is in fact a rather common tightrope situation where partners should agree explicitely whether double in direct position should promise 2 or more defensive tricks，or exactly 2 ？ 6 level？Anyway，here $Q$ was led and was the sole defensive trick， $5 \cdots \mathrm{X},+1$ ．

| 閉室叫牌 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Closed room bidding |  |  |  |
| West | North | East | South |
|  |  |  | pass |
| $1 *$ | 14 | 4＊ | 5 |
| X | pass | pass | pass |

東叫得很好，但此牌屬於南北，同上理由，西實不應加倍，在首攻 Q ，西用 －$K$ 再＊$A$ 取得二墩，防止超墩！
West made the same error，banking on perhaps an Ace from partner，he did better overtaking partner＇s $\geqslant$ lead，stopping the overtrick

除默契問題外，防守仍是二隊薄弱環節
Defence，as usual，is a weak spot．


二桌合約都是 3NT，均由東做莊。首攻都是 v6，只有八墩牌，開室下一很正常。閉室，I 隊坐東西，即使首攻－都不能完成的合約，結果會被完成，是D隊運氣不佳還是疏忽？（ 12 IMPs）
East declared 3NT in both rooms by $v 6$ led．In the other room，the contract was one down，normal．leong＇s team however made it when North－South probably erred in throw－in carding
（7）D隊在開室坐南北時叫牌
Zen＇s North－South in Open room

| West | North | East | South |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1 *$ | 14 |
| $2 *$ | $3 *$ | $3 *$ | pass |
| $4 *$ | pass | pass | pass |

首攻 3，南未找到同伴叫過的 回攻，結果被打成，輸（不該輸的） 10 IMPs 。另一桌由東做莊4v下一。
＊3 lead but South missed the trump promotion defense of－return to allow the contract home， 10 IMPs ，when $4 v$ by East was one down in the other room．
（8）


開室由北打 3 很正常。閉室由南主打 $3 N T$ ，西能找到正確首攻嗎，很難吧。結果3NT還超一。如能找到 J 首攻，再穿 v，合約將下一，來回相差 16 IMPs 。 Open room contract was $3 *$ fair enough．In the closed room，South declared in 3NT， could the killing $\leqslant$ lead and switch be found？No！ 10 tricks．


Report of youth development 2004 to 2005
By：WK Lai，Leo Cheung

## I Introduction

The objectives of youth development program is to train up youth players who are expected to become advance players and fight for China Hong Kong in open series at both regional and international level．To achieve this objective，the youth development sub－committee（YDSC） adopted following four stages．

1）It starts from developing bridge as a common inter－collage activity among secondary school level．YDSC plans to promote bridge to both secondary school students and teachers．We expect that bridge would be a popular activity，such like swimming，football and dancing，in secondary schools after five years．We expect there will be over 1,000 active student players after five years．

2）Bridge is more popular in universities compare with secondary schools．We not only keep attracting more bridge players in university，but also to improve their skill and enlarge their exposure．YDSC focus on the quality of bridge players at university level．Formal inter－university tournaments would be held by HKCBA．Outstanding players are invited to join Hong Kong Youth Team for more intensive training．

3）Hong Kong Youth Team is one of the strongest team at Pacific Asia．Each year，we would recruit 10－12 new members．The size would be kept at 30 to 40 persons．．We give intensive training，including regular training，course and also regional tournament，to youth team members．Our aim is to win Pacific Asia Bridge Championship（youth section），World University Championship and Intercity（youth section），and getting into final 4 at World Junior Tournament．

4）In order to support youth development plan，YDSC needs large amount of working capital． We would organize regular fund raising events to collect sponsorship．These events include Fund raising dinner organized by Shirley Chang，AIA student funding and other possible sponsorship activities．


## II Promoting bridge at secondary school

YDSC promotes bridge among secondary schools in 3 ways as following,

1. Training program for secondary school teachers

YDSC would like to setup a training program for secondary school teachers. In order to increase the effectiveness promotion of bridge among secondary school, training of schoolteachers is a must. Teachers help to organize bridge clubs at secondary schools and monitor their students in bridge events. They act as our agent of promoting bridge in secondary schools. Certifications are awarded to teachers who finish the whole program. Moreover, we registered this program as credit course recognized by Education Department to attract more teachers participating. The program mainly focuses on teaching them how to operate a bridge club, how to run bridge tournaments and how to train up student playing bridge. It contains 3 parts, the introductory seminar, advance course and practical period.

This program had been run on Oct 8 and Oct 15, 2005. Teachers from more than 20 schools had attended this 12-hour course.
2. Organize Secondary School Bridge League (SSBL)

In order to promote bridge effectively, YDSC re-set up SSBL as a platform for sec-school bridge players. Through SSBL, sec-school bridge players can have a chance to participate in organizing bridge tournaments, at the same time, we can promote bridge at sec-schools level. At the beginning, SSBL would focus on organizing two annual events, AIA inter-collage team tournament and AIA inter-collage pair tournament.

The first SSBL Annual General Meeting (AGM) was held on Oct 29, 2005. Mr. Tom Leung chairs the board of directors, which including Mr. Billy Szeto and Mr. Ronald Hui.

## 3. Rose Bowl (Inter-secondary-school bridge championship)

YDSC would continue organize Rose Bowl as the most important inter-collage bridge championship. It includes qualifying round, best 16 , quarterfinal, semifinal and final round. The prize of would include HKCBA season pass, intercity (youth section) ticket, University-Collage friendly cup ticket, bridge books and trophies but not cash.

Rose Bowl 2005 was held at June and July. More than 60 teams from 30 schools participated.
4. Formal bridge class in Lam Tai Fai Secondary school

HKCBA is carrying a formal bridge class in Lam Tai Fai Secondary school on every WED in one year term. Mr. Jacky Ip is class instructor.

III Inter-post-secondary school cup
Bridge is more popular in university compare with in sec-schools. YDSC appreciates the work been done by Hong Kong Post-secondary Union of Bridge (HKPUB). We believe that university students are more mature and capable to run bridge tournaments and promoting bridge among universities. We propose to leave HKPUB as a full-student organization, which is independent from HKCBA.

In order to raise the standard of university bridge players and in order to reduce financial pressure of HKPUB, YDSC would like to take the responsibility to organize the inter-post-secondary cup. Of course HKPUB would help to promote this tournament among students. The inter-post-secondary cup would be held at every July and August. It includes qualifying round, best 16, quarterfinal, semifinal and final round. The prize of would include Pacific Asia University tournament ticket, Regional bridge tournament, HKCBA season pass, intercity (youth section) ticket, University-Collage friendly cup ticket, bridge books and trophies. Top players are also invited to participating in Hong Kong Youth Team.

Inter-post-secondary Bridge Tournament was held at July 2005. HKCBA provided qualified directors and venues throughout this event.

## IV Summary of Hong Kong contract bridge youth team

## Aim of HK youth team

The ultimate objective of youth development program is to train up youth players who are expected to become advance players and fight for China Hong Kong in open series at both regional and international level. To achieve this, Hong Kong Contract Bridge Association (HKCBA) forms a sizable team and providing them enough training. Hong Kong Youth team is also be sent to participate varies world and regional events such as World Youth Team Championship, Pacific Asia Bridge Championship, Pacific Asia Bridge Congress and Intercity Bridge Tournament. Mr. WK Lai, Mr. S.S. Bux and Mr. Leo Cheung lead the team since March 2004.

## General description of HK youth team

The team was set up since year 2002. All team members are aged 26 or below. Currently there are 34 members who were selected from more than 80 interviewers. The age ranges from 19 to 25. HK youth team is supervised under youth development sub-committee of Hong Kong Contract Bridge Association (HKCBA).

## Training

The team is divided into several 2 to 4 -person small groups. A mentor who is senior bridge player such as Mr. Derek Zen, Mr. Samuel Wan and Mr. David C.C. Ng leads each group. Weekly trainings including lectures, practices and discussions are provided. Moreover, team members are compulsory to participate in several local main events including intercity tournament 2004 that lasted for a week time. In order to enlarge team members' exposures, HK youth team sent all of them (divided into 4 teams) to participate Pacific Asia Bridge Congress 2004 in Taipei at July.

This is a 10-day regional event while teams from Japan, Chinese Taipei, Singapore and Thailand participated.

Moreover, each youth team member needs to be stand-by player in HKCBA pair events. They would be partner with the-last-single player. It encourage more single walk-in player to HKCBA pair events.

## Team structure

Only one team (6-person) can represent Hong Kong in Pacific Asia Bridge Championship 2005 in Seoul, S. Korea and World Youth Team Championship in Sydney, Australia. Ten youth players were selected into Team A at March 2005 by examination, overall performance during last one year, log-out trail and, of course, discipline record. The rest went into Team B. More intensive trainings are provided to Team A . The team would select 3 pairs from 5 pairs in Team A to participate PABF and WYTC according to their performance and stability. Nevertheless, Team B was divided into 4 teams and was sent to participate either Guangdong province team tournament (Ladder B) or Intercity bridge tournament 2005 in Hong Kong.

## Performance of HK youth before 2004

1. Finished at $2^{\text {nd }}$ runner-up at Pacific Asia Bridge Championship (youth session) 1999, China,
2. Finished at $10^{\text {th }}$ place at World Junior Bridge Tournament 1999, USA,
3. Won Pacific Asia Bridge Championship 2002, Thailand,
4. Finished at $9^{\text {th }}$ place at World Junior Bridge Tournament 2003, France
5. Finished at $2^{\text {nd }}$ runner-up at Pacific Asia Bridge Championship 2003, Philippines

## Performance of HK youth 2004

1. Finished at $2^{\text {nd }}$ runner-up at Pacific Asian Bridge Congress 2004 in Taipei.
2. Won Intercity bridge tournament (youth session) 2004 in Hong Kong,

## Performance of HK youth 2005

The HK youths performed well in both local and regional events. They often finished at first three places in local events and cup events held by HKCBA. Internationally, HK youth also won their reputation by performing well at following events.

1. Finished at $5^{\text {th }}$ place at Pearl River Cup (open) 2005,
2. Finished at $3^{\text {rd }}$ place at Pacific Asian Bridge Championship 2005 in Seoul,
3. Won one of three berths of zone 6 to participate World Youth Team Championship 2005 in Sydney,
4. Finished at $1^{\text {st }}$ runner-up at Guangong Team (Ladder A) Tournament 2005,
5. Finished at $7^{\text {th }}$ place at Guangong Team (Ladder B) Tournament 2005,
6. Finished at $9^{\text {th }}$ place at World Youth team Championship 2005, Sydney,
7. Finished in top-4 at Hong Kong intercity tournament (youth session) 2005

## $43^{\text {rd }}$ PABF Championships

 Captain's Report ~ Hong Kong Senior Team
## 1. Introduction

The Championships were held in the Seoul Olympic Parktel Hotel, in Seoul of Korea, from $23^{\text {rd }}$ June to $3^{\text {rd }}$ July 2005. Four teams from Hong Kong took part in all the four sections - Open, Ladies, Youth and Senior.

There were 14 teams in the Senior section, from 9 PABF NCBOs (or 7 Zone 6 NCBOs), with 5 teams from Japan and 2 from Korea.

## 2. The Team

Before I was appointed the captain in end May, a team was already set up with the following composition -- Ella Graca partnering Fu Kwan, while the partnerships between Chan Yiu, Louis Shen, York Liao and George Wang (who resided in Shanghai but was also a HK resident) had yet to be decided.

Afterwards, it was found that George was also the NPC of the China Senior team, but no officials (from HKCBA or PABF) could confirm whether there would have been any conflicts. To be safe, Chan Yiu found his own partner in mid June and the team was finalized, with the following 3 fixed pairs:

> Ella Graca + Fu Kwan,
> Chan Yiu + Lam Shee, and
> Louis Shen + York Liao.

Only the pair Chan/Lam had good partnership experience, especially in higher level tournaments.

As there was only limited time available, only 2 practice sessions could be organized on the 5th and 19th of June, with me substituting George in the first session.
3. Match Format

Double round robin, with 16 boards per match, were played to decide the winners of the Championships, while the first Zone 6 team would get the first berth for the World Senior Bowl, and the remaining 2 berths to be decided by the subsequent 4 Zone 6 teams (only one team from each NCBO). The second and third teams would play for the second berth, while the loser would play with the winner of the fourth and fifth placers to decide the final berth.
4. The Matches

The final results were as follows:

| Final |  | Round Robin 1 |  | RR2 | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ranking | Team | Rank | VPs | VPs | VPs |
| 1 | Japan - Yamada | 4 | 221 | 286 | 507 |
| 2 | Australia | 1 | 267 | 216 | 483 |
| 3 | China | 3 | 241 | 226 | 467 |
| 4 | Chinese Taipei | 2 | 242 | 218.5 | 460.5 |
| 5 | China HK | 6 | 205 | 240 | 445 |
| 6 | Indonesia | 5 | 218 | 211 | 429 |
| 7 | New Zealand | 9 | 178 | 228 | 406 |
| 8 | Japan - Queens \& Knight | 8 | 179 | 220 | 399 |
| 9 | Japan - Yokohama | 9 | 183 | 166 | 349 |
| 10 | Thailand | 13 | 150 | 166 | 316 |
| 11 | Japan - PS-Jacks | 11 | 170 | 139 | 309 |
| 12 | Japan - Wakasa | 10 | 172 | 129 | 301 |
| 13 | Korea - Ivy League | 12 | 166 | 107 | 273 |
| 14 | Korea - Joy Club | 14 | 125 | 134.5 | 259.5 |

We finished $6^{\text {th }}$ in the first round robin and $5^{\text {th }}$ (or $4^{\text {th }}$ in Zone 6 ) overall. Just counting the scores of the second round robin, we were only second to the ultimate winner (Yamada). Throughout the tournament, we were able to maintain a position in the front half of the field, except after round 3. In fact, after beating Chinese Taipei in round 24, we were only trailing the then $4^{\text {th }}$ placed Taipei by 0.5 VP . Unfortunately, we lost the final two matches and could not proceed further to a higher ranking. Please refer to the Appendix for the results of all the matches.

As can be observed, we won 7 matches, drew once and lost 5 times in each of the 2 round robins. Only in one match did we get a single-digit score (6:24 lost to China in round 12). We won $25: x$ in 5 matches, all in the second round robin, that accounted for the far better results in the second RR.
5. The Knock-out Matches

The Yamada team from Japan won the first berth. Then the teams from China, Chinese Taipei and Thailand decided that they would not be playing for the berths, thus leaving 3 teams to play for the remaining 2 berths - China HK, Indonesia and Korea (Ivy League). We first played against Indonesia for the second berth, the loser would then play against Korea for the final berth. We lost to Indonesia by $81: 132$ IMPs ( $18: 42,20: 77$ and 43 : 13), and then beat Korea by $163: 112$ IMPs ( $70: 30,36: 54$ and $57: 28$ ). Thus, Hong Kong will be eligible to send a team to play in the World Senior Bowl, to be held together with the Bermuda Bowl and Venice Cup, in Estoril of Portugal in October/November this year. My congratulations to all the team members for their great efforts!!!

## 6. Team Performance

In my opinion, the datum might not be related to a pair's performance. However, as can be seen from the Appendix, the net datum between the two pairs could be a good indication of the team's performance. I would like to point out that we lost quite a lot of part-score double swings, mostly with both contracts declared by the opponents.

The case was brought to the CTD immediately after the match. His reply was that if it was not explicitly stated in the systems notes, a bid of the opponent's suit (even possibly short) should be a cue-bid rather than a genuine suit. He even blamed us for not informing the TD that the opponents had no systems notes. In my opinion, if the opponents had not provided incorrect information to our pair, they would not have arrived at the wrong contract. Thus, damages had certainly been done to us. However, as it was already the final round of the RR2, and the results did not affect both teams' positions, we did not take any further action.

## Lessons learnt :

1. Always state clearly, on the systems notes, the actions to be taken for each individual case. Do not assume any action to be common or standard practice.
2. If the opponents are found to have no systems notes, always inform the TD.
B. Use of the Pick-up Slips

We had been requested twice by the opponents to adjust the scores of a board each after the matches.
Case 1: Round 6 (vs Thailand), board 25
Towards the end of the play, 4H by N, declarer claimed 9 tricks. Despite reminded by our players (Chan and Lam) that he should have made 10 tricks instead, both opponents still insisted that they made only 9 tricks, and Chan duly signed the pick-up slip. On the following day, the Thai pair approached Chan and claimed that they should have made 10 tricks. Chan agreed and the result of the match was adjusted from 24:6 to 22:8.

Case 2: Round 17 (vs Japan - Yamada), board 3
N played the board in 4 S and claimed 9 tricks, agreed and signed by our player. After the match, the declarer, having discussed the hand with his team-mates with reference to the hands records, requested us to agree upon adjusting the score to 10 tricks made. We agreed and the result was adjusted from 51:45imp to 41:45imp, again a difference of 2 VPs.

Case 3: $\quad$ Round 23 (vs Thailand), boards 5-7
The pick-up slip was collected by the caddy while board 7 (2NT by S) was still being played. Thus, the number of tricks (9) and the final score (150) were not entered, nor had the EW signed on it. The boards was input into the computer as 2 NT making 8 tricks. After getting the computer score-sheet, we noticed the error and had to find the opponents to agree on the actual score.

## Queries/Comments :

1. Based on sportsmanship and friendliness, we agreed to adjust the appropriate scores of the first two cases, but what actually was the use of having the EW sign the pick-up slips? My understanding is that EW's duty is to verify what S has recorded before he/she signs on it, and that should be the final result.
2. The caddies and scorers should be trained to collect/score slips that have been signed.

## $43^{\text {rd }}$ PABF Championships

## Summary

I am glad be invited by open team, and later be appointed by council, as NPC of open team participating in $43^{\text {rd }}$ Pacific Asia Bridge Championship, Seoul 2005. China Hong Kong open team had finished at $5^{\text {th }}$ out of twelve teams ${ }^{1}$. We entered the play-off session fighting for berth to Bermuda Bowl, but we failed to do so after losing to Indonesian team². Nevertheless, our team already did the best and the result is out of our own expectation.

The team was re-formed at late May after it won open team trial. Mr. Lawrence Lau resigned from the team due to health problem. His place was replaced by Mr. Eric Cyngiser. Council also waived any kind of penalty towards Mr. Lawrence Lau regarding to his resignation. The team is formed by:

Mr. WK Lai and Mr. Laurance Lo
Mr. Wai-kin Ng and Mr. Daniel Chiu
Mr. Alan Sze and Mr. Eric Cyngiser

## Background of 43 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Pacific Asia Bridge Championship, Seoul 2005

Korean Contract Bridge League (KCBL) organizes the 43rd PABC event under supervision of Pacific Asia Bridge Federation. Mr. Anthony Ching is the Chief Tournament Director of this event.

PABC is a bi-annual event. It is divided into four categories: Open, Lady, Senior and youth. In open series, totally twelve NCBOs had sent teams to join. They are Australia (zone 7), China Hong Kong, Chinese Taipei, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. Prizes would be given to top three teams finishing two round robins. On the other hand, three teams from zone 6 would be selected to participate

Except Australia team (from zone 7), the winner after two round robins would automatically get one berth. The second and third team would be grouped into winners' pool while the forth and fifth would be grouped into loser's pool and enter another 64-baords payoff section. Winner of winners' pool would get the second berth while loser would fight against winner of losers' pool for the last berth at another 64-board match.

## Training and preparation

Once after the team formation was finalized, the training program started. All pairs have to attend at least one at-the-table training, plus one online training including partnership bidding every week. On average, each pair spent about 12-15 hours on weekly training. I especially appreciate Mr. Alan Sze and Mr. Eric Cyngiser's pair. They put a lot of afford to improve their new partnership. Except the compulsory trainings, they almost played every night at OKbridge.

