

Report by the President of the SABF to the AGM

John Zollo, 4 November 2016

Have 12 months really passed since I stepped into the role of President of the SABF? Apparently time goes quicker the older you get. This reminds me that the age profile of the bridge community is weighted towards the older end of the age spectrum. This means we have to keep recruiting new players to stay ahead, or at least not go backwards. How have we performed over the past 12 months? Our growth in 2016 was, to some extent, disappointing; our affiliated clubs have about 30 more members in total now than they did 12 months ago. The shining lights this year were Bridge in the City and some of our regional clubs – Gawler, Bridge in the Barossa and St Vincents.

Bridge is a game (sport?) where new entrants are, by and large, (mature) adults who have never tried the game before. They must be taught from scratch, and then encouraged and cajoled along a difficult and usually lengthy path until they are at least moderately proficient. By then, if they think they're getting the hang of the game, and they haven't been put off by discouraging or unfriendly or, worse, rude players, they may actually start to really enjoy the game and, hopefully, become "hooked" and become long-term devotees. However, one bad experience by new players with

an unpleasant opponent can be enough to turn them off the game.

The SABF is playing its part in the recruitment process by subsidising affiliated clubs in their marketing and teaching programs. A number of clubs have taken advantage of this subsidy and have run successful teaching programs which have helped them grow, or at least helped stave off declines which go hand in hand with older club memberships. I urge all clubs to work on their recruiting, but just as important (if not more so), they must strive to promote the social side of the game and create a really friendly playing environment so that new and inexperienced players don't get turned off and give up on bridge.

The SABF is also responsible for state-level bridge, and runs a number of events through the year, mainly on Thursday nights. We have started running restricted events for inexperienced players in parallel with the open events, with some success. I would urge all clubs to encourage their less experienced players to have a go and enter some of the restricted events. They will be playing against their peers and when they gain confidence they may graduate to the open events, which are mostly Swiss events. This means that players by and large play against other players of similar standard, while also having the opportunity to occasionally play against top-level players. As with club memberships, we need new players to feed into SABF run events.

On the national stage, the ANOT was again a great success. Numbers were slightly down on 2015, mainly because the dates clashed with a major congress on the east coast, and as this will not occur in 2017, we are hopeful that participation will increase again.

Contents

AGM President's Report	1
Canberra Bridge Club	2
From Minor Peccadillos to Blatant Cheating	3
Gawler Teams Congress	7
Results	8
Masterpoint Session Awards	8
SABF Events	9
SABF Matters	10
2017 Under Life Butler Pairs.....	10
2017 ANC Restricted Butler Trials.....	10

President's Report (Continued)

The ANC was staged in Brisbane this year, and one team managed to bring home the bacon – the Seniors. Congratulