# Newsletter July ~ September 2015 

HKCBA LTD
http://www.hkcba.org
Member of World Bridge Federation
Member of Pacific Asia Bridge Federation

## 目 錄

## Table of Contents

PageMinutes of the 2nd Council Meeting．2015／16 ..... 3
Minutes of the 3rd Council Meeting．2015／16 ..... 5
參加第 50 屆 APBF Participation in the $50^{\text {th }}$ APBF Championships ..... ．． 7
三角賽中 2 副牌 2 Boards in Triangular Bridge Competition 2015 ..... 20
零點叫牌 Bidding with Zero HCP． ..... 25
Captain＇s Report－Hong Kong Girls Team ..... 28
Captain＇s Report－Hong Kong Juniors Team ..... 30
Captain＇s Report－Hong Kong Seniors Team 1 ..... 32
Captain＇s Report－Hong Kong Seniors Team 2 ..... 35
Captain＇s Report－Hong Kong Open Team． ..... 40

## 2nd Council Meeting Minutes

Date: April 27, 2015 (Monday)

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Venue: Unit 1103, 11/F, East Ocean Centre, 98 Granville Road, TST, KLN, HK

Present: Officers:
Derek Zen - President (DZ)
Leo Cheung - Vice President (LC)
Pearlie Chan - Secretary (PC)
Christopher Leung - Treasurer (CL)

Council members:
CC Wong (CC)
Charlie Lee (XL)
John Tsang (JT)
KF Mak (KF)
Ronald Hui (RH)
Tony Lau (TL)
WK Lai (WK)

Apologies: Council members:
Arthur Lau (AL)

| Item | Content | When | Action |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Adopt minutes of last meeting. |  |  |
| 2 | Matters raised in last meeting (by minutes order): |  |  |
|  | a) Progress update: HKCBA website revamp: Alan Sze will take up the outstanding tasks and have them completed by end of the year 2015. The working committee will continue to follow up with him on progress. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TL,WK, } \\ & \text { XL } \end{aligned}$ |
| 3 | Financial Affairs: |  |  |
| 3 i | Latest Bank Balance: HKD36.6K. |  |  |
| 4 | Internal Affairs: |  |  |
| 4 i | Intercity update: Title sponsor: Avia Asset Management Limited |  |  |



## 3rd Council Meeting Minutes

Date: June 2, 2015 (Tuesday)

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Venue: Unit 1103, 11/F, East Ocean Centre, 98 Granville Road, TST, KLN, HK

Present: Officers:
Derek Zen - President (DZ)
Leo Cheung - Vice President (LC)
Pearlie Chan - Secretary (PC)
Christopher Leung - Treasurer (CL)

Council members:

CC Wong (CC)
Charlie Lee (XL)
John Tsang (JT)
KF Mak (KF)

Ronald Hui (RH)
Tony Lau (TL)
WK Lai (WK)
Arthur Lau (AL)

| Item | Content | When | Action |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Adopt minutes of last meeting. |  |  |
| 2 | Matters raised in last meeting (by minutes order): <br> b) Progress update: HKCBA website revamp: Alan Sze will come up with the plan on the outstanding tasks shown below. <br> (i) Result upload <br> (ii) Member's individual past results and master point <br> (iii) Password reset page <br> (iv) Calendar view of the schedule <br> (v) Running score of current year <br> (vi) Search function for a particular event <br> (vii) Personal page <br> (viii) Out-dated news <br> (ix) Others in Event calendar <br> He agreed to pay for any over-budgeted tasks at his own cost. The final deadline would be the end of the year 2015. The working committee will continue to follow up with him on progress. |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { TL,WK, } \\ \text { XL } \end{gathered}$ |


$\square$
Rose Bowl as effect was not sufficient．RH would follow．
c）It was agreed to review the membership fee in the coming meeting．

The next council meeting will be held on June 29， 2015 （Monday）．

# Participation in the $50^{\text {th }}$ APBF Championships 

因為澳門打橋牌的人比較少，所以有機會代表澳門參加 APBF，不但可以看到亞洲最好選手的表演，也能知道自己的差距，我們還是從牌說起。 As the number of bridge players in Macau is only many，I had the chance to represent Macau in the $50^{\text {th }}$ APBF Championships．It gave me the opportunity to watch the show of the Asian expert players as well as comparing my standard with them．Let us start with talking about the playing of bridge．

## （1）第一循環對日本隊 Versus Japan Team in Round Robin 1

| \＃9 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| N／EW |  |
| ヘ A | ヘ K 65 |
| －K J 863 | $\checkmark$ A952 |
| － 98 | －AT |
| \＆A K 865 | \＆J T 42 |

我坐西，主打 $6 \vee$ ，首引 $\rightarrow 7$ ，第 2 墩 $\vee \mathrm{A}$ ，南北都跟出。第 3 墩 $\vee 2$ ，南 10 ，你放 J 還是 K 。結果我放錯，日本隊員放 J，17IMP。主打的時候，我曾想， $\checkmark$ 和\＆打對一個，就打成，誰知道，\＆是永遠打不對。事後，隊友建議，對 $\checkmark$ 和\＆都打飛牌，南有任一 Q ，你都能成功。你如在賽場，你會怎麼打？現

在，我在網上查看，公開組 14 隊，有 10 隊叫到 $6 \downarrow$ ，想不到 9 個隊都沒有打成。大概都和我一樣，打 $\mathbf{V}$ 時上 $\vee \mathrm{K}$ 。

I sat West and declared $6 \vee$ ．First led the $\boldsymbol{\wedge} \mathbf{7}$ ，won in hand．I played the $\vee \mathrm{A}$ at trick 2，both North and South followed．I played the $\downarrow 2$ at Trick 3 and South followed with the $\vee 10$ ．Would you place the J or the K ．If I placed a small wrongly，Japan player might place the J．At the end，I placed wrong and lost 17 IMPs．When I declared，I had thought if both the $\vee \mathrm{s}$ and \＆s were played right， then the contract could be made．

However，the \＆s can never be played right．Afterwards，teammates suggested finessing both the $\vee s$ and $\AA s$ ，if South had one of the queens，you would succeed． If you were in the venue，how would you have played？I have checked from the web that 10 out of 14 teams had bid $6 \boldsymbol{v}$ ，but 9 of them could not make the contract．Perhaps，they，liked me，had placed the $\quad \mathrm{K}$ ．

| \＃9 | －Q J 9 8 7 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N／EW | $\bullet 7$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { K Q } 65 \\ & \& \text { Q } 97 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { A A } \\ & \vee K J 863 \\ & \bullet 98 \end{aligned}$ |  | －K 65 |
|  |  | －A 952 |
|  |  | －AT |
| \％AK 865 |  | \＆JT42 |
|  | －T432 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ QT4 |  |
|  | －J7432 |  |
|  | －3 |  |

因為這牌一定要先處理 $\boldsymbol{v}$ ，沒有人想到，$\&$ 是必輸一墩，如果打 $6 \%$ ，一定先處理の，那麼打成 $6 \%$ 的人，不會只有 1 人了。

Since it is necessary to handle the $\vee$ s first no one would think about the sure loss of one $\%$ trick．If the contract is $6 \%$ ，they would hand the $\%$ first and the number of players who can make $6{ }^{\circ}$ would exceed one．
（2）

| \＃ 19 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| S／EW |  |
| － 5 | －AKJ 96 |
| －K 82 | $\checkmark$ AQ 4 |
| －J 763 | －AK 8 |
| ＊AK 862 | －94 |

我坐西，第 2 家開叫 $1 \%$ ，同伴 $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，我 $2 \boldsymbol{*}$ 示弱，最後這副牌叫到由西主打 6 NT ，首攻 $\%$ ，我想應該相信北有 $\%$ 長套。所以打南北 是 3－3的機會不多，另外，只取 4 墩 或 3 墩（即送一墩 或一墩 ）也不夠 12 墩，你的第 12墩只有從擠牌中得到。所以你要確定北有 $\boldsymbol{\infty}+\boldsymbol{a}$ 還是 $\downarrow+$ 長套，如是前者，就要先打 ，當打完 和 後，就應該在 中 和 中擠住北家。對這副牌而言，這是唯一正確的打法，但沒有人這樣打，可能很多人先飛＾，只能得到 4 墩 A，由於北不是 $+\boldsymbol{+}$ 長套，不能對北擠牌，也即沒有第 12 墩。

唯一打成的是香港隊 K．F．Mak，據介紹，他第 2 墩也是出 $\uparrow$ ，飛 $\uparrow \mathrm{Q}$ ，然後打
不知南何以認為西有 4 張 ，最後西的 J 是他意外的第 12 墩。

I sat West and opened $1 *$ in the $2^{\text {nd }}$ seat，partner responded $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ and I rebid $2 *$ to show weak．In the end，West declared 6NT，First led the \＆Q，I thought North should have length in the $\%$ suit and so the chance of $\&$ being 3－3 was remote． On the other hand，only getting $4 \uparrow$ trick and $3 \star$ tricks（i．e．，give a or a ） would not be enough for 12 tricks．Your $12^{\text {th }}$ trick has to come from a squeeze．

So，you have to ascertain whether North has long suits in $++\uparrow$ or $\uparrow$ ．If it is the former，you would play the $\geqslant s$ first，after playing all the $\geqslant s$ and $\vee s$ ，North will be squeezed in both the $\AA$ and $\uparrow$ suits．For this board，this is the only correct way．However，no one played this way．Perhaps，many of them just finessed the $\uparrow$ first and only got $4 \uparrow$ tricks．As North is not having long $\downarrow+$ \＆suits，it is not possible to squeeze North and so cannot get 12 tricks． The only player who could make was a Hong Kong player－K．F．Mak．Based on his introduction，he also played a at Trick 2 and finesse the $\wedge \mathrm{Q}$ ，and then played the $\uparrow A, \uparrow K$ and another $\uparrow$ ．At this moment，South discarded $a \star$ ．When the $5^{\text {th }}$ was played from the dummy，South discarded another $\bullet$ ．It was unknown why South would consider West having 4 carders $\downarrow$ ，West＇s $\downarrow \mathrm{J}$ unexpectedly became his $12^{\text {th }}$ trick．

| \＃ 19 | ＾Q T 72 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\overline{\text { S／EW }}$ | －J 97 |  |
|  | －95 |  |
|  | \＆Q J T 3 |  |
| A 5 |  | A AK J 96 |
| －K 82 |  | －A Q 4 |
| －J763 |  | －AK 8 |
| \＆AK 862 |  | \＆ 94 |
|  | A 843 |  |
|  | －T653 |  |
|  | －Q T 42 |  |
|  | － 75 |  |

這副牌你要猜對北有 $\boldsymbol{n}$ 和 $\boldsymbol{A}$ 長套，才能打成，第 2 墩起打 3 輪 $\downarrow$ ，南進手，假定回』（回什麼都一樣），你一共打 4 輪 ， 2 輪』，再打 3 輪 『，各剩 4 張牌

For this board，you have to guess that North having both long a and $\boldsymbol{a}$ suits before you can make the contract．Play 3 rounds of $\diamond$ sfrom Tricks 2 to 4 ， South gains entry and let us assume that he would return a \＆（same for other returns ），you play 4 rounds of $\downarrow, 2$ rounds of $\AA$ ，and then 3 rounds of $\bullet$ ，with 4 cards remaining in each hand as follows：

| \＃ 19 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| S／EW |  |
| － 5 | －AKJ 9 |
| －－－ | $\checkmark$－－ |
| －－－ | ＊ |
| \％ 862 | \％－－ |

北留哪 4 張牌，是不是被擠住。可能沒有人猜北是 $\boldsymbol{+}+\boldsymbol{A}$ ，所以都沒有打成。沒有叫到 slam 的隊都贏牌。 公開組 14 隊有 11 隊叫到 $6 N T$ ， 10 位莊家沒有打成。

Which 4 cards will North retain？Isn＇t it that North is squeezed？However，no one guessed that North had long $\&+\infty$ suits．So，no one could make the contract（unless the opponents defended wrongly）．

Those teams who had not bid slam became the winning teams． 11 out of 14 teams in the Open Series bid 6NT， 10 declarers failed to make the contract．
（3）強隊猜牌也不一定猜對，第2循環對日本隊 Strong team might not guess rightly．Versus Japan in Round Robin 2.

我坐西，開叫 $1 \diamond$ ，最後我們二桌都由西主打 $5 \vee$ ，北首引 $A \mathrm{~A}$ ，你看 4 家牌，第 2 墩北回 或 ，我都只有 10 墩牌，當北看到明手牌後，他要猜同伴有 \＆K還是 A ，只能有一張，考慮好久，還是猜錯，第 2 墩出 A A ，被我打成。

I sat West and opened $1 \diamond$ ，and the Wests at both tables declared $5 \vee$ ．North first lead the $\uparrow$ A．Looking at the 4 hands，if North returns a $\downarrow$ or $\downarrow$ ，I can only have 10 tricks．When North saw the dummy＇s cards，he had to guess whether his partner had the $\& \mathrm{~K}$ or the $\star \mathrm{A}$－only one of them．After thinking for a long time， he still guessed wrong and played the \＆A，and I made the contract．

| \＃ 8 | ＾A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W／Nil | $\checkmark 4$ |  |
|  | －Q 9652 |  |
|  | ＊A Q J 742 |  |
| －Q 8 |  | A K T 94 |
| －K Q T 7 |  | －AJ98652 |
| －K J 83 |  | －－－ |
| \＆K T 8 |  | \＆ 65 |
|  | A J 76532 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 3$ |  |
|  | －AT74 |  |
|  | ＊ 93 |  |

另一桌北沒有出』，我們勝 11 IMP

At the other table，North did not played a \＆，and we won 11 IMPs for this board．

仍是這場牌，你是北，持
The same round．You are North，holding：

| \＃16 | － 9854 |
| :---: | :---: |
| W／EW | －K 7432 |
|  | －J 9 |
|  | －T3 |

聽到叫牌 You listened to the bidding：

| $\mathbf{W}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1} \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ | Pass | $1 \boldsymbol{4}$ | Pass |
| 2NT | Pass | 3NT | Pass |
| Pass | Pass |  |  |

你首引還是 $\boldsymbol{v}$ ，日本隊首引 $\boldsymbol{8}$ ，被做成。如果我的 和 $\boldsymbol{v}$ 對調，他出 - 就完
全正確。
Would you lead a or a $\downarrow$ ？Japan Team first lead the $\wedge$ and 3NT was made． If my $\uparrow s$ and $\downarrow s$ were exchanged，his lead of $a \downarrow$ would be totally correct．

其實，這牌西應開叫 $2 \%$ ，同伴 $2 \star$ ，如你叫 $2 N T$ ，最後仍可能打 $3 N T$ 。
如叫 $3 \%$ ，最後可能打 $4 \wedge$ 或 $5 \%$ ，是最佳合約。
In fact，West should have opened $2 \star$ and his partner responded $2 \star$ ．If you bid $2 N T$ ，you would still declare 3 NT in the end．If you bid $3 \AA$ ，you may declare $4 \wedge$ or $5 \%$－the best contract．

另桌日本隊也是由西主打 3NT 下 1，一樣沒有叫到最佳合約。

At the other table，Japan＇s West player also declared 3NT which went down 1 as 3NT was not the best contract．

| \＃16 | －9854 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W／EW | $\checkmark$ K 7432 |  |
|  | －J 9 |  |
|  | $\because \mathrm{T} 3$ |  |
| $\stackrel{A Q}{\sim}$ |  | －K T 62 |
|  |  | $\bullet$ J T 8 |
| －AK 6 |  | －84 |
| ＊A K Q J 6 |  | ＊9872 |
|  | －J 7 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ A Q 9 |  |
|  | －Q T 7532 |  |
|  | － 54 |  |

同場，同伴東第 4 家開叫 $1 \uparrow$ ，我只能應 $1 N T$ ，同伴 3 ，最後同伴主打 $4 \uparrow$ 。

In the same round，my partner who sat East opened $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，I could only respond 1 NT ， partner $3 \leqslant$ and he finally declared $4 \uparrow$ ．

```
#7
^ KJ
\bulletQT972
- J }
* Q 8 3 2
```

- A Q T 87
$\checkmark$--
- AK 73
*AT96

首引 2 ，你認為像單張嗎？如果你信，你就要假定南是 4441 或 5431 牌型，

將牌不能是 5 張，否則打不成。一種是調 4 輪將，你要假定 $\% \mathrm{~K}, ~ \% \mathrm{~J}$ 都在南家，才夠 10 墩牌。第 2 種是第 2 墩送出 1 張小 ，這點也很難，北進手，如回將牌，你只能上 A，將 ，希望對方將牌是 3－3 或持 2 張將牌有 $\uparrow 9$ ，否則你如再將 回手，有可能將牌失控。這種打法，只要求南有 $\& \mathrm{~K}$ ，就夠 10墩。北如不回將牌，你也只要將 1 次 ，千萬不要將 回手，實戰中，同伴不相信 2 是單張，第 2 墩出 K ，南將，回 A ，請看 4 家牌

