## 2010 Barrier Reef Teams by Richard Wallis

After missing out last year, I was looking forward to contesting the Barrier Reef Open Teams again this year with John Brockwell as my partner, especially as our team mates were Magnus Moren and Neville Francis. Alas we did not perform consistently enough to rack up enough of the large wins that are necessary to win such a contest, and were out of the money.

Our big chance was in match 7 when we played team 1 who were comfortable leaders, and boards 2 to 13 were all played in game ( 1 slam and 2 games to us as NS) and only 1 went off to give us 12 Imps . Our slam and 2 games were flat as were 6 games for EW, except for a very thin 5D bid by EW and doubled by John, who held a trump trick and an outside Ace, and potential tricks in the other 2 suits. We could tell it was not our year when declarer made his 11 tricks (and 13 Imps ) by finessing me for the CT. Another thin game bid by EW gave them an 8 Imp win and we were too far behind.

The winners this year, winning all 8 matches and averaging over 20 VPs per match, were David Appleton/ Peter Reynolds, and David Beachamp/ Kathy Boardman. David Appleton is home-grown, Peter Reyolds, formerly from WA is now living in the ACT, David Beachamp lives in Sydney, and Kathy Boardman is from NZ. Second were Therese Tully/ Sue Lusk and Lindy Vincent/ Richard Ward.

Winners of the Restricted Teams were Patrick Bugler/ John Kelly and Nikolas Moore/ Geoff Martin, averaging over 19 VPs per match. Nik and Geoff were originally the reserve pair for the Open team, but are now members of the Queensland Junior team for this year's ANC in Hobart.

The entry was a little down this year, and even so the playing venue was a little crowded at times, but all of the players coped very well, and the Souths Leagues Club was a great venue for the players when not playing bridge, and it was relatively close to suitable accommodation.

| M 1 | 2 |  | Board 7 in the first match brought up a bit of system that I had looked <br> Bd 7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| at on the card but not discussed. I saw mini-splinters on the card, and |  |  |  |


| M 1 | AK9875 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 8 | Q94 |  |  |
| DIr W | 6 |  |  |
| Vul Nil | 63 |  |  |
| T2 | J6 |  |  |
| J652 | AKT87 |  |  |
| 8532 |  |  | AQJ74 |
| 972 |  |  | 5 |
|  | Q3 |  |  |
|  | 3 |  |  |
|  | KT9 |  |  |
|  | AKQJT84 |  |  |
| W | N | E | S |
| , | 4S | X | / |
| 5H | // |  |  |


| M 2 | K96 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 22 | T97 |  |  |
| DIr E | 98742 |  |  |
| Vul EW | 85 |  |  |
| T |  | 8754 |  |
| A862 |  | J543 |  |
| AKQJ |  | 53 |  |
| AK42 |  |  | JT3 |
|  | AQJ32 |  |  |
|  | KQ |  |  |
|  | T6 |  |  |
|  | Q976 |  |  |
| w | N | E | S |
|  |  | / | 1S |
| X | 2S | / | 3C |
| X | 3S | // |  |


| M 2 | AKJT2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 28 | JT5 |  |  |
| DIr W | K2 |  |  |
| Vul NS | J65 |  |  |
| 6543 |  | Q97 |  |
| 986 |  | KQ7 |  |
| JT8 |  | Q73 |  |
| 972 |  |  | AKT3 |
|  | 8 |  |  |
|  | A432 |  |  |
|  | A9654 |  |  |
|  | Q84 |  |  |
| W | N | E | S |
| 1 | 1S | 1NT | X |
| // |  |  |  |

On board 8 in the first match I could only conclude that after the Pairs John had become wary of my opening game bids.
I thought that I had a reasonable 4S opening bid, too good for 3S as I would do that with KQJxxxx.
Apparently East did not have any established system to deal with this high level opening, so they doubled. I think most people would have acted, but 4NT to show 2 suits to play would have been a more popular choice.
Over the double, West chose to bid, and landed on her feet with 5 H . When this came around to John, he passed it out.
I am sure that John would have doubled 5D, but I do not know why he did not at least bid 5 S over 5 H if he was not going to double, and I never got around to asking him.
5 H went 3 light for +150 , but with NS playing in 4 S at the other table for 12 tricks and -480 , we lost 8 Imps.

