

♠♥♣♦ SAWBA Interprovincial Teams 2025 ♠♥♣♦

9 & 10 August

Bulletin # 2

Thank you all for participating in this event. After 2 days of play, the final round was exciting in all three sections. In the C section, the final result was in doubt up until the last board.

Well done to the winners!

A Section:

Eastern Cape

Dawn Palmer ♥ Glynis Dornon ♥ Ester Goosen ♥ Dianne Penlington

B Section:

Western Cape

Toni Hendler ♥ Meryl Cohn ♥ Sue Botha ♥ Erica Zimet

C Section:

KZN

Nanette Clouston ♥ Sandy Candotti ♥ Kitty Phillips ♥ Patricia Betterton

Final Results

Pos	No	Team	Category	Score
1	2	Eastern Cape (A)	A Section	71.28
2	4	KZN (A)	A Section	63.92
3	1	Gauteng (A)	A Section	52.44
4	3	Western Cape (A)	A Section	52.36
1	7	Western Cape (B)	B Section	66.04
2	8	KZN (B)	B Section	65.89
3	5	Gauteng (B)	B Section	60.07
4	6	Eastern Cape (B)	B Section	48.00
1	12	KZN (C)	C Section	84.04
2	9	Gauteng (C)	C Section	82.92
3	10	Eastern Cape (C)	C Section	52.03
4	11	Western Cape (C)	C Section	21.01

Puppet Stayman

Board 8	♠ 86543			
Dealer W	♥ 954			
None Vul	♦ KJ43			
	♣ 2			
	♠ K9	♠ A10	NT	♠ ♥ ♦ ♣
♥ AKJ107	♥ Q63	♥ Q63	N	3 8 3 3 7
♦ Q82	♦ A10976	♦ A10976	S	3 8 3 3 7
♣ Q107	♣ 843	♣ 843	E	10 5 9 9 6
	♠ QJ72		W	10 5 9 9 6
	♥ 82			
	♦ 5			
	♣ AKJ965			
			Par -430 4NT= EW	
			NS: 4 + 11 = 15 HCP	
			EW: 10 + 15 = 25 HCP	

This board was interesting from both a bidding and play point of view.

Many East pairs decided to go puppet Stayman after their partner's opened a 15-17 NT. This looks like a reasonable decision in view of a potential ruffing value in spades and sharp values in the East hand. However, two bad things happened as a result:

A. They found their 5-3 heart fit and

B. 3♣ was doubled by South for the lead. 4♥ had no play on a club lead.

Those who just bid 1NT-3NT were treated to a spade lead by North. Now the contract hinged on how the diamond suit was played. The percentage line in diamonds is to finesse the queen and if that loses, finesse for the jack. This works well on the hand and 9 tricks roll in.

Contract	Lead	Score	IMP	
4♥-2 W	♣2	100	+5.73	-5.73
4♥-2 W	♣2	100	+5.73	-5.73
4♥-2 W	♣2	100	+5.73	-5.73
3NT-1 W	♠4	50	+4.00	-4.00
4♥-1 W	♣2	50	+4.00	-4.00
3NT-1 W	♠6	50	+4.00	-4.00
4♥-1 W	♣2	50	+4.00	-4.00
3NT= W	♠8	400	-6.36	+6.36
3NT= W	♠6	400	-6.36	+6.36
3NT+1 W	♠6	430	-6.82	+6.82
3NT+1 W	♦3	430	-6.82	+6.82
3NT+1 W	♦3	430	-6.82	+6.82

Visualisation

Board 9	♠ 432	< >					
Dealer N	♥ A97432						
EW Vul	♦ A						
	♣ K85						
♠ 1086		♠ -	NT	♠	♥	♦	♣
♥ J8		♥ 65	N	13	13	13	5 6
♦ 98754		♦ KQJ1062	S	13	13	12	5 6
♣ Q76		♣ J10932	E	0	0	0	7 6
	♠ AKQJ975		W	0	0	0	7 6
	♥ KQ10		Par +1520 7NT= NS				
	♦ 3		NS: 11 + 19 = 30 HCP				
	♣ A4		EW: 7 + 3 = 10 HCP				

Grand slams are always interesting. Board 9 should have been an easy grand slam to bid but many pairs floundered with only 2 bidding 7♥ (slightly inferior to 7♠ or 7NT) and some only getting to game.

When you have an unbalanced hand, point count is often unimportant. If you can visualize your partner's hand, you will be able to count how many tricks your side can take. The South hand is a good example of this approach. When partner opens 1♥, South can visualize 7 spade tricks, 5 heart tricks (if partner has the ace) and 1 club trick. If partner has 2 aces, 13 tricks will be there for the taking. All that is required is to agree hearts as trumps and go Blackwood. If partner has 2 aces, it is highly likely that 7♠ or 7NT will be the best grand slam. Most of the time, that spade suit will be worth 7 tricks even if partner is void. Even interference from East shouldn't make bidding this grand slam difficult. Whatever your methods, agree hearts (eg. with a cue bid raise) and go Blackwood. There is no need to show your spade suit.