First lead the 2 ．Do you think it is a singleton？If you think so，you have to assume South＇s hand to be 4441 or 5431，and he cannot have 5 trumps else you cannot make the contract．You may draw 4 rounds of trump．You have to assume that both the $\approx \mathrm{K}$ and $\approx \mathrm{J}$ are in South’s hand in order to get 10 tricks． The $2^{\text {nd }}$ way is to give a small at trick 2 ．This is also difficult．If North gains entry and returns a trump，you have to place the $\uparrow \mathrm{A}$ and ruff a $\downarrow$ ，and hope that the trumps are $3-3$ or the one with 2 trumps has the 9 ，else if you have to ruff a $\downarrow$ to hand，you will lose trump control．This method only requires South to have the $\AA \mathrm{K}$ and you can obtain 10 tricks．If North does not return a trump， you only need to ruff a $\begin{gathered}\text { once and you should ruff a } \downarrow \text { to hand．In practice，}\end{gathered}$ partner did not believe that the 2 was a singleton and he played at trick 2 the $\star K$, ruff by South who returned a $\uparrow$ ．Please see the 4 hands：

| \＃ 7 | －92 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S／All | －AK 83 |  |
|  | －Q T9654 |  |
|  | $\because 4$ |  |
| －K J |  | －A Q T 87 |
| －Q T 972 |  | $\checkmark$－－ |
| －J 8 |  | －AK 73 |
| \＆Q 832 |  | $\because$ AT9 6 |
|  | － 6543 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ J 654 |  |
|  | －2 |  |
|  | ¢ KJ7 5 |  |

應該用• A 得（這點很難），將 ，』A 回手，調完將，打』K，』J 在南，也有 10 墩，實際莊家用明手 K 得，最後下 1 ，輸 14 IMP 。

這副牌相對還是容易處理，如果打成，我們將勝日本隊 2 IMP。
Declarer should win with the $\uparrow$（ this is difficult ），ruff a $\downarrow$ ，returned to hand by the $\approx \mathrm{A}$ ，draw trumps and played $\approx \mathrm{K}$ and $\approx \mathrm{J}$ to be in South’s hand and obtain 10 tricks．In practice，the declarer won with Dummy＇s $\uparrow \mathrm{K}$ and down 1 finally，lost 14 IMPs．

This board is comparatively easy to handle．If this board had been made，we could have won Japan Team 2 IMPs．

## （4）對新加坡隊 Versus Singapore Team

| \＃20 | AT65 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W／All | －A Q 9 |  |
|  | －Q963 |  |
|  | －T63 |  |
| －K |  | －A 2 |
| －T 84 |  | －KJ 63 |
| －K T 875 |  | －A J |
| \＆Q J 98 |  | ＊AK742 |
|  | －QJ98743 |  |
|  | $\checkmark 752$ |  |
|  | －42 |  |
|  | $\because 5$ |  |

在我們這桌，二家不叫，同伴 $1 \infty$ ，南 $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，我應該叫 $3 \boldsymbol{m}$ 較好，表示有 $\boldsymbol{m}$ 支持，沒有 4 張，約 8－10分，估計也難叫到最佳合約 6 。。但我叫加倍，表示有點牌型，最後停在 $4 \vee$ ，另桌，新加坡隊叫到 $6 \downarrow$ 下 1 ，奇怪是 2 隊都不打 9 張配合的»，而打7張配合的

At my table，both West and North passed，and my partner bid $1 *$ ，South $2 \boldsymbol{4}$ ．It was better for me to bid $3 *$ to show my \＆support．Without 4 －carder $\boldsymbol{\vee}$ ，and about 8－10 points，it is difficult to reach the best contract of $6 \%$ ．However，I doubled to show I had shape and we finally arrived at $4 \vee$ ．At the other table， Singapore Team bid $6 v$ down 1．It is strange that both 2 teams did not bid the 9 －card fit $\%$ contract，but bid the 7 －card $\vee$ contract．

再看一牌新加坡隊用接力叫，能知道南的牌型是 4234，可能不知道大牌確切位置，所以他們叫到由北做莊的 $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，

Let us see another board which the Singapore Team used relay bids to know that South＇s shape to be 4234．Perhaps they did not know the position of the high cards and North became the declarer of $4 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，

| $\# 10$ |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| E／All | か 965 |
|  | －A J T 8 |
|  | K T 4 2 |
|  | \＆ 86 |

－K 7
－ 965432
－JT4 2
－Q 7
$\checkmark 7$
－A 653
＊Q J 5
－K742
－A Q 83
$\checkmark$ K Q
－J 98
\＆AT93

同伴首引 A ，再出 ，這第 2 墩 起碼失去時效，如第 2 墩回』，莊家一定不能完成合約。但莊家很難打對 $\boldsymbol{4}$ ，使 只失 2 墩，又不失 $\boldsymbol{*}$ ，或者只失 1墩 1 墩 ，如看 4 家牌，第 3 墩出 9 ，東不蓋就放小，東 10 ，你 $A$ ，再 小，打成，莊家看不見 4 家牌，不會這樣打，結果下 1 。隊友叫到這牌最佳定約 3NT。所以強隊也不能每副牌都叫得好。

但是，我們太多不該錯的牌，例如，同伴只有 1 張 A ，在同意我 為將牌後，$^{\text {，}}$叫 4 NT ，我答 5 A ，他 $6 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，少 2 個關鍵張，實際少 2 個 A，白送 13IMP 給對方，如果這不該錯的牌不錯，我們將贏新加坡隊 12IMP。

Partner first lead the $\star$ A，and another $\star$ ．The $\star$ at trick 2 was played at the wrong time．It was better to return a $*$ instead and the declarer could never make the contract．However，the declarer had difficulty to play the $\uparrow$ s rightly to ensure that he only lost $2 \uparrow s$ and with no $\%$ loser，or only lost $1 \uparrow$ and $1 \%$ ．If you look at the 4 hands，play the 9 at trick 3，play small if East did not cover． If East played the $\uparrow 10$, you covered with the $\uparrow A$, another small $\uparrow$ ，contract made．The result was down 1．My teammates bid the best contract of 3NT． Therefore，strong teams might not be able to find the right contracts all the time．

However，we had too many mistakes that should not have been made．For example，my partner had only one Ace．After he has agreed my as trump，he bid 4NT，and I answered 5A，he bid 6a without at least 2 keycards．In fact， lacking 2 Aces and gave 13 IMPs to the opponents with no special reasons．If we did not make such a mistakes，we should have won Singapore Team 12 IMPs．
（5）談談香港隊 Let us talk a bit about Hong Kong Team．
我寫出前 5 名的成績，比較一下：

|  | 第1循環 | 第2循環 | 總成績 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 日本 | 188.77 | 159.42 | 348.19 |
| 新加坡 | 165.3 | 170.07 | 335.37 |
| 中國 | 154.43 | 180.49 | 334.92 |
| 印尼 | 146.85 | 142.51 | 289.36 |
| 香港 | 114.31 | 164.03 | 278.34 |

I list out the results of the top 5 open teams for comparison：
RR1 RR2 Total VPs

| Japan | 188.77 | 159.42 | 348.19 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Singapore | 165.3 | 170.07 | 335.37 |
| China | 154.43 | 180.49 | 334.92 |
| Indonesia | 146.85 | 142.51 | 289.36 |
| Hong Kong | 114.31 | 164.03 | 278.34 |

如果只計算第 2 循環的成績，香港隊名列第 3 ，相當好的成績，其實這應該是
香港隊應有的名次。我不知道何以香港隊前一半打的很差，好在後勁足，打出他應有水平。

If we only count the VPs of Round Robin 2，Hong Kong should rank $3^{\text {rd }}$－a very good result．In fact，this should be Hong Kong＇s proper ranking．I do not know why Hong Kong team has played badly in Round Robin 1．Luckily，they caught up in Round Robin 2 and played at their appropriate level．

Hong Kong team has handled many boards very well，i．e．，has a strong ability to read cards，e．g．：

| $\frac{\# 6}{\mathrm{E} / \mathrm{EW}}$ | －T 82 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | －63 |  |
|  | －J 75 |  |
|  | \＆Q 7653 |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \& K Q J } 9 \\ & \vee \text { Q J } \\ & \text { Q } 932 \\ & \& \text { K } 4 \end{aligned}$ |  | －A 43 |
|  |  | －T 87 |
|  |  | －A T |
|  |  | \＆A J T 98 |
|  | ค 765 |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ AK 942 |  |
|  | －K864 |  |
|  | －2 |  |

香港隊坐東西時叫牌 The bidding when Hong Kong players sat East and
West：

| $\mathbf{W}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1 \AA$ | $1 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ |
| Dbl | Pass | $1 \uparrow$ | Pass |
| $2 \boldsymbol{}$ | Pass | $3 \&$ | Pass |
| 3NT | Pass | Pass | Pass |

首引 $\downarrow$ ，南忍讓，西用 $\vee \mathrm{J}$ 得，打 4 輪 $\uparrow$ ，再』A，\＆K，第 8 墩送出 $\downarrow$ ，投入到南，打成合約。

North lead a $\vee$ ，South ducked，West won with the $\downarrow J$ ，played 4 rounds of $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} \mathbf{s}$ ， then $\& A$ and $\& K$ ，gave a $\downarrow$ at trick 8，end－played South，and made the contract．也有一些牌，需要改善，例如 Some plays have to be improved，e．g．：

| \＃ 17 | A K Q 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N／Nil | $\bullet 4$ |  |
|  | －K6542 |  |
|  | \＆K 854 |  |
| ヘ A 97 |  | ＾T8652 |
| －Q9873 |  | $\checkmark$ A J T |
| － 97 |  | －T3 |
| \＆Q J 7 |  | ＊A 62 |
|  | A J 4 |  |
|  | －K 652 |  |
|  | －A Q J 8 |  |
|  | ＊T93 |  |