Nevertheless, other two pairs also squeezed their valuable time for training. For example, when Mr. Daniel Chiu was on his business trip at States, he also login Bridge Base Online practicing partnership bidding with Mr. Wai-kin NG despite 15 hours time lag ${ }^{3}$. Their efforts are worth. During the PABF, I did not see major partnership misunderstanding. They could know each other teammates well and have rational discussions after each match

## Performance

China Hong Kong finished at $5^{\text {th }}$ place after two round robins. Our final VP score is 350, which only 0.5 behind Japan's. Accordingly, We can enter to playoff section (one life only) for Berth to Bermuda Bowl 2005. We play against Indonesia team. We had a very bad starting at first segment by losing 4-60 imps. Our team did not give up and try to catch back in the remaining 3 segments. Although we finally still lost by 9IMPs in total, our teammates did try their best.

I would like to say that all three pairs performed very well. Following are the datum analysis for reference.

WK Lai - Laurance Lo have average 0.42 with 300 boards been played, ranking at $6^{\text {th }}$.
Eric Cyngiser - Alan Sze have average 0.05 with 340 boards been played, ranking at $14^{\text {th }}$.
Daniel Chiu - Wai Kin Ng have average -. 018 with 240 boards been played, ranking at $23^{\text {rd }}$.
The different datum may not reflect whole story since pairs played against different teams. Also, total number of boards have been played are different. In short, China Hong Kong open team did well this year in Seoul.

## Result of $1^{\text {st }}$ Round Robin

| Open Series |  | Against |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Adj | Total | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Team | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |  |  |
| 1 | Ch Macau |  | 14 | 14 | 25 | 14 | 13 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 15 | 6 | 17 |  | 137 | 10 |
| 2 | Ch Taipei | 16 |  | 10 | 14 | 17 | 20 | 16 | 20 | 24 | 22 | 8 | 15 |  | 182 | 3 |
| 3 | Japan | 16 | 20 |  | 25 | 18 | 15 | 10 | 17 | 22 | 14 | 12 | 0 |  | 168.5 | 7 |
| 4 | NZ | 4 | 16 | 5 |  | 16 | 19 | 14 | 14 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 18 |  | 159 | 8 |
| 5 | Australia | 16 | 13 | 12 | 14 |  | 23 | 7 | 19 | 13 | 19 | 20 | 20 |  | 176 | 4 |
| 6 | Philippines | 17 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 7 |  | 11 | 14 | 19 | 15 | 6 | 15 |  | 140 | 9 |
| 7 | China | 25 | 14 | 20 | 16 | 23 | 19 |  | 18 | 25 | 25 | 19 | 16 |  | 220 | 1 |
| 8 | China HK | 25 | 10 | 13 | 16 | 11 | 16 | 12 |  | 23 | 25 | 16 | 6 |  | 173 | 5 |
| 9 | Thailand | 18 | 6 | 16 | 13 | 17 | 11 | 3 | 7 |  | 25 | 9 | 16 |  | 132.5 | 11 |
| 10 | Korea | 15 | 8 | 16 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 2 | 5 | 5 |  | 15 | 11 |  | 115 | 12 |
| 11 | Indonesia | 24 | 22 | 18 | 12 | 11 | 24 | 11 | 14 | 21 | 15 |  | 19 |  | 190 | 2 |
| 12 | Singapore | 13 | 15 | 25 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 24 | 14 | 19 | 11 |  |  | 172 | 6 |

Result of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Round Robin

|  | Open Series | $\begin{gathered} \hline 1 R R \\ d o \end{gathered}$ | Against |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Adj | Total | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Team |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |  |  |
| 1 | China | 220 |  | 20 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 24 | 10 | 14 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 25 |  | 431 | 1 |
| 2 | Indonesia | 190 | 10 |  | 9 | 15 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 22 | 15 | 10 | 20 | 15 |  | 346 | 6 |
| 3 | Chinese Taipei | 182 | 14 | 21 |  | 9 | 25 | 15 | 16 | 13 | 22 | 17 | 25 | 23 |  | 382 | 2 |
| 4 | Australia | 176 | 13 | 15 | 21 |  | 10 | 19 | 25 | 9 | 21 | 17 | 14 | 25 |  | 365 | 3 |
| 5 | China Hong Kong | 173 | 12 | 21 | 1 | 20 |  | 20 | 15 | 12 | 21 | 22 | 14 | 19 |  | 350 | 5 |
| 6 | Singapore | 172 | 6 | 14 | 15 | 11 | 10 |  | 14 | 5 | 21 | 14 | 18 | 21 |  | 321 | 8 |
| 7 | Japan | 168.5 | 20 | 15 | 14 | 5 | 15 | 16 |  | 25 | 25 | 23 | 12 | 12 |  | 350.5 | 4 |
| 8 | New Zealand | 159 | 16 | 8 | 17 | 21 | 18 | 25 | 5 |  | 19 | 17 | 11 | 22 |  | 338 | 7 |
| 9 | Philippines | 140 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 11 |  | 13 | 15 | 17 |  | 254 | 11 |
| 10 | China Macau | 137 | 8 | 20 | 13 | 13 | 8 | 16 | 7 | 13 | 17 |  | 0 | 10 |  | 262 | 10 |
| 11 | Thailand | 132.5 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 16 | 16 | 12 | 18 | 19 | 15 | 25 |  | 20 |  | 295.5 | 9 |
| 12 | Korea | 115 | 4 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 9 | 18 | 8 | 13 | 20 | 10 |  |  | 234 | 12 |

Result of Playoff

| Open Series |  | Segment |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| China Hong Kong | 4 | 42 | 36 | 44 | 126 |
| Indonesia | 60 | 34 | 36 | 5 | 135 |

Training Record

| Date | Training | Book and Dicky | Daniel and Anthony | Eric and Alan |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $24-4-2005$ | on table | x |  | x |
| $29-4-2005$ | OKB vs Taipei Team | x |  | x |
| $2-5-2005$ | on table vs Leo/Michael Ware | x | x | x |
| $6-5-2005$ | OKB | x |  | x |
| $8-5-2005$ | on table vs Youth A team | x | x | x |
| $9-5-2005$ | BBO partnership bidding |  | x | x |
| $12-5-2005$ | OKB vs Samuel Wan's team | x |  | x |
| $14-5-2005$ | BBO partnership bidding |  | x | x |
| $15-5-2005$ | on table training | x | x |  |
| $26-5-2005$ | OKB 9-12pm | x | x | x |
| $2-6-2005$ | OKB vs Youth A team 8-11pm |  | x | x |
| $5-6-2005$ | on table training + KF pair | x |  | x |
| $6-6-2005$ | BBO partnership bidding |  | x | x |
| $9-6-2005$ | OKB 9-12pm | x | x |  |
| $12-6-2005$ | on table training |  | x | x |
| $13-6-2005$ | OKB 9-12pm | x | x |  |
| $16-6-2005$ | BBO partnership bidding | x | x | x |
| $20-6-2005$ | OKB 9-12pm |  | x | x |
| $21-6-2005$ | OKB 9-12pm |  |  | x |

## 43 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ PABF Championships

## Captain's Report ~ Hong Kong Ladies Team

In May 2005, I was appointed by the council to be the NPC of Hong Kong Ladies Team. Before going into the details of the report, I would like to thank the council to appoint me as the NPC of the Ladies Team and volunteers who have contributed a lot on the trainings.

## Hong Kong Ladies Team Selection

The 2005 Hong Kong PABF Ladies Team was selected through a team trial (Amy Yeung's team Vs Shirley Leong's Team). The following team was formed to represent Hong Kong Ladies Team in Seoul.

Non-playing captain:
Players:

## Tony Lau

Amy Yeung (AY) \& Monica Chan (MC)
Flora Wong (FW) \& Tiffany Tse (TT)
Charmian Koo (CK) \& Pearlie Chan (PC)

## Objective

Our objective is to finish a respectable position in the field so that we can qualify for the playoff and fight for the berth. Besides, we would try to gain experience from the matches in order to improve our bridge skills.

## Training

The team has been formed in Sept 2004. They have participated in various HKCBAL regular tournaments such as Ladder Team and IMP pairs as a kind of regular practice. After I was appointed to be the NPC, besides participating in CBA's events, training sessions were scheduled on every Sunday, 3 pairs of the ladies were arranged to form in different combinations and played against different opponents such as the Hong Kong Youth Team and the Hong Kong Senior Team representatives.

## Championship format

There were 10 teams participating in the $43^{\text {rd }}$ PABF Ladies Series: China, Japan, Indonesia, Australia, New Zealand, China Hong Kong, Singapore, Thailand, Japan and Korea. Top five finishers in Zone 6 will be qualified to play-offs to fight for the berths in Venice Cup.

## Results

The result of the first round robin was satisfactory. They scored 13.7 VP per round which was under my expectation. We lost 2 heavy matches against China and Australia and we could not achieve expected result against some same level opponents. The ladies did show some instability for high-level biddings and defense. In order to secure for the playoff, we need some adjustments for the second round robin.

| Ladies's Series |  | Against |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Adj | Total | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Team | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  |  |  |
| 1 | China Hong Kong | 1 | 16 | 23 | 23 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 11 | 17 | 10 | 1 | 123 | 7 |
| 2 | New Zealand | 14 | 1 | 25 | 16 | 4 | 15 | 24 | 20 | 4 | 7 | Y | 129 | 5 |
| 3 | Chinese Taipei | 7 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 9 | / | 46 | 10 |
| 4 | Thailand | 7 | 14 | 21 | 1 | 13 | 14 | 10 | 14 | 6 | 9 | -0.5 | 107.5 | 8 |
| 5 | China | 24 | 25 | 25 | 17 | 1 | 25 | 17 | 25 | 19 | 20 | / | 197 | 1 |
| 6 | Singapore | 19 | 15 | 25 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 9 | 19 | Y | 129 | 5 |
| 7 | Australia | 24 | 6 | 25 | 20 | 13 | 20 | 1 | 20 | 17 | 8 | / | 153 | 4 |
| 8 | Korea | 19 | 10 | 21 | 16 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 12 | -0.5 | 106.5 | 9 |
| 9 | Japan | 13 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 11 | 24 | 13 | 25 | 1 | 16 | R | 176 | 2 |
| 10 | Indonesia | 20 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 10 | 11 | 22 | 18 | 14 | 1 | -0.5 | 159.5 | 3 |

## Datum:

|  |  | AY + MC |  |  |  |  |  | FW + TT |  |  |  |  | CK + PC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | + | - | Net | VP | + | - | Net | VP | + | - | Net | VP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Indonesia |  |  |  |  | 29 | 46 | -17 | 10 | 18 | 32 | -14 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Japan | 26 | 42 | -16 | 17 | 56 | 25 | +31 | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Korea | 32 | 31 | +1 | 11 |  |  |  |  | 25 | 42 | -17 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Australia | 27 | 39 | -12 | 6 | 12 | 51 | -39 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Singapore |  |  |  |  | 26 | 43 | -17 | 11 | 26 | 31 | -5 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | China | 19 | 50 | -31 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 29 | 46 | -17 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Thailand | 62 | 13 | +49 | 23 | 28 | 30 | -2 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | C.Taipei |  |  |  |  | 42 | 20 | +22 | 23 | 40 | 20 | +20 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | N.Zealand |  |  |  |  | 37 | 38 | -1 | 16 | 24 | 22 | +2 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RR1 sub total | 166 | 175 | -9 |  | 233 | 256 | -23 |  | 162 | 193 | -31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.8 | 12.6 |  |  | -3.3 | 15.1 |  |  | -5.2 | 12.8 |

The ladies performed much better than the first round robin and we scored 16.2 VP per round. We were ahead of Singapore by 9 VP and finished sixth. We qualified for the playoff and our opponent was Singapore.

|  | Ladies Series | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 1RR } \\ \hline \text { c/o } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Against |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Adj | Total | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Team |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  |  |  |
| 1 | China | 197 | 1 | 17 | 24 | 22 | 19 | 25 | 19 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 1 | 398 | 1 |
| 2 | Japan | 176 | 13 | 1 | 9 | 20 | 13 | 21 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 25 | 1 | 328 | 2 |
| 3 | Indonesia | 159.5 | 6 | 21 | 1 | 22 | 20 | 15 | 19 | 16 | 18 | 25 | 1 | 321.5 | 3 |
| 4 | Australia | 153 | 8 | 10 | 8 | / | 16 | 21 | 13 | 25 | 25 | 13 | 1 | 292 | 4 |
| 5 | New Zealand | 129 | 11 | 17 | 10 | 14 | 1 | 14 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 25 | 1 | 277 | 5 |
| 6 | Singapore | 129 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 9 | 16 | 1 | 14 | 15 | 25 | 25 | 1 | 260 | 7 |
| 7 | China Hong Kong | 123 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 17 | 11 | 16 | 1 | 25 | 18 | 25 | 1 | 269 | 6 |
| 8 | Thailand | 107.5 | 3 | 14 | 14 | 1 | 11 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 25 | 24 | 1 | 216.5 | 8 |
| 9 | Korea | 106.5 | 5 | 13 | 12 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 12 | 0 | / | 19 | 1 | 184.5 | 9 |
| 10 | Chinese Taipei | 46 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 99 | 10 |

## Datum:

|  |  | AY + MC |  |  |  | FW + TT |  |  |  |  | CK + PC |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | + | - | Net | VP | + | - | Net | VP | + | - | Net | VP |  |  |  |
| 1 | New <br> Zealand | 29 | 61 | -32 | 11 |  |  |  |  | 37 | 31 | +6 | 11 |  |  |
| 2 | Australia |  |  |  |  | 21 | 34 | -13 | 17 | 42 | 21 | +21 | 17 |  |  |
| 3 | Singapore | 39 | 53 | -14 | 16 | 61 | 42 | +19 | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | China | 23 | 27 | -4 | 11 |  |  |  |  | 25 | 40 | -15 | 11 |  |  |
| 5 | C. Taipei |  |  |  |  | 50 | 22 | +28 | 25 | 62 | 13 | +49 | 25 |  |  |
| 6 | Indonesia | 27 | 40 | -13 | 11 | 23 | 40 | -17 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Korea | 40 | 31 | +9 | 18 |  |  |  |  | 41 | 32 | +9 | 18 |  |  |
| 8 | Japan |  |  |  |  | 25 | 42 | -17 | 12 | 31 | 32 | -1 | 12 |  |  |
| 9 | Thailand | 71 | 13 | +58 | 25 | 47 | 27 | +20 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RR2 sub total |  | 229 | 225 | +4 |  | 227 | 207 | +20 |  | 238 | 169 | +69 |  |  |  |
| Average |  |  |  | +0.7 | 15.3 |  |  | +3.3 | 17.7 |  |  | +11.5 | 15.7 |  |  |

## Playoff

After the third set of match, our scores were very close and only lacked behind Singapore by 11 imps . However, due to the lack of experience in playoff and some misunderstandings in bidding, we lost the fourth set and the match.

|  | China Hong Kong | Singapore |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1^{\text {st }}$ set | 22 | 48 |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ set | 43 | 38 |
| $3^{\text {rd }}$ set | 45 | 35 |
| $4^{\text {th }}$ set | 15 | 33 |
| Total | 125 | 154 |


|  | AY + MC | FW + TT | CK + PC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1^{\text {st }} \mathrm{RR}(\mathrm{imp})$ | -9 | -23 | -31 |
| $2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{RR}$ (imp) | +4 | +20 | +69 |
| Total imp gain | -5 | -3 | +38 |
| No. of matches played | 11 | 13 | 12 |
| Average IMP gained | -0.45 | -0.23 | +3.17 |
| Average VP gained | 14.1 | 16.3 | 14.3 |

As shown from the datum, 3 pairs performed satisfactory and in line with my expectation. Among the 3 pairs, CK \& PC performed best in average. AY \& MC especially performed well in the playoff against Singapore. For FW \& TT, although they are newly formed partnership, their performance was up to standard.

## Conclusion

We enjoyed the tournament and gained valuable experience during the match. We would like to share with you some of our experience.

1. The first and the most essential element to perform well in a RR is "stability".
2. Trust your partner in any circumstances, this is the foundation of any partnership. When in doubt, try to work out what is going on at the table.
3. Trust your teammates. Do not try to perform heroic actions.
4. Do not discuss the hands during the match, as this may bring uncomfortable to both sides.
$43^{\text {rd }}$ PABF Championships

## Captain's Report ~ Hong Kong Youth Team

## Summary

I am glad to be NPC of Hong Kong Youth Team which participating Pacific Asia Bridge Championship (PABC) held at Seoul from June 23 to July 3, 2005. And our youth have good performance there.

After two round robins, we finished at $3^{\text {rd }}$ place after Japan and Australia out of nine teams. Although we lost to Chinese Taipei team later in payoff when fighting second berth to World Youth Team Championship (WYTC), we won the third berth by beating Indonesia team at second round payoff.

The youth team's training program had been started from March 2004 under supervision of Mr. WK Lai, Mr. SS Bux and me. Through a paper examination and a log-out trial, five pairs out of seventeen had been selected as Team A at March 2005. Intensive training had been assigned to Team A once it was formed. By May 23, youth team committee selected three pairs from Team A to participate PABC. They are Mr. Chi-cheung Ng and Mr. Cheuk-hin Leung's pair (NL); Mr. Wai-lap Chiu and Mr. Yu-cheung Ip’s pair (CI); and Mr. Chung-man Leung and Mr. Wai-sing Yiu's pair (LY).

These six youth gentlemen will also represent Hong Kong in $10^{\text {th }}$ World Youth Team Championship, which will be held at Sydney from August 7 to August 17, due to their outstanding performance during PABC tournament.

## Background of 43 ${ }^{\text {rd }}$ Pacific Asia Bridge Championship, Seoul 2005

Korean Contract Bridge League (KCBL) organizes the 43rd PABC event under supervision of Pacific Asia Bridge Federation. Mr. Anthony Ching is the Chief Tournament Director of this event.

PABC is a bi-annual event. It is divided into four categories: Open, Lady, Senior and youth. In youth series, totally nine NCBOs had sent teams to join. They are Australia (zone 7), China Hong Kong, Chinese Taipei, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. Prizes would be given to top three teams finishing two round robins. On the other hand, three teams from zone 6 would be selected to participate $10^{\text {th }}$ WYTC in Sydney.

Except Australia team (from zone 7), the winner after two round robins would automatically get one berth. The second and third team would be grouped into winners' pool while the forth and fifth would be grouped into loser's pool and enter another 64-baords payoff section. Winner of winners' pool would get the second berth while loser would fight against winner of losers' pool for the last berth at another 64-board match.

## Performance

Hong Kong Youth Team finished at $3^{\text {rd }}$ place after two round robins while Japan got championship and Australia got $1^{\text {st }}$ runner-up. When fighting for berth to Sydney’s WYTC, we lost at winners' pool to Chinese Taipei but won Indonesia at the last payoff.

## Round Robins

We had a very bad start at the first round robin by losing 4-25 to Indonesia. However, our players picked up quickly at second match by winning 24-6 against Philippines. Throughout the first round robin, we had 5 wins but also 3 big losses, which against Indonesia (4-25), Chinese Taipei (8-22) and Australia (7-23). We finished at $7^{\text {th }}$ out of nine teams after first round robin.

Same as what we experienced in first round robin, we also had a bad start at second round robin by losing 11-19 to Philippines, which we expected to win. Once again, our players could forget sadness and then concentrated again to the matches left. We beat strong opponents like Japan (21-9), Australia (22-8) and Chinese Taipei (20-10). Although we had three losing matches, they were not big losses, 11-19 to Philippines, 13-17 to Singapore and $12-18$ to Indonesia. And eventually, they finished at $3^{\text {rd }}$ place, 1.5 VPs ahead Chinese Taipei's team.

## Payoffs

Hong Kong youth teams entered into winners' pool and played against Chinese Taipei for second berth to $10^{\text {th }}$ WYTC. We have big losses in first segment and forth segment and eventually lost the payoff. Right after losing to Chinese Taipei, HK youth entered the next payoff playing against Indonesia. Despite losing two matches to Indonesia during round robins, our players kept their confidence and stamina, played card by card towards their dream to Sydney. And they did it.

Compare with previous Hong Kong youth teams, this team is not an outstanding one in terms of skill level and experience. However, we are one of the best Hong Kong youth teams ever in terms of team harmony, discipline and psychological quality. All team members showed up together 15 minutes before every match no matter who was going to sit out. The sit-out pair often bought lunch set for the whole team even during raining days. As a result, all of us can enjoy enough rest during tiny lunch break. We never blame other teammates or own partner before teammates and NPC after bad matches. We rather prefer rational discussion about hands be played. All of above show great team harmony. We are disciplinary that slept before twelve every night and wake up before nine at morning while tournament starting from ten. Neither alcohol nor smoking is allowed throughout the tournament. Good team harmony and discipline creates high level of psychological quality and concentration. We could concentrate on every single match no matter how strong opponents are and no matter how bad result had been got in previous matches. Because of concentration, our players can recover very soon after bad starting at both round robins. Because of concentration, we have no fear to so-called strong teams. Because of concentration, we could keep our confidence throughout two round robins and two rounds of payoff, which totally 448 hands had been played. And finally, we finished our task bringing trophies and berth back.

Hong Kong youth often kept friendly attitude towards other players and officials. Although in such high-standard championship, we were serious and keeping "poker" face at the table, we never were impolite or rude to anyone. Furthermore, our youth were first volunteering to help Mr. Rick Wakeman to organize BBO broadcasting.

## Strategy

I believe that teams are very close to each other in such high level championship. Who can keep concentration, who can win the tournament. So throughout the matches, I emphasized on building up team harmony, discipline and confidence, which I have mentioned at previous paragraph. Moreover, as defense skill is major weakness among most youth teams, I encouraged Hong Kong players bid aggressive games but safe slams. LY pair is relatively weak in defense against aggressive bidders. They are more effective playing against conservative players, so I avoid putting them playing against aggressive players. NL pair are experienced players who I am confident to let them playing against aggressive and strong players. CI pair used RED system with some creative overcall conventions. To maximize their effectiveness, I try to put CI pair against in-experienced players. Nevertheless, I restricted any kind of psychic bid.

In short, our players are stable in bidding. They did not give out "disaster" scores like 800 or 1100. However, they need more practices at slam biddings. LY pair should also improve their compete bidding against aggressive opponents. Our youth performed fair declarer skill. They made plan before starting the first trick, even though the plan might not be the best one, at least they had try the best effort. Defense skill is the major weakness among our team. They are lack of imagination during defending game contracts like 3NT and 4-mojors. During one-month time before entering WYTC, we will focus on training their defense skill as well as slam bidding techniques. Since I lined-up according to players' strength and weakness, datum is not reliable to evaluate players' performance. No datum information is provided here. However, I appreciate that they have all performed the best in every single match. It is because they value the opportunity representing Hong Kong and their future in bridge career.

## Result of $1^{\text {st }}$ Round Robin

|  |  | Against |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bye | Adj | Total | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Team | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Philippines |  | 22 | 13 | 24 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 21 | 6 | 18 | -0.5 | 141.5 | 4 |
| 2 | Thailand | 8 |  | 5 | 22 | 14 | 25 | 17.5 | 16 | 13 | 18 | -0.5 | 138 | 6 |
| 3 | Singapore | 17 | 25 |  | 19 | 10 | 16 | 22 | 15 | 13 | 18 |  | 155 | 3 |
| 4 | Korea | 6 | 8 | 11 |  | 11 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 18 | -2.5 | 73.5 | 9 |
| 5 | Japan | 14 | 16 | 20 | 19 |  | 25 | 22 | 18 | 12 | 18 |  | 164 | 1 |
| 6 | Indonesia | 17 | 4 | 14 | 24 | 5 |  | 6 | 16 | 25 | 18 |  | 129 | 8 |
| 7 | Australia | 21 | 15 | 8 | 22 | 8 | 24 |  | 18 | 23 | 18 |  | 157 | 2 |
| 8 | Chinese Taipei | 9 | 14 | 15 | 25 | 12 | 14 | 15 |  | 22 | 18 | -2.5 | 141.5 | 4 |
| 9 | China Hong Kong | 24 | 17 | 17 | 25 | 18 | 4 | 7 | 8 |  | 18 |  | 138 | 6 |


| Youth Series |  | $\begin{gathered} 1 \mathrm{RR} \\ \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{o} \end{gathered}$ | Against |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bye | Adj | Total | Rank |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Team |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Japan | 146 |  | 6 | 21 | 19 | 25 | 22 | 9 | 20 | 21 |  | -0.5 | 288.5 | 1 |
| 2 | Australia | 139 | 24 |  | 15 | 14 | 24 | 8 | 8 | 22 | 17 |  |  | 271 | 2 |
| 3 | Singapore | 137 | 9 | 15 |  | 7 | 15 | 25 | 17 | 5 | 22 |  |  | 252 | 5 |
| 4 | Chinese Taipei | 123.5 | 11 | 16 | 23 |  | 20 | 12 | 11 | 21 | 22 |  |  | 259.5 | 4 |
| 5 | Philippines | 123.5 | 3 | 6 | 15 | 10 |  | 14 | 19 | 3 | 25 |  |  | 218.5 | 8 |
| 6 | Thailand | 120 | 8 | 22 | 3 | 18 | 16 |  | 3 | 8 | 23 |  |  | 221 | 7 |
| 7 | China Hong Kong | 120 | 21 | 22 | 13 | 19 | 11 | 25 |  | 10 | 20 |  |  | 261 | 3 |
| 8 | Indonesia | 111 | 10 | 8 | 25 | 9 | 25 | 22 | 20 |  | 20 |  |  | 250 | 6 |
| 9 | Korea | 55.5 | 9 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 10 |  |  | -0.5 | 122 | 9 |

## Result of Playoffs

| Youth Series | Segment |  |  |  | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| China Hong Kong | 20 | 55 | 25 | 1 | 101 |
| Chinese Taipei | 54 | 22 | 32 | 45 | 153 |


| Youth Series | Segment |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |
| China Hong Kong | 47 | 45 | 15 | 18 | 125 |
| Indonesia | 17 | 28 | 26 | 27 | 98 |

## Bulletin \#8, July 1, Friday

Thursday on Vugraph - by Rick Wakeman
... I must mention that the Hong Kong youth has played a huge role in the BBO broadcast success to date. They have operated 6 sessions now and without them what has happened in the last two days just wouldn't have been possible. Hats off to you guys! A heart felt thank-you from the organizing committee....

10th World Youth Bridge Championships, Sydney 2005 Captain's Report ~ China Hong Kong Youth Team

## Summary

As we got the berth of World Youth Bridge Championship (WYBC) in Seoul, we can participate this world class youth bridge tournament which held in Sydney. This year, Hong Kong Youth team finished at $9^{\text {th }}$ out of 18 and we got 259VP which was 4 VPs above average. This is first time that Hong Kong Youth Team's ranking and average VPs finished above average.