Contract	Lead	Score	IMP	
7♥= N	♣ J	1510	+10.55	-10.55
7♥= N	♦ K	1510	+10.55	-10.55
6♠+1 S	♣ 6	1010	0.00	0.00
6♠+1 S	♣ 6	1010	0.00	0.00
6♥+1 N	♦ K	1010	0.00	0.00
6♠+1 S	♣ 7	1010	0.00	0.00
6♠+1 S	♣ 6	1010	0.00	0.00
6♥+1 N	♦ K	1010	0.00	0.00
6♠+1 S	♦ 9	1010	0.00	0.00
6♥+1 N	♦ 2	1010	0.00	0.00
4♥+3 N	♦ K	510	-10.55	+10.55
5♠+2 S	♣ 6	510	-10.55	+10.55

Playing too much Pairs?

The screenshot shows a bridge hand interface with the following details:

- Contract:** 4♠+1 W
- Board:** Bd 10, Dlr E
- Tricks taken:** 11
- Players:**
 - North: Prue Gillespie
 - West: Caroline Richardson
 - East: Clare Mitchell
 - South: Heather Barnes-Webb
- Hand Cards:**
 - North: ♠ K76, ♥ K62, ♦ AQJ94, ♣ 85
 - West: ♠ AJ1052, ♥ AQ95, ♦ 65, ♣ J2
 - East: ♠ Q94, ♥ 43, ♦ 1083, ♣ AKQ97
 - South: ♠ 83, ♥ J1087, ♦ K72, ♣ 10643
- Score Table:**

W	N	E	S
		P	P
1♠	2♦	3♦*	P
3♥*	P	4♠	P
P	P		

Most pairs got to play in 4♠ on this hand. Caroline Richardson was the only one to play this contract correctly when she received the ♣8 lead. She saw that winning the first club in dummy in order to take the spade finesse would complicate the play of the hand. She, therefore, won the first club in hand with the Jack, laid down the ♠A and continued spades. She easily came to 10 tricks with 4♠, 5♣ and 1♥. Well done Caroline!

Other pairs, who won the first club in dummy, were influenced by pairs considerations where the spade finesse might lead to an overtrick. Here, winning the first club on the table risked the contract. If North ducks the first round of spades and then wins the second round and returns a trump (not a difficult defense to find), there is no entry to the table to unblock the clubs.

Contract	Lead	Score	IMP
4♠-2 W	♣8	200	+9.18 -9.18
4♠-1 W	♣8	100	+7.18 -7.18
3♠-1 W	♦4	100	+7.18 -7.18
4♠-1 W	♣8	100	+7.18 -7.18
3♠+1 W	♣8	170	+1.91 -1.91
3♠+1 W	♣8	170	+1.91 -1.91
3♠+2 W	♣8	200	+1.27 -1.27
4♠= W	♣8	620	-7.00 +7.00
4♠= W	♣8	620	-7.00 +7.00
4♠= W	♦A	620	-7.00 +7.00
4♠= W	♣8	620	-7.00 +7.00
4♠+1 W	♣8	650	-7.82 +7.82

13 tricks or 9

Board 16
Dealer W
EW Vul

♠ KJ9752
 ♥ 3
 ♦ K742
 ♣ K5

♠ A10864
 ♥ AK52
 ♦ AJ6
 ♣ 3

♠ 3
 ♥ QJ76
 ♦ 3
 ♣ AQJ10976

♠ Q
 ♥ 10984
 ♦ Q10985
 ♣ 842

	NT	♠	♥	♦	♣
N	0	5	0	7	0
S	0	5	0	7	0
E	13	8	13	6	13
W	13	8	13	6	13

Par -2220 7NT= EW

NS: 10 + 4 = 14 HCP

EW: 10 + 16 = 26 HCP

Pairs who made 13 tricks playing in hearts must have been wondering whether they should have bid it. At 2 tables 4♥ was defeated. A diamond lead proved to be fatal when declarers tried to draw trumps and then misguessed the clubs. North was able to force the dummy and cut declarer off from her club tricks. On a diamond lead, it is correct to win and play Ace of clubs followed by queen pitching a spade. This has the effect of neutralizing the diamond force. If North decides to continue diamonds with the king, declarer should not ruff and should discard from dummy losing that trick. It is then easy to draw trumps ending in dummy and claim the remaining tricks. The principles to follow are:

- A. Start with the side suit
- B. Keep the danger hand off lead (South).