香港隊坐南北時叫牌：The bidding when Hong Kong players sate North and
South：

| $\mathbf{W}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \star$ | $1 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ | Dbl |
| $2 \boldsymbol{\uparrow}$ | Pass | Pass | $?$ |

南的牌，在同伴不能自由叫牌的情形下，只能叫 3 * ，還能叫其他嗎？
With South＇s cards，when partner could not make a free bid，he could only bid $3 \diamond$ ，what else could he bid？

實際叫牌 The actual bids were：

| $\mathbf{W}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 \star$ |  | Dbl |
| $2 \boldsymbol{A}$ | Pass | Pass | Dbl |
| Pass | $3 \star$ | Pass | 3 |
| Pass | 3NT | A．P． |  |

第 2 次的 DBL ，是不是冒叫，首引 J ，莊家只能得到 5 墩 $\downarrow 1$ 墩 $\downarrow$ ，結果下 3 。

Wasn＇t the $2^{\text {nd }}$ double an overbid by South？East first led the $\vee \mathrm{J}$ ，and the declarer could only win $5 \star$ s and $1 \vee$ ，down 3 ．

$$
\text { 三角賽中 } 2 \text { 副牌 }
$$

## 2 Boards in Triangular Bridge <br> Competition 2015

每年舉行一次的香港，廣州，澳門三角賽，今年 6 月在廣州舉行。參賽 6

隊中，以廣州市隊實力最強。有 2 副牌，我的印象很深刻

The annual bridge completion among the 3 cities－Hong Kong，Guangzhou and Macau－was held in June in Guangzhou this year．Among the 6 teams participating，Guangzhou Team was the strongest．The following 2 boards were very impressive to me．
（1）你是西，持 You are West，holding：

```
#2
E/NS
- Q J983
- 32
* --
* K Q T }96
```

叫牌 Bidding：

| $\mathbf{W}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1 \imath}$ | $\mathbf{1 \uparrow}$ |
| $2 \%$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{q}$ | Pass |
| $?$ |  |  |  |

同伴開叫 $1 \boldsymbol{\sim}$ ，上家爭叫 $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，這幫了很大的忙，我可以叫不逼叫的 $2 \boldsymbol{\mu}$ ，
否則我只能叫 $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，說不定沒有機會叫出 $\boldsymbol{m}$ 套（因為我們打 2 蓋 1 體系）。現在第 2 輪同伴扣叫，應該和\＆套配合，我的牌就變得相當好，我沒有叫 2 NT ，也即沒有告訴同伴我有很強的 1 檔張而強調我的 0 套，叫 $3 \boldsymbol{a}$ ，也是有機會讓同伴表達他的牌，他叫 $5 \%$ ，最後就會叫到 $6 \%$ 。如他叫 3 ，我只能叫 3NT。如講分，我只有有用的 5 分

My partner opened $1 \boldsymbol{\bullet}$ ，and my RH0 overcalled $1 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ ．This helped me a lot because I could bid a non－forcing $2 *$ else I could only bid $1 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ ，and I might not have the chance to bid the \＆（because we played 2 over 1 Game Force system）． My partner cuebid in the $2^{\text {nd }}$ round implying fit in \＆，and my cards became very good．I have not bid 2NT to inform my partner that I had very strong a stoppers but emphasized my \＆suit by bidding 3\＆，and gave my partner a chance to indicate his hand．He bid 5\＆，and finally bid 6 \＆．If he had bid 3 instead，I could only bid 3NT．Talking about points， I had only 5 useful points．

| $\mathbf{W}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $\mathbf{1} \boldsymbol{1}$ | $\mathbf{1} \uparrow$ |
| $2 \%$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{1}$ | Pass |
| $3 \%$ | Pass | $5 \%$ | Pass |
| $6 \%$ | Pass | Pass | Pass |

首引～10，你看 4 家牌， 6 不是太難打，另桌廣州隊打 3 NT ，勝 10 IMP 。

North first lead the $\boldsymbol{\uparrow} 10$ ．Looking at 4 hands， 6 was not difficult to make．

Guangzhou Team played 3NT at the other table and we won 10 IMP for this board．

| \＃2 | －T 4 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E／NS | －J 85 |  |
|  | －Q8642 |  |
|  | － 754 |  |
| －Q J983 |  | －－－ |
| $\checkmark 32$ |  | －K Q T 74 |
| －－－ |  | －AKJT9 |
| ＊K Q T 962 |  | －AJ 3 |
|  | －AK 7652 |  |
|  | －A 96 |  |
|  | －753 |  |
|  | － 8 |  |

如果南不叫 1A，我要叫 $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，最後可能打 $3 N T$ ，很難叫到 $6 \boldsymbol{\%}$ 。
If South did not bid $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，I had to bid $1 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，and had to play 3 NT in the end and it would be difficult to find 6．
（2）大輸赢的一牌 A full－swing board
你是西，持 You are South，holding：

```
#7
4 K987
\vee --
-T7632
* A Q J 3
```

上家開叫 $1 \vee$ ，你叫牌嗎？我是贊成叫牌，現在叫牌，趨向積極。當然叫牌都會有風險，你不知道後面 2 家，誰拿什麼牌？

RH0 opened $1 \vee$ ，would you bid？I agreed to bid．The current trend of bidding was aggressive．Of course，your bid would have risk as you did not know what cards were being held by your LHO．

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\# 7}{\text { S/A }} 11 \\
& \text { - K } 987
\end{aligned}
$$

如果東西的牌如上，而且西叫了加倍，東一定要叫牌，即使東的牌型是 2623，也要叫牌，因為現在叫加倍的西，和以前不同，不一定有太多防守力量。這全在 2 人是不是同意採取積極的叫牌方式。我因為同伴不同意我不夠分參與叫牌，所以，我持西的牌，Pass，北叫 $4 \boldsymbol{\downarrow}$ ，成為最後合約。實際的 4家牌是：

If the cards of East and West are as above，when West doubles，East must bid，even if East＇s shape is 2623．It is because the present West（when compared with the previous West）who has doubled might not have too much defensive power．It all depends on whether the two persons have agreed to use aggressive bidding．As my partner did not
agree my bidding without sufficient strength，I passed holding West’ cards．North bid $4 \vee$ ，which became the final contract．

實際的 4 家牌是：In reality，the 4 hands were as follows：

| $\frac{\# 7}{S / A} 11$ | $\rightarrow 5$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | －K T 873 |  |
|  | －J 84 |  |
|  | －7542 |  |
| － $\mathrm{\sim}$ K 987 |  | A Q J T 643 |
|  |  | －Q 6 |
| －T7632 |  | －K 95 |
|  |  | －K 9 |
| $\therefore$ A Q J 3 | －A 2 |  |
|  | －AJ 9542 |  |
|  | －A Q |  |
|  | －T86 |  |

4 是鐵牌，另一桌，東打 $5 \boldsymbol{A}$ ，也是鐵牌，輸 1300 分， 16 IMP ．
$4 \checkmark$ was cold．At the other table，East declared $5 \boldsymbol{\wedge}$ ，which was also cold and we lost 1300，minus 16 IMPs．

我們聯手 21 分，分多，但以為將牌，東西只有 3 墩牌，橋牌的輸赢是依嬴墩計算的。

We jointly had 21 HCPs．Though the HCPs were higher，East and West could have 3 tricks with the s as trump．The success at bridge is dependent on the number winning tricks．


# Bidding with Zero 

 HCP你是南，持 You are South，holding：

| $\frac{\# 19}{\mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{EW}}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | － 9752 |
|  | － 64 |
|  | －T9 |
|  | ＊T9753 |

二家不叫到同伴，開叫 15－17 的 1 NT ，你上家不叫，到你，我想你和多數
人一樣－－－－不叫，對嗎？
After 2 passes，your partner opened a 15－17 1NT．Your RHO passes and it is your turn to bid．I think you will also pass like many other people，right？

這是今年 6 月在美國舉行的 Senior 選拔賽中決賽的一副牌，你不叫以後，一桌的實際叫牌是

This was a board in the USA＇s Senior Selection Trial held in June 2015．After your
pass，the actual bidding at one table was as follows：

| $\mathbf{W}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Pass |
| Pass | 1NT | Pass | Pass |
| 2 | Pass | 2NT | Pass |
| 3 | Pass | $4 \downarrow$ | Pass |
| Pass | Pass |  |  |

你看 4 家牌 Let＇s see the 4 hands：

| $\frac{\# 19}{S / E W}$ | －Q J T |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | －A K 8 |  |
|  | －A 754 |  |
|  | －J 84 |  |
| －K 643 <br> －Q T9 752 <br> －Q 86 <br> ＊－－ |  | －A 8 |
|  |  | $\bullet$ J 3 |
|  |  | －KJ32 |
|  |  | ＊AKQ 62 |
|  | － 9752 |  |
|  | － 64 |  |
|  | －T9 |  |
|  | \＆T9753 |  |

首攻 $Q$ ，到 $K$ ，出 6 到 $K$ ，是不是拿到 11 墩。也不是所有人都不叫，另一桌的叫牌：

First led the $\uparrow Q$, to $\wedge K$, played the $\sigma$ to the $\star$ ，and declarer got 11 tricks． Not everyone would not bid．The bidding at another table was as follows：

| $\mathbf{W}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{E}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1 N T$ | Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2}$ |
| Pass | $2 \boldsymbol{2} \boldsymbol{2 N T}$ | Pass |  |
| 3 | Pass | Pass | Pass |

首引 ，結果 $3 *+1$

這桌坐南的是 Zia ，他的 2 —叫，勝 11 IMP 。他的牌沒有點，只能叫一次，他選擇轉移か，張數還差 1 張－－－－可見適當的變通很必要。

First led a $\bullet$ ，and the result was $3 \diamond+1$ ．

The one who sat South was Zia，his bid of $2 v$ won 11 IMP．He had no HCPs and he had only one chance to bid and he chose to transfer to $\boldsymbol{a}$ ，with one card less－this shows that suitable deviation is necessary．

| \＃ 18 | － 65 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E／NS | － 7 |  |
|  | －A985 |  |
|  | \＆A K J 863 |  |
| － 742 |  | ค AT93 |
| －KJ943 |  | －Q6 |
| －K J 43 |  | －T 6 |
|  |  | ＊T9742 |
| ＊Q | ヘ K Q J 8 |  |
|  | －AT852 |  |
|  | －Q 72 |  |
|  | － 5 |  |

# Captain's report - Hong Kong Girls team $20^{\text {th }}$ APBF Youth Teams Championships 

The $20^{\text {th }}$ APBF Youth Teams Championships was held from April 1-7, 2015 at Bangkok, Thailand. There are totally 10 Juniors teams and 8 Girls teams, both are up to 25 years old.

The Juniors team and the Girls team are the members of the Hong Kong Youth Team.
The team members of Girls Team are :
Crystal Tang, Elaine Lu, Krystal Fang, Joyce Leung, Joyce Tung, Ruby Hui

| CHINA HONG KONG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IMPs |  | VPs |  |  | Ranking |
| Round | Opponent (final <br> Rank) | HKG | Opponen <br> t | HKG | Opponen <br> t | Total VPs |  |
| 1 | Chinese Taipei Blue | 60 | 33 | 16.26 | 3.74 | 16.26 |  |
| 2 | Chines Taipei White | 53 | 21 | 17.03 | 2.97 | 33.29 |  |
| 3 | Singapore | 48 | 11 | 17.72 | 2.28 | 51.01 |  |
| 4 | Thailand A | 7 | 38 | 3.12 | 16.88 | 54.13 |  |
| 5 | China | 37 | 62 | 4.08 | 15.92 | 58.21 |  |
| 6 | Thailand B | 44 | 34 | 12.80 | 7.20 | 71.01 |  |
| 7 | Indonesia | 16 | 27 | 6.96 | 13.04 | 77.97 | 5 |
| 8 | Indonesia | 24 | 36 | 6.72 | 13.28 | 84.69 |  |
| 9 | Chinese Taipei Blue | 36 | 44 | 7.71 | 12.29 | 92.40 |  |
| 10 | Thailand A | 39 | 56 | 5.61 | 14.39 | 98.01 |  |
| 11 | China | 27 | 46 | 5.20 | 14.80 | 103.21 |  |


| 12 | Singapore | 41 | 37 | 11.20 | 8.80 | 114.41 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | Thailand B | 83 | 4 | 20 | 0 | 134.41 |  |
| 14 | Chinese Taipei <br> White | 79 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 154.41 | 4 |

Crystal, Elaine, Joyce Tung and Ruby had participated in the Girls series in past years but Krystal and Joyce Leung was the first time to participate.

The Hong Kong Girls team won 7 out of 14 matches, the average VP was 11.03. The match lost to Thailand A is just 31 imps , already the worst match in this tournament. The Girls team finally ranked 4th and got the berth to participate the World Youth Teams Championships in 2016.

In general, the discipline and team spirit was very good and most of them had performed better than my expectation. Although they cannot get the trophy, they already did quite well when they played against some tough opponents such as China and Indonesia.

In the tournament, Crystal played all 14 rounds as she is the most experienced player in the team. Elaine and Joyce Tung played 11 rounds, Ruby played 9 rounds, Krystal played 7 rounds and Joyce Leung played 4 rounds. The final datum of the girls are:
Crystal +0.42
Elaine +0.19
Joyce Tung +0.11
Ruby +0.14
Krystal +0.71
Joyce Leung +1.30
imps per board respectively.

In conclusion, all the teams made many mistakes even the highest rank teams. Good partnership understanding always can reduce the lost of imps. Although the Girls cannot get the trophy in this tournament, they already played much better than last two years girls series events. I believe they had gained some valuable experiences also. I wished they will do better in future.

## KF Mak

Coach and NPC of Hong Kong Girls team

# Captain's report - Hong Kong Juniors $20^{\text {th }}$ APBF Youth Teams Championships 

The $20^{\text {th }}$ APBF Youth Teams Championships was held from April 1-7, 2015 at Bangkok, Thailand. There are totally 10 Juniors teams and 8 Girls teams, both are up to 25 years old.

The Juniors team and the Girls team are the members of the Hong Kong Youth Team.
The team members of Juniors Team are :Francis Chan, Gavin Tang, Mark Ng, Vinci Wan, Xavier Chan, Zia Wai

| CHINA HONG KONG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IMPs |  | VPs |  |  | Ranking |
| Round | Opponent (final Rank) | HKG | Opponen <br> t | HKG | Opponen <br> t | Total VPs |  |
| 1 | Indonesia | 32 | 19 | 13.52 | 6.48 | 13.52 |  |
| 2 | Philippines | 66 | 25 | 18.21 | 1.79 | 31.73 |  |
| 3 | China | 65 | 23 | 18.33 | 1.67 | 50.06 |  |
| 4 | Australia | 16 | 101 | 0 | 20 | 50.06 |  |
| 5 | Singapore | 44 | 25 | 14.80 | 5.20 | 64.86 |  |
| 6 | Thailand | 35 | 23 | 13.28 | 6.72 | 78.14 |  |
| 7 | Japan | 41 | 25 | 14.18 | 5.82 | 92.32 |  |
| 8 | Chinese Taipei | 48 | 11 | 17.72 | 2.28 | 110.04 |  |
| 9 | New Zealand | 25 | 41 | 5.82 | 14.18 | 115.86 | 4 |
| 10 | Chinese Taipei | 21 | 16 | 11.48 | 8.52 | 127.34 |  |
| 11 | New Zealand | 29 | 20 | 12.55 | 7.45 | 139.89 |  |


| 12 | China | 14 | 77 | 0 | 20 | 139.89 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 13 | Philippines | 44 | 35 | 12.55 | 7.45 | 152.44 |  |
| 14 | Indonesia | 10 | 71 | 0 | 20 | 152.44 |  |
| 15 | Thailand | 78 | 11 | 20 | 0 | 172.44 |  |
| 16 | Australia | 45 | 21 | 15.74 | 4.26 | 188.18 |  |
| 17 | Japan | 40 | 13 | 16.26 | 3.74 | 204.44 |  |
| 18 | Singapore | 14 | 22 | 7.71 | 12.29 | 212.15 | 4 |

In past years, only Zia had participated in the Juniors series while Francis, Mark, Vinci and Xavier had participated in the Youngsters series. Gavin had also participated some youth competition in China. In whole tournament, Francis - Mark, Gavin - Zia, Vinci - Xavier had fixed the partnership and equally played 12 matches out of 18 matches.

The Hong Kong Juniors team won 13 out of 18 matches, the average VP was 11.79. The matches lost to Australia in RR1, China and Indonesia in RR2 is more than 60 imps , which costed them lost the 2nd runner up to Australia by 3.09 VP. The Juniors team finally ranked 4th and got the berth to participate the World Youth Teams Championships in 2016.

In general, the discipline and team spirit was quite good and they had performed sightly better than my expectation. Although they cannot get the trophy, they already did quite well especially they won some tough opponents such as Australia and Japan in last day of tournament.

The final datum of the Juniors are:
Francis - Mark +0.22
Gavin - Zia -0.11
Vinci - Xavier +0.36
imps per board respectively.

In conclusion, all the teams made many mistakes even the highest rank teams. Good partnership understanding always can reduce the lost of imps. Although the Juniors cannot get the trophy in this tournament, they already showed they can fight with any team as they won at least once against all opponent teams in this tournament. I believe they had gained some valuable experiences also. I wished they will do better in next year world youth teams championships.

KF Mak
NPC of Hong Kong Junior team

## Captain's Report - Senior Team 1 <br> $5 \mathbf{5 0}^{\text {th }}$ PABF Senior Team (Bangkok, 21 to 31 May 2015)

The $50^{\text {th }}$ Pacific Asia Bridge Championships was held from 21 to 31 May 2015 in Bangkok, Thailand. The Championships consisted of three major team events: Open Team, Ladies Team and Senior Team.

The Hong Kong Senior Team comprised of three partnerships:

- Karic Chiu (Playing Captain) - Peter Yeung
- Vincent Li - Peter Chun
- Edmund Tse - Roger Ling

The Senior Team Championship was played in two round robins in 9 days, with 14 participating teams meeting each other twice. At the end of the two round robins, the first three teams will be declared as the Champion, $1^{\text {st }}$ Runners up and $2^{\text {nd }}$ Runners up respectively. For the three Bermuda berths in India this year, the highest finishing Zone 6 team will automatically be qualified, and the next four ranking Zone 6 teams will compete in knock out format for the remaining two berths (the 2 higher ranking teams have two life while the 2 lower ranking teams have one life).
Before the start of the tournament, the Hong Kong Senior Team had agreed to share playing the round robin equally, that is, each pair to play two matches for days with three matches, but no more than three matches for days with four matches.

## Analysis of Results by Country

Given below is the final ranking after the second round robin with two direct matches score alongside:

| Rank | Country | Total VPs | VP Scored <br> By $1^{\text {st }}$ Round | VP Scored <br> By $2^{\text {nd }}$ Round |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Indonesia | 347.97 | 12.76 | 5.80 |


| 2 | Chinese Taipei 1 | 346.44 | 10.28 | 7.24 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3 | Japan | 331.51 | 13.41 | 12.76 |
| 4 | Australia 1 | 325.04 | 3.92 | 12.53 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | China Hong Kong 1 | $\mathbf{3 2 3 . 0 4}$ | - | - |
| 6 | China | 312.32 | 14.94 | 10.82 |
| 7 | Thailand 1 | 295.16 | 14.20 | 3.92 |
| 8 | Australia 2 | 249.22 | 15.45 | 5.06 |
| 9 | Indonesia 2 | 226.22 | 14.01 | 13.61 |
| 10 | Singapore | 225.94 | 14.39 | 14.94 |
| 11 | Chinese Taipei 2 | 191.23 | 16.93 | 11.83 |
| 12 | Thailand 2 | 174.28 | 18.01 | 16.38 |
| 13 | China Hong Kong 2 | 146.36 | 15.61 | 16.8 |
| 14 | Korea | 143.27 | 11.83 | 15.61 |
|  |  | Subtotal | $\mathbf{1 7 5 . 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 4 7 . 3 0}$ |

Hong Kong finished fifth out of 14 teams, scoring 36 points above average in the first round robin (ranked $1^{\text {st }}$ ) and 7 points above average in the second round robin, and lost marginally by 11 IMPs (138 IMPs to 149 IMPs) to China in the 64 boards Bermuda berth play off.

For the combined two-round total VPs scored, we beat or drew all the teams, except losing to Australia 1 and Chinese Taipei 1. In general, we did well in the first round robin but only an average performance in the second round as well as in the playoff, which probably due to individual players being overloaded after playing the extended 20 boards match format.

The eventual champion was Indonesia 1, Chinese Taipei 1 was second and Japan third. The 3 Bermuda berths went to Indonesia, Japan and China.

## Individual Pair Performance

The performances of the three pairs were all above average using the official tournament Butler scoring. Although the sitting direction has some effect on the analysis (more strong pairs were in NS direction), no doubt Edmund and Roger were the best performance pair among all three pairs.

| Butler per board | $\underline{1}^{\text {st }}$ Round | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Round | Average |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Vincent $\mathrm{Li}-$ Peter Chun <br> (sitting $50 \%$ NS and $50 \%$ <br> EW) | 0.142 | -0.116 | +0.013 |
| Karic Chiu - Peter Yeung <br> (sitting NS throughout) | 0.085 | -0.032 | +0.027 |
| Edmund Tse - Roger Ling | 0.901 | 0.478 | +0.690 |


| (sitting EW throughout) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Conclusion

This year the team did better on slam bidding compared with previous years and actually had positive IMPs in this area. However, our judgement errors on both bidding and play increased significantly, especially in later part of the tournament. We also saw a number of matches the team gained a huge number of IMPs, but a lot of them were offset by the careless errors which resulted only small wins. That was a discourage sign as other strong teams usually won big VP scores against weak teams, and the trending had seriously affected the team's ultimate ranking position. If the Senior Team is to fare better in future, we must emphasis training on mental focus and alertness, and hopefully by reducing the negative IMP figures we could climb to a higher status.

Last but not least, I would like to thank the Council for their support and back-up, our team members for their harmony and co-operation during the championships.

Respectfully submitted


# 50 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Asia Pacific Bridge Federation Championship Hong Kong Senior Team 2 Captain's Report 

## Henry Lam

The Hong Kong Senior Team 2 consists of 6 members: Henry Lam - Pauline Ling, KL Fung Amy Yeung and Alex Leigh - Mario Yeung. The team had regular practice for a year and the players Henry Lam, Pauline Ling, Alex Leigh, Amy Yeung and Mario Yeung had played in the same senior team in the 2014 Redbull World Bridge Series in Sanya.

We arrived at Montien Hotel of Bangkok on the 20th of May. The weather in Bangkok was hot but not as humid as that in Hong Kong. There were 14 teams participating in the Senior Series, most of them were familiar faces who had played in the open team in the past. The teams played in two round robins, with 20 -board per round. The highest-ranking Zone 6 team at the end of the round robins would automatically earn the berth to the World Championship. The 2nd berth is determined by a 64 -board play-off between the 2nd and 3rd ranking Zone 6 teams. The winner of this play-off will earn the second berth. The 3rd berth is determined by a 48 -board play-off between the loser of $2 \mathrm{nd} / 3 \mathrm{rd}$ play-off and the winner of the $4 \mathrm{th} / 5$ th play-off. The winner of this play-off will earn the third berth.

Our Team had a good start, losing to our Hong Kong Team 1, a losing draw to Japan , and won Thailand 2. We finished at the 6th position on the first day. However, this was the highest position we could get in the whole match. We finished at the $12^{\text {th }}$ position at the end of the first round robin.

The following is a summary of the scores of the $1^{\text {st }}$ round robin.

## $4 \mathbf{4 0}^{\text {th }}$ PABF Championships $1^{\text {st }}$ Round Robin Scoreboard

|  | Team | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Ad j | Total <br> VP | Ra nk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Singapore |  | 10.82 | 1.37 | 15.45 | 0.00 | 7.47 | 1.37 | 5.61 | 5.80 | 2.32 | 3.34 | 15.61 | 17.06 | 10.00 |  | 96.22 | 11 |
| 2 | China <br> HK 2 | 9.18 |  | 1.88 | 11.83 | 3.20 | 4.89 | 6.80 | 4.39 | 5.42 | 0.00 | 5.61 | 7.93 | 19.65 | 9.18 |  | 89.96 | 12 |
| 3 | Taipei 1 | 18.63 | 18.12 |  | 2.21 | 6.80 | 9.72 | 15.28 | 9.72 | 12.53 | 13.81 | 18.53 | 13.81 | 19.25 | 12.30 |  | 170.71 | 3 |
| 4 | Australia <br> 2 | 4.55 | 8.17 | 17.79 |  | 4.39 | 11.34 | 9.45 | 4.55 | 12.30 | 12.53 | 16.38 | 8.92 | 14.01 | 10.28 |  | 134.66 | 8 |
| 5 | Australia <br> 1 | 20.00 | 16.80 | 13.20 | 15.61 |  | 12.30 | 5.99 | 16.08 | 11.59 | 4.55 | 8.41 | 16.23 | 19.25 | 3.77 |  | 163.78 | 4 |
| 6 | Indonesia <br> 2 | 12.53 | 15.11 | 10.28 | 8.66 | 7.70 |  | 3.48 | 5.99 | 2.21 | 7.70 | 12.53 | 10.82 | 3.20 | 9.18 | $-0$ <br> 5 | 108.89 | 9 |
| 7 | China | 18.63 | 13.20 | 4.72 | 10.55 | 14.01 | 16.52 |  | 5.06 | 7.24 | 1.77 | 14.01 | 18.91 | 13.81 | 15.77 | -0. <br> 5 | 153.70 | 6 |
| 8 | China <br> HK 1 | 14.39 | 15.61 | 10.28 | 15.45 | 3.92 | 14.01 | 14.94 |  | 14.20 | 12.76 | 16.93 | 11.83 | 18.01 | 13.41 |  | 175.74 | 1 |
| 9 | Thailand 1 | 14.20 | 14.58 | 7.47 | 7.70 | 8.41 | 17.79 | 12.76 | 5.80 |  | 14.94 | 11.08 | 3.34 | 19.09 | 1.47 |  | 138.63 | 7 |
| 1 0 | Indonesia <br> 1 | 17.68 | 20.00 | 6.19 | 7.47 | 15.45 | 12.30 | 18.23 | 7.24 | 5.06 |  | 20.00 | 19.99 | 17.68 | 8.41 |  | 175.70 | 2 |
| 1 1 | Chinese <br> Taipei | 16.66 | 14.39 | 1.47 | 3.62 | 11.59 | 7.47 | 5.99 | 3.07 | 8.92 | 0.00 |  | 17.79 | 8.92 | 0.75 |  | 100.64 | 10 |
| 1 2 | Korea | 4.39 | 12.07 | 6.19 | 11.08 | 3.77 | 9.18 | 1.09 | 8.17 | 16.66 | 0.01 | 2.21 |  | 7.02 | 1.09 |  | 82.93 | 13 |
| 1 3 | Thailand 2 | 2.94 | 0.35 | 0.75 | 5.99 | 0.75 | 16.80 | 6.19 | 1.99 | 0.91 | 2.32 | 11.08 | 12.98 |  | 7.70 |  | 70.75 | 14 |
| 1 4 | Japan | 10.00 | 10.82 | 7.70 | 9.72 | 16.23 | 10.82 | 4.23 | 6.59 | 18.53 | 11.59 | 19.25 | 18.91 | 12.30 |  | -1 | 155.69 | 5 |