After 96-boards final, USA I and Poland drew, then USA I beat Poland in 8-board sudden death. USA I is the champion, Poland is $1^{\text {st }}$-runner-up and Canada is $2^{\text {nd }}$-runner-up of this WYTC. And here is the ranking of round robin:

| Round Robin |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ladder |  |  |
| Rank | Team | VPs |
| 1 | Poland | 345 |
| 2 | France | 333 |
| 3 | USA1 | 311.8 |
| 4 | Canada | 299 |
| 5 | Hungary | 276 |
| 6 | Chinese Taipei | 272 |
| 7 | Australia | 270 |
| 8 | Israel | 265.7 |
| 9 | China Hong Kong | 259 |
| 10 | Chile | 247 |
| 11 | Norway | 246 |
| 11 | Japan | 246 |
| 13 | England | 245 |
| 14 | Egypt | 226 |
| 15 | USA2 | 224 |
| 16 | Brazil | 219 |
| 17 | New Zealand | 167 |
| 18 | Pakistan | 59 |
| 15 | USA2 | 224 |
| 16 | Brazil | 219 |
| 17 | New Zealand | 167 |
| 18 | Pakistan | 59 |
|  |  |  |

As Abby Chiu's incident happened, we decided to select Leung Check Hin-Baron Ng, KF Mak-Alick Ng, Ivan Leung-Yiu Wai Sing these 3 pairs to represent HK youth team to participate WYBC. Non-Playing Captain is me, WK Lai. Team Manager is Charmian Koo and Recorder is Ivan $\mathrm{Hu}(\mathrm{He}$ is now studying in Australia).

## Training

Actually, we have only around 1 month left after we were back from Seoul. We arranged 4 training sessions including 3 face-to-face trainings and 1 internet training per week after 3 pairs are selected. Those face-to-face trainings, we try to arrange they playing against different style opponents.

## Sponsorship

Besides those sponsorships from youth sub-committee, Mr. Samuel Wan helped us raising another $\$ 35,000$ from himself and his friends including Mr. Derek Zen, Ms Linda Tao and Ms Doreen Pao. After agreed by the sponsors, we decided to divide this $\$ 35000$ into:

1) Ivan Leung, Yiu Wai Sing, Leung Cheuk Hin(students): \$7000
2) Mak Kwok Fai, Alick Ng, Baron Ng(working):
\$4000
3) The remain $\$ 2000$, as pocket money for the team

With the sponsorship from youth sub-committee, the players are still studying are fully sponsored for the trip

## Strategy

As there were 3 matches per day, I let each pair played 2 matches per day. I tried to arrange Mak-Ng pair playing against strong team, Yiu-Leung pair playing against non-aggressive team and Leung-Ng pair against aggressive team.

## Conclusions

This year, the standard of WYTC is pretty high, we can only find New Zealand is weak team and Pakistan is very weak team. And, comparing with top 4 teams, our standard is still quite far away. Although we win the tournament champion USA I, we performed quite bad when playing against other strong teams. Playing against European teams' result also bad, we lost 5 matches and 1 won 1 match only.

As the most experienced pair in the team, Mak-Ng performed fair, they did well on defence. But on bidding, they did not handle very well especially on some slam bidding. Leung-Ng pair had very bad start in first 2 days, from the datum showing they either got positive IMPs or negative a huge amount of IMPs, I think they need to aware this phenomenon. Yiu-Leung pair, as the less experienced and youngest pair, their performance is better than I expected. What they need now is the experience of playing against strong opponents.

| Round | Opponents | IMPs | VPs | Leung-Ng | Mak-Ng | Yiu-Leung | Total | Position |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Chinese Taipei | 3 | 16 | -39 | 43 |  | 15 | 9 |
| 2 | Australia | 20 | 19 |  | 4 | 19 | 34 | 7 |
| 3 | Brazil | -24 | 10 | -41 |  | 5 | 44 | 11 |
| 4 | Egypt | 8 | 16 | 1 | 10 |  | 60 | 7 |
| 5 | Israel | -30 | 9 | -33 |  | -6 | 69 | 11 |
| 6 | Poland | -28 | 9 |  | -29 | -8 | 78 | 13 |
| 7 | USA2 | 20 | 19 | 9 |  | 9 | 97 | 12 |
| 8 | Japan | 8 | 16 |  | 4 | 2 | 113 | 10 |
| 9 | USA1 | 13 | 18 | 6 | 13 |  | 131 | 11 |
| 10 | England | -3 | 14 | 7 | -16 |  | 145 | 9 |
| 11 | New Zealand | 45 | 24 | 39 |  | 12 | 169 | 7 |
| 12 | France | -18 | 11 |  | 5 | -27 | 180 | 9 |
| 13 | Hungary | -34 | 8 |  | -19 | -22 | 188 | 10 |
| 14 | Canada | -52 | 5 | -50 | -18 |  | 193 | 14 |
| 15 | Pakistan | 76 | 25 | 42 | 56 |  | 218 | 10 |
| 16 | Chile | 29 | 21 | 10 |  | 21 | 239 | 9 |
| 17 | Norway | 22 | 20 |  | -11 | 22 | 259 | 9 |

JANUARY～MARCH 2006
一月 JANVOAB9 2006

| 3 | Tue | Open IMP Pairs 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 6 | Fri | Open IMP Pairs 2 |
| 7 | Sat | Yeh＇s Cup Trial 1 |
| 8 | Sun | Yeh＇s Cup Trial 2 |
| 8 | Sun | PABF Simultaneous Pairs 4 |
| 10 | Tue | Paul Jones 5 |
| 13 | Fri | Ladder Team 6 |
| 14 | Sat | Yeh＇s Cup Trial 3 |
| 15 | Sun | Yeh＇s Cup Trial 4 |
| 17 | Tue | Continuous Pairs 6 |
| 20 | Fri | AGM and AGM Pairs |
| 24 | Tue | January Pairs |

二月 EEABOOAB9 2006

| 5 | Sun | PABF Simultaneous Pairs 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 10 | Fri | IMP Pairs 6 |
| 14 | Tue | Paul Jones 6 |
| 17 | Fri | Ladder Team 7 |
| 18 | Sat | PABF Trial 1RR \＃1 |
| 19 | Sun | PABF Trial 1RR \＃2 |
| 21 | Tue | Continuous Pairs 7 |
| 24 | Fri | February Pairs |
| 25 | Sat | PABF Trial 1RR \＃3 |
| 26 | Sun | PABF Trial 1RR \＃4 |

三月 MARCH 2006

| 3 | Fri | IMP Pairs 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 4 | Sat | Open League 5（Matches 8 and 9） |
| 5 | Sun | PABF Simultaneous Pairs 6 |
| 7 | Tue | Paul Jones 7 |
| 10 | Fri | Ladder Team 8 |
| 14 | Tue | Continuous Pairs 8 |
| 17 | Fri | March Pairs |
| 18 | Sat | PABF Trial 2RR \＃1 |
| 19 | Sun | PABF Trial 2RR \＃2 |
| 25 | Sat | PABF Trial 2RR \＃3 |
| 26 | Sun | PABF Trial 2RR \＃4 |
| 28 | Tue | Mixed Pairs 1 |
| 31 | Fri | Mixed Pairs 2 |