On board 22 in the second match my 1S opening bid only promised a 4-card suit, and John made an aggressive response of 2 S over the double by West. I am not sure if he interpreted my 3C as a game try, but he definitely was not interested.
West subsided fairly quickly, but what could they do at the vulnerability as East was marked with a virtual Yarborough, even though a 4-4 fit was assured. If the vulnerability had been reversed, I am sure that there would have been no stopping West until 4 H was reached, and if we had continued on the $4 S$, the double would have been obvious.
West led the DA and was in difficulties at once. A spade shift was obvious, but what about trick 3 when she won the DK? Eventually I was able to get a club trick and ruff a club for 8 tricks and 1 off for -50 .
At the other table Neville and Magnus were not easily shut out of the auction and finished in 4HE, making the suggested 11 tricks for +650 and 12 Imps.

On board 28 in the second match East made a fairly routine overcall of 1NT, but found John instead of his partner in possession of the outstanding points, and 1NTX became the final contract.
Having doubled for penalties, John now had to decide whether to lead my suit or his long suit? Since East was prepared for a spade lead, and may have even had more spades than me, John led the D5. In fact since my spades were so good, we probably had the same number of tricks on a spade lead as well as a diamond.
I won the DK and returned a diamond, and John cleared his suit.
Declarer exited with the HK, and I signalled for a heart on the run of the diamonds and John duly obliged, setting up my HJ and his $4^{\text {th }}$ heart. However, the fun was over for East, as he could just cash his clubs for 4 tricks and +500 .
At the other table, NS went all the way to 3NT, but only had 8 tricks for another +100 and 12 Imps.

| M 3 | 9862 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 7 | - |  |  |
| DIr S | J54 |  |  |
| Vul All | AKJ542 |  |  |
| Q4 | AK |  |  |
| A974 | KQJ852 |  |  |
| T982 | 63 |  |  |
| T83 | JT753 Q87 |  | Q87 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | T63 |  |  |
|  | AKQ7 |  |  |
|  | 6 |  |  |
| W | N | E | S |
|  |  |  | 1 |
| 1 | 1C | 1H | 1S |
| 2 H | 2 S | 3 H | 4S |
| // |  |  |  |

On board 7 in the third match I opened light in $3^{\text {rd }}$ seat and got the magic response of 1 S from John, signifying at least a 5-card suit after the 1 H overcall, so I had no problem with raising to 2 S , as holding a heart void I now had a good hand, albeit minimum having already opened the bidding.
John's hand was enhanced by the spade support, and his heart length indicated probable shortage in my hand, so he had no hesitation in going to 4S, passed out.
There was nothing in the play and John was able to ruff the opening lead of the HA in dummy, enter his hand with the DA to ruff another heart, throw his last heart on the second top club, and then lead trumps. Even on an unlikely trump lead there are 11 easy tricks.
At the other table Neville and Magnus stole the hand in 3 H , and even though NS got their club ruff to take this 1 off, -100 was still worth 11 Imps to us.

| M 3 | AT82 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 8 | Q83 |  |  |
| DIr W | 853 |  |  |
| Vul Nil | JT7 |  |  |
| QJ4 | K7653 |  |  |
| K96 | J2 |  |  |
| AKJ7 | Q64 |  |  |
| A65 |  |  | K83 |
|  | 9 |  |  |
|  | AT754 |  |  |
|  | T92 |  |  |
|  | Q942 |  |  |
| W | N | E | S |
| 1NT | / | 2 C | / |
| 2NT | 1 | 3NT | // |

On board 8 in the third match I was wary of leading either major suit after East's extended Stayman ask, so I led the CJ won on the table with the CK while John contributed the C4 (high encouraging).
Declarer led to the SQ and I won and continued the CT, on which John played the C9, and I thought that declarer had 4 clubs. Declarer now played 2 more rounds of spades, and 4 rounds of diamonds, before exiting with the C5, having discarded the C8 on the $4^{\text {th }}$ diamond.
Since John had a high and low club left, he was able to let me win the C7, cash the ST, and exit with the H3 so he could cash the HA and CQ for 1 off and +50 . Otherwise West makes the HK for 9 tricks.
At the other table Neville and Magnus got to the normal contract of 4 S , and contrived to make an overtrick for +450 , and +11 Imps.
Notice how overtricks are considered relatively unimportant at teams, but here it was worth a whole Imp!

| M 4 | AK85 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 22 | Q9 |  |  |
| DIr E | 53 |  |  |
| Vul E | AKQT4 |  |  |
| T972 | 643 |  |  |
| T3 |  | A862 |  |
| QJT6 |  |  | K842 |
| 975 |  |  | 86 |
|  | QJ |  |  |
|  | KJ754 |  |  |
|  | A97 |  |  |
|  | J32 |  |  |
| W | N | E | S |
|  |  | / | 1H |
| / | 2C | 1 | 2H |
| 1 | 2S | 1 | 3C |
| 1 | 3D! | , | 3NT |
| // |  |  |  |

On board 22 in the fourth match I was looking for a slam, but it did not look like a fit, as John's 3C rebid may have been forced with a reluctance to bid 3NT.
However, when I trotted out good old $4^{\text {th }}$ suit forcing, John showed a diamond stop, and I should therefore have picked up the inference that he must have 3-card club support, otherwise he would have bid 2NT over 2S! Holding a balanced minimum hand, he did not want to go past $3 N T$, hence the 3 C and not 4 C .
John was not unduly worried in 3NT, and just took his 10 tricks after the diamond lead, making +430 .
As NS found out at the other table, 6NT is not a good bet without a better fit and controls, and they also only has 10 tricks after the diamond lead for +100 and 11 Imps.
6 C is cold on the layout, as declarer can win the DA at trick 1, cash the top spades in dummy and 2 rounds of trumps finishing in hand, then discard the diamonds in dummy on the spades while West follows, and ruff the D5 in dummy. Then give up the HA and take the rest of the tricks.

| M 4 | A73 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 27 | A |  |  |
| Dir S | AKJ6 |  |  |
| Vul Nil | Q6542 |  |  |
| KT9652 |  |  | QJ |
| JT8 |  |  | 97642 |
| T |  |  | 854 |
| 87 |  |  | AJ8 |
|  | 9 |  |  |
|  | KQ53 |  |  |
|  | Q9732 |  |  |
|  | KT7 |  |  |
| W | N | E | S |
| 3S | 3NT | // |  |

Board 27 in the fourth match was pretty routine in our match, although we lost an Imp when I ducked the first spade and cashed my 9 tricks rather than rely on East having the CA. When East won the CA he had 2 hearts to cash.
The real fun was at another table where NS had one of those unfortunate bidding mishaps and ended in 4 H , played by North!
4-1 fits do not normally get included in the possible contracts by Deep Finesse, and this was no exception, but 4 H was cold, because the spades broke 6-2, and the hearts 5-3!
North won the SQ at trick 1, cashed the HA and ruffed a spade to cash the top trumps in dummy.
Now a diamond to hand and a club towards dummy, inserting the CT when East plays low, and all East can take are the 2 trumps and the CA. Notice that if the hearts were $4-4$, West would be able to ruff in and cash a lot of spades.

| M 5 | AQ875 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 3 | KT84 |  |
| DIr S | A |  |
| Vul EW | K96 |  |
| KJ |  | T94 |
| Q7653 |  | 92 |
| 764 |  | KJ3 |
| J75 |  | AQ842 |
|  | 632 |  |
|  | AJ |  |
|  | QT9852 |  |
|  | T3 |  |
| W | N E | S |
|  |  | 3D |
| / | 3 S / | 4S |
| // |  |  |

Board 3 in the fifth match was a good example of a conditioned reflex taking over instead of thinking the hand through.
Deep Finesse suggests that 4S is always cold when played by North, but when East led the H9 I inserted the HJ and when West covered I was in complete control, thanks to that magic H 8 . If the HJ holds the trick, I can still get a discard and make 10 tricks but it is harder.
I won the HK and went to dummy with the HA to take the spade finesse, cashing 2 rounds to leave East with the master trump. Then I cashed the DA, discarded both of the clubs in dummy on the master hearts, then ruffed a club for my $10^{\text {th }}$ trick.
At least East did not make the mistake of ruffing a heart in front of dummy, otherwise he would have been endplayed to give me 11 tricks.
At the other table North went off in the same contract when the hearts were not set up, so we gained 10 Imps .

| M 5 | K4 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 11 | KQ6532 |  |  |
| DIr S | T84 |  |  |
| Vul Nil | T4 |  |  |
| A87653 | - |  |  |
| 87 | J9 |  |  |
| Q2 | AKJ963 |  |  |
| AQ3 | KJ962 |  |  |
|  | QJT92 |  |  |
|  | AT4 |  |  |
|  | 75 |  |  |
|  | 875 |  |  |
| W | N | E | S |
|  |  |  | 1 |
| 1S | 3 H | 4D | 1 |
| 4S | 1 | 5C | / |
| 6D | // |  |  |

On board 11 in the fifth match the opponents got overboard in a big way when they got to the unmakeable slam, but inexplicably, John led the HA and then switched to the SQ!
I played the H 6 on the opening lead, which was encouraging, but I do not know why John switched to the SQ instead of continuing hearts for a quick 1 off.
There was some suggestion that I should have dropped the HK on the table at trick 1 as a definite encouragement, but what would I be expected to play if I had a spade void and wanted a switch?
At the other table Neville and Magnus stopped in the sensible contract of 5C, and also made 12 tricks, but that was only +420 and 11 Imps away.
/ This resulted in a narrow 16-14 win to us instead of the 21-9 win that

| M 6 | 974 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bd 20 | A8 |  |  |
| Dlr W | 82 |  |  |
| Vul All | AK9853 |  |  |
| AJT532 | Q86 |  |  |
| J6 |  |  | QT972 |
| QJ54 |  |  | 96 |
| 7 |  |  |  |
|  | K |  |  |
|  | K543 |  |  |
|  | AKT73 |  |  |
|  | 642 |  |  |
| W | N | E | S |
| 2D | 3C | 1 | 3NT |
| // |  |  |  |

Board 20 in the sixth match was a trap that we fell into, although it was our only loss in match 6 versus many gains for a maximum win.
When I bid 3C over the Multi 2D from West, John had a difficult bid to make and unfortunately chose the wrong one.
If West makes the normal lead of the SJ, or any negative lead that allows John to win the first trick, John will initially think that 3NT looks good, but will then revise his opinion when the clubs do not break, and down he will go.
However, this West had been reading a few books where dummy turns up with the singleton SQ, so he led the SA and took the first 6 tricks. Worse was to come, when John still had to lose a trick at the end to go 3 off for -300 .
At the other table Magnus and Neville arranged for East to be the declarer in 3S, which had 5 losers for -100 and 9 Imps out.

On board 21 in the sixth match lady luck was on my side when John transferred to show 5 hearts and 4 spades and I chose to play in the 5-3 fit instead of the 4-4.
We had already gotten lucky when John had chosen the transfer route instead of Stayman, as then the 4-4 spade fit would have come to light and the fie would have been cast.
Normal theory is that the 4-4 fit is better, as discards are available on the 5-card suit, but I had good minor suit cards, so discards were not likely to be a problem. At the other table NS found their spade fit, but 4 S was scuttled by the heart ruff, easy to find since after the lead of the C5 and the singleton shows up in dummy, the switch to hearts is automatic.
In 4 H I had no problems, and quickly gave up 2 top hearts and the $C A$ for +620 and 12 Imps.


Board 28 in the sixth match was a routine slam, with a successful finesse available for the grand slam, but you would only be in 7S by accident, so it seemed like a flat board.
If John could put me in game just on the basis that I had opened the bidding I was sure that my rich controls and good suits would give me a play for slam, and if we were missing the HA, the other suits would just have to provide the necessary tricks, so I just bid it.
I won the HA on the table and led the top 2 trumps from hand, just in case East had Jxxx, but when everything was friendly, I drew trumps and took the club finesse, making 13 tricks for +1460 when that suit behaved as well.
My estimate of a flat board was wrong, as NS at the other table made some try for slam, but stopped in 6S, also making 13 tricks, but 13 Imps to us.


| M 7 | KQ9742 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bd 9 | QT5 |  |  |
| DIr N | KJ7 |  |  |
| Vul EW | 9 |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |
| J832 |  | 863 |  |
| T5 |  | AK6 |  |
| AKQ865 |  | AQ9 |  |
|  |  | AJT |  |
|  | J432 |  |  |
|  | 974 |  |  |
|  | 86432 |  |  |
|  | T7 |  |  |
| W | N | E | S |
|  | $1 S$ | X | / |
| 2S | X | 4 H | I/ |

On board 4 in the seventh match against the eventual winners, we were unlucky when the opponents got to a fluky game, and the cards were just in the right positions to allow it to make.
West did not invite East, she just jumped to game, and it is very likely that with nothing to spare, East would have declined an invitation.
The double by John was incidental, as we were going to lose 12 Imps anyway, as Magnus and Neville had been 1 down in 3NT at the other table.
I led the S5, and when declarer led the top diamonds, it was probably obvious to him that he was likely to lose 2 clubs and a diamond, for 1 off.
However, he made the crucial play of leading the first club away from dummy, and when John played the CJ and the CQ won, he had to guess the club position.
Since John had doubled it was unlikely that I had the CA and ducked, so he only had 1 way to play for 11 tricks and took the finesse on the way back for -750.

On board 9 in the seventh match EW had difficulty finding the right contract.
When West forced with $2 S$ it presumably showed exactly 4 hearts, and East decided to try the Moysian fit, although there appeared to be no guarantee that West was short in spades, since John had not shown any support.
According to Deep Finesse, hearts can make 11 tricks for EW, but luckily our declarer did not find the right line after being forced to ruff a spade at trick 2, and finished 1 off for +100 to us.
At the other table Neville and Magnus did find their club fit, and made 11 tricks in 5C for +600 and 12 Imps.