## Scores of Senior Hong Kong Team 2 in the First Round robin

| Match | Country | 1MP | VP | Cummulative <br> VP | Rank |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | China Hong Kong 1 | $22: 48$ | $4.39: 15.61$ | 4.39 | 14 |


| 2 | Japan | $35: 38$ | $9.18: 10.82$ | 13.57 | 11 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | Thailand 2 | $74: 12$ | $19.65: 0.35$ | 33.22 | 6 |
| 4 | Korea | $30: 38$ | $7.93: 12.07$ | 41.15 | 8 |
| 5 | Chinese Taipei 2 | $18: 37$ | $5.61: 14.39$ | 46.76 | 10 |
| 6 | Chinese Taipei 1 | $36: 81$ | $1.88: 18.12$ | 48.64 | 11 |
| 7 | Thailand 1 | $41: 61$ | $5.42: 14.58$ | 54.06 | 11 |
| 8 | Indonesia 2 | $28: 51$ | $4.89: 15.11$ | 58.95 | 12 |
| 9 | Australia 2 | $48: 41$ | $11.83: 8.17$ | 70.78 | 11 |
| 10 | China | $31: 44$ | $6.8: 13.20$ | 77.58 | 10 |
| 11 | Indonesia 1 | $18: 93$ | $0: 20$ | 77.58 | 11 |
| 12 | Australia 1 | $19: 53$ | $3.20: 16.80$ | 80.78 | 12 |
| 13 | Singapore | $49: 52$ | $9.18: 10.82$ | 89.96 | 12 |

We finished at the $12^{\text {th }}$ position after the first round robin.

## $1^{\text {st }}$ Round Robin Datum

| Match | Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | + | - | $+$ | - | + | - |
| 1 | China Hong Kong 1 |  |  | 21 |  |  | -48 |
| 2 | Japan |  | -27 |  |  | 26 |  |
| 3 | Thailand 2 |  | -3 | 70 |  |  |  |
| 4 | Korea |  | -15 | 9 |  |  |  |
| 5 | Chinese Taipei 2 |  | -46 |  |  | 27 |  |
| 6 | Chinese Taipei 1 |  |  |  | -33 |  | -19 |
| 7 | Thailand 1 |  | -28 | 7 |  |  |  |
| 8 | Indonesia 2 |  | -24 |  |  |  | 0 |
| 9 | Australia 2 |  |  | 15 |  |  | -13 |
| 10 | China |  | -17 |  |  |  | -1 |
| 11 | Indonesia 1 |  | -51 |  | -40 |  |  |
| 12 | Australia 1 |  |  |  | -16 |  | -19 |
| 13 | Singapore | 1 |  | 3 |  |  |  |
| Subtotal |  | -210 |  | +36 |  | -47 |  |
| Butler |  | -1.167 |  | 0.2 |  | -0.294 |  |

## Scores of Senior Hong Kong Team 2 in the Second Round robin

| Match | Country | 1MP | VP | Cummulative <br> VP | Rank |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | China Hong Kong 1 | $17: 51$ | $3.20: 16.80$ | 93.16 | 12 |
| 2 | Indonesia 1 | $20: 84$ | $0.21: 19.79$ | 93.37 | 12 |
| 3 | Chinese Taipei 1 | $9: 63$ | $1: 19$ | 94.37 | 13 |
| 4 | Australia 1 | $10: 70$ | $0.51: 19.49$ | 94.88 | 13 |
| 5 | Japan | $31: 70$ | $2.56: 17.44$ | 97.44 | 13 |
| 6 | Indonesia 2 | $10: 88$ | $0: 20$ | 97.44 | 13 |
| 7 | Thailand 1 | $36: 61$ | $4.55: 15.45$ | 101.99 | 13 |
| 8 | Australia 2 | $42: 47$ | $8.66: 11.34$ | 110.65 | 13 |
| 9 | Chinese Taipei 2 | $40: 42$ | $9.45: 10.55$ | 120.10 | 13 |
| 10 | Korea | $49: 15$ | $16.8: 3.2$ | 136.90 | 13 |
| 11 | Singapore | $17: 52$ | $3.07: 16.93$ | 139.97 | 13 |
| 12 | China | $34: 49$ | $6.39: 13.61$ | 146.36 | 13 |
| 13 | Thailand 2 | $21: 92$ | $0: 20$ | 146.36 | 13 |

$2^{\text {nd }}$ Round Robin Datum

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Match | Team | + | - | + | - | + | - |
| 1 | China Hong Kong 1 |  |  |  | -17 |  | -20 |
| 2 | Indonesia 1 |  | -40 |  |  |  | -37 |
| 3 | Chinese Taipei 1 |  |  | 11 |  |  | -66 |
| 4 | Australia 1 |  | -35 |  | -33 |  |  |
| 5 | Japan |  | -14 |  |  |  | -41 |
| 6 | Indonesia 2 |  |  |  | -46 |  | -38 |
| 7 | Thailand 1 |  | -24 |  |  |  | -5 |
| 8 | Australia 2 | 17 |  |  | -23 |  |  |
| 9 | Chinese Taipei 2 |  | -3 |  | -1 |  |  |
| 10 | Korea | 44 |  |  |  |  | -2 |
| 11 | Singapore |  |  |  | -14 |  | -23 |
| 12 | China |  | -29 |  |  | 5 |  |
| 13 | Thailand 2 |  | -35 |  | -56 |  |  |
| Subtotal |  | -119 |  | -179 |  | -227 |  |
| Butler |  | -0.661 |  | -1.119 |  | -1.261 |  |