Contract	Lead	Score
4♥-3 W	♦ 2	300
4♥-2 W	♦ 2	200
3♠-2 W	♥ 3	200
4♥+2 W	♦ 2	680
4♥+3 W	♣ K	710
4♥+3 W	♥ 3	710
4♥+3 W	♦ 2	710
4♥+3 W	♦ 2	710
5♥+2 W	♥ 3	710
4♥+3 W	♦ 2	710
6♥+1 W	♦ 2	1460
6♥+1 W	♥ 3	1460

Pairs versus Teams

Board 23
Dealer S
All Vul

♠ A74
 ♥ 8532
 ♦ A8
 ♣ KJ75

♠ 62
 ♥ KQ96
 ♦ QJ942
 ♣ 96

♠ K83
 ♥ J10
 ♦ 10765
 ♣ Q1084

♠ QJ1095
 ♥ A74
 ♦ K3
 ♣ A32

	NT	♠	♥	♦	♣
N	4	4	4	7	4
S	4	4	4	7	4
E	9	9	9	6	9
W	9	9	9	6	9

Par -600 3NT= EW

NS: 6 + 8 = 14 HCP

EW: 14 + 12 = 26 HCP

Playing pairs, if a NT contract can make the same number of tricks as a major suit contract, it is important to play in NT. Most players don't realize that even in teams, if both the NT contract and the major suit contract can make exactly 9 tricks, it is important to play in NT. This hand illustrates this principle. Well done to those pairs who avoided the 5-3 spade fit and played in 3NT which was laydown.

Contract	Lead	Score
4♠-1 E	♦Q	100
4♠-1 E	♥K	100
4♠-1 E	♥K	100
3NT-1 W	♥J	100
3♠= E	♦Q	140
3NT= W	♦5	600
3NT= W	♦5	600
3NT= W	♥J	600
3NT+1 W	♣4	630

Final Say

Robert and I enjoyed running this tournament. It was our first attempt at organizing a teams event on RealBridge. The platform is quite friendly and it proved to be much easier to work with compared with BBO for teams events. I was disappointed that players are still not alerting conventional bids despite numerous reminders to do so. It is an important aspect of our game that opponents are fully informed of our methods. Internationally, failure to alert is considered to be unethical.

As usual, Robert gave up his time and helped me with editing of these bulletins both from technical and aesthetic point of views. We hope you enjoyed reading them.

- Bernard Donde

Cross-IMPs

Sort by: Display:

Pos	Team	Pair	Average	Category	Bds
1	Eastern Cape (A)	Dawn Palmer & Glynis Dornon	+0.39	A Section	96
2	KZN (A)	Linda Campbell & Di Knowler	+0.39	A Section	96
3	Western Cape (A)	Jocelyn Ashberg & Shirley Kaminer	+0.34	A Section	72
4	Eastern Cape (A)	Ester Goosen & Dianne Penlington	+0.11	A Section	96
5	KZN (A)	Isobel Speirs & Glenda Macleod	-0.08	A Section	96
6	Western Cape (A)	Carol Grunder & Jill Rabie	-0.10	A Section	72
7	Gauteng (A)	Delys Shepard & Helene Roberts	-0.21	A Section	96
8	Gauteng (A)	Louise Berman & Jennefer Matisonn	-0.34	A Section	96
9	Western Cape (A)	Marilyn Bradley & Michele Alexander	-0.90	A Section	48
1	Western Cape (B)	Sue Botha & Erica Zimet	+0.81	B Section	96
2	Gauteng (B)	Trish Crosse & Bev Hewitt	+0.25	B Section	96
3	KZN (B)	Janne Masojada & Tanya Rawson	+0.12	B Section	96
4	Gauteng (B)	Jenny Foaden & Renee Kenny	-0.00	B Section	96
5	Eastern Cape (B)	Liesel Hutton & Kathy Light	-0.01	B Section	96
6	KZN (B)	Mignon Leigh & Jenny Ten-Bokum	-0.02	B Section	96
7	Eastern Cape (B)	Alison Puggia & Sally Potgieter	-0.22	B Section	72
8	Western Cape (B)	Toni Hendler & Meryl Cohn	-0.66	B Section	96
9	Eastern Cape (B)	Alison Puggia & Lana Soutar	-1.24	B Section	24
1	Eastern Cape (C)	Maureen Bee & Prue Gillespie	+1.26	C Section	10
2	KZN (C)	Nanette Clouston & Sandy Candotti	+1.26	C Section	96
3	Gauteng (C)	Caroline Richardson & Clare Mitchell	+1.13	C Section	96
4	Gauteng (C)	Frances Harrison & Jennifer Adams	+0.42	C Section	96
5	Western Cape (C)	Ling Stein & Caryn Querido	+0.25	C Section	24
6	Western Cape (C)	Nadine Pincus & Ling Stein	+0.02	C Section	24
7	Eastern Cape (C)	Heather Barnes-Webb & Prue Gillespie	-0.01	C Section	62
8	KZN (C)	Kitty Phillips & Patricia Betterton	-0.03	C Section	96
9	Western Cape (C)	Nadine Pincus & Caryn Querido	-0.06	C Section	48
10	Eastern Cape (C)	Julie Pfister & Arauna Viljoen	-0.09	C Section	72
11	Eastern Cape (C)	Corrice Holmes & Prue Gillespie	-0.70	C Section	24
12	Western Cape (C)	Sharon Levy & Hayley Cohen	-1.78	C Section	24
13	Eastern Cape (C)	Maureen Bee & Corrice Holmes	-2.03	C Section	24
14	Western Cape (C)	Hayley Cohen & Mandy Donninger	-2.28	C Section	24
15	Western Cape (C)	Mandy Donninger & Sharon Levy	-2.37	C Section	48