|  | Team | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total <br> VP | Ra nk |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Singapore |  | 16.93 | 6.59 | 13.61 | 10.00 | 18.01 | 8.41 | 5.06 | 6.80 | 2.32 | 14.39 | 10.00 | 16.23 | 1.37 | $\begin{aligned} & 225 . \\ & 94 \end{aligned}$ | 10 |
| 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { China } \\ & \text { HK } 2 \end{aligned}$ | 3.07 |  | 1.00 | 8.66 | 0.51 | 0.00 | 6.39 | 3.20 | 4.55 | 0.21 | 9.45 | 16.80 | 0.00 | 2.56 | 146. <br> 36 | 13 |
| 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chinese } \\ & \text { Taipei } 1 \end{aligned}$ | 13.41 | 19.00 |  | 15.28 | 8.66 | 12.30 | 3.92 | 12.76 | 12.30 | 5.42 | 20.00 | 16.93 | 19.09 | 16.66 | $36 .$ <br> 44 | 2 |
| 4 | Australia <br> 2 | 6.39 | 11.34 | 4.72 |  | 3.62 | 0.01 | 10.82 | 14.94 | 2.10 | 8.92 | 14.39 | 18.12 | 13.20 | 5.99 | $\begin{aligned} & 249 . \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | 8 |
| 5 | Australia <br> 1 | 10.00 | 19.49 | 11.34 | 16.38 |  | 16.93 | 11.59 | 7.47 | 15.93 | 11.34 | 9.45 | 13.81 | 11.34 | 6.19 | $\begin{aligned} & 325 . \\ & 04 \end{aligned}$ | 4 |
| 6 | Indonesia <br> 2 | 1.99 | 20.00 | 7.70 | 19.99 | 3.07 |  | 5.24 | 6.39 | 7.70 | 1.47 | 3.92 | 17.06 | 18.73 | 4.07 | $\begin{aligned} & 226 . \\ & 22 \end{aligned}$ | 9 |
| 7 | China | 11.59 | 13.61 | 16.08 | 9.18 | 8.41 | 14.76 |  | 9.18 | 7.70 | 10.55 | 12.30 | 20.00 | 17.56 | 7.70 | $\begin{aligned} & 312 . \\ & 32 \end{aligned}$ | 6 |
| 8 | China <br> HK 1 | 14.94 | 16.80 | 7.24 | 5.06 | 12.53 | 13.61 | 10.82 |  | 3.92 | 5.80 | 11.83 | 15.61 | 16.38 | 12.76 | $\begin{aligned} & 323 . \\ & 04 \end{aligned}$ | 5 |
| 9 | Thailand <br> 1 | 13.20 | 15.45 | 7.70 | 17.90 | 4.07 | 12.30 | 12.30 | 16.08 |  | 14.39 | 18.12 | 16.23 | 6.80 | 1.99 | $295 .$ <br> 16 | 7 |
| 10 | Indonesia <br> 1 | 17.68 | 19.79 | 14.58 | 11.08 | 8.66 | 18.53 | 9.45 | 14.20 | 5.61 |  | 11.08 | 19.93 | 2.68 | 19.00 | $377 .$ <br> 97 | 1 |
| 11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chinese } \\ & \text { Taipei } 2 \end{aligned}$ | 5.61 | 10.55 | 0.00 | 5.61 | 10.55 | 16.08 | 7.70 | 8.17 | 1.88 | 8.92 |  | 1.99 | 12.53 | 1.00 | $\begin{aligned} & 191 . \\ & 23 \end{aligned}$ | 11 |
| 12 | Korea | 10.00 | 3.20 | 3.07 | 1.88 | 6.19 | 2.94 | 0.00 | 4.39 | 3.77 | 0.07 | 18.01 |  | 3.20 | 3.62 | $143 .$ <br> 27 | 14 |
| 13 | Thailand <br> 2 | 3.77 | 20.00 | 0.91 | 6.80 | 8.66 | 1.27 | 2.44 | 3.62 | 13.20 | 17.32 | 7.47 | 16.80 |  | 1.27 | $174 .$ $28$ | 12 |
| 14 | Japan | 18.63 | 17.44 | 3.34 | 14.01 | 13.81 | 15.93 | 12.30 | 7.24 | 18.01 | 1.00 | 19.00 | 16.38 | 18.73 |  | $331 .$ <br> 51 | 3 |

The whole tournament ran smoothly. We did not have any penalties and did not receive any complaints. Our final position was $13^{\text {th }}$. Our performance had been unsatisfactory. It was quite an experience since this was the first time our team members played in such a long event.

I would like to thank the HKCBA to allow us to play in the APBF Championship. It gives us a great experience and helps us to find our defects. I hope we will have better performance next time.

# Captain's report - Hong Kong Open team $50^{\text {th }}$ APBF Championship 

## Overall

The Hong Kong Open Team (comprising Dicky Lai, Laurance Lo, W K Chan, K F Mak, Baron Ng, Tony Lau and NPC Samuel Wan) ranked $5^{\text {th }}$ out of 14 teams and just made it to the play-off for a berth in the Bermuda Bowl in Chennai. Unfortunately, the Team lost to $4^{\text {th }}$ ranked Indonesia over 64 boards by 178 to 210 imps , and thus lost the right to represent the region. It is worth noting that Indonesia subsequently lost to China in a dog fight. As a result, the top three teams in the round robin all earned the right to compete in India. There were no surprises.

The final packing order was:

| 1. Japan | 348.19 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. Singapore | 335.37 |
| 3. China | 334.92 |
| 4. Indonesia | 289.36 |
| 5. China Hong Kong | 278.34 |
| 6. Australia | 272.77 |
| 7. New Zealand | 271.57 |
| 8. Thailand | 271.53 |
| 9. Malaysia | 253.62 |
| 10. China Macau | 230.50 |
| 11. Philippines | 221.55 |
| 12. Chinese Taipei | 215.16 |
| 13. Korea | 198.95 |
| 14. New Caledonia | 112.61 |

This is considered a somewhat satisfactory result considering that the team had a terrible start and at one point, was lying in the next-to-last position. The recovery in the second round robin demonstrated tremendous fighting spirit and the resultant climb to the upper half of the table was marveled and applauded by a lot of people.

I should point out that of the teams finishing above us, many participants are either full-time or semi-full time bridge professionals. 14 teams in the Open Series is also the largest number ever to appear in the APBF Championships.

## Preparation

The selection trials were concluded less than three months before the tournament and featured a nail-biting finish with this team showing great character by overcoming a 54 imp deficit in the final stanza of 16 boards.

Ever since I accepted the invitation to serve as NPC for the team, I immediately embarked on an ambitious and rigorous training program, which consisted of

- Bidding difficult hands selected from The Bridge World magazine (Challenge the Champs)
- Solving bidding and leading problems from the Bridge World (Master Solvers Club) and discussing answers with the partner
- Playing wild and distributional hands planted by the NPC (the hands were selected from recent world championships)
- Solving Declarer Play problems set by the NPC
- Bidding slam hands on BBO once a week
- Discussing each player's weaknesses
- Documenting defensive system against artificial conventions such as transfer responses, multi-2D, 2-suited openings, mini-no trumps etc.
- Playing team games on BBO

Altogether, 6 rounds of practices were arranged. Scores were awarded to the answers and the overall scores are attached. I declared upfront that to do well in the competition, everyone should fine-tune the partnership agreements, especially in competitive bidding.

The team demonstrated great spirits by completing the assignments on time and providing quality answers to the quizzes.

## Objective

The overall objective is to do well in the Championships. In particular, securing a berth for Chennai is high on everyone's list.

## Actual Team Performance

The team started badly, losing to underdogs Malaysia in the opening match. In fact, after three days of competition, the team lay in the next-to-last position, only ahead of new entrants New Caledonia. Losing to formidable opponents like Singapore, China and Japan was disheartening but succumbing to weaker teams like Macau and Korea was even more painful. .

The team survived the onslaught from strong teams early on in the second round robin and really pulled up our socks, so to speak, against the weak teams. Eventually, we scooped up $164+$ VPs in the second round robin (compared to 114 in the first), pipping Thailand at the post and thus earned for the right to the play-off.

The team is consisted of two relatively experienced partnerships (Tony/Baron, WK/KF - each had over 3 years of experience playing together). In comparison, the partnership of Dicky/Laurance is practically green so I decided to fall back on the well-oiled combination of Dicky/KF whenever we faced solid opposition such as China, Japan and Singapore. As a result, Dicky, KF, Tony and Baron had to play a larger number of boards compared to Laurance and WK. Given that we decided to put our best foot forward for Chennai, this seemed to be the only option.

## Pair Performance

As evidenced from the results, almost every pair put up an erratic performance. It was slightly disappointing to note that the partnership of Tony/Baron had the most ups and downs despite their good showing during training. Evidently, solving problems on paper is very different from making decisions at the table when the pressure is so much greater.

The pair performance, as reflected by the datum, is summarized in the spreadsheet attached.

## Individual Performance

Dicky and KF, who had the most international experience, were no doubt pillars of the team. In order to measure the players' performance, I tried to count the number of mistakes the players made during the round robin and following is my conclusion:

| Dicky | 7.5 'obvious' mistakes/misjudgments over 19 sessions |
| :--- | :--- |
| Laurance | 10.5 mistakes $/ 12$ sessions |
| W K Chan | 12.5 mistakes $/ 14$ sessions |
| KF | 14 mistakes over 21 sessions |
| Baron | 15.4 mistakes over 19 sessions |
| Tony | 19 mistakes over 19 sessions |

Please note that the above measurement is purely subjective without taking into account quality of the opposition as well as brilliant decisions that gained points. In other words, I have only measured 'debits', not 'credits'.

Here is another approach, using the Butler ranking:

| Rank <br> (Out of | Player <br> yers) | Correct Butler | Boar |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First Round Robin |  |  |  |
| 42 | W K Chan | 0.001 | 159 |
| 47 | Laurance Lo | -0.029 | 140 |
| 48 | K F Mak | -0.058 | 199 |
| 53 | Dicky Lai | -0.088 | 180 |
| 72 | Baron Ng | -0.615 | 179 |
| 72 | Tony Lau | -0.615 | 179 |

Second Round Robin

| 5 | W K Chan | 0.728 | 114 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | K F Mak | 0.700 | 214 |


| 19 | Baron Ng | 0.409 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 19 | Tony Lau | 0.409 | 200 |
| 21 | Dicky Lai | 0.386 | 194 |
| 40 | Laurance Lo | 0.080 | 94 |

## Recommendations

The strong countries performed well, not only because they have better talent, but mostly because they have better partnerships. I would recommend holding the trials as early as possible and thereafter, make it mandatory for each partnership to bid a certain number of hands, either in the form of quizzes or on BBO.



1,431

| 1,135 | 1,025 | 278.3440 over 12 sess44 over 14 <br> sess | minus 8 <br> over 19 <br> sessions | 55 over 7 sess |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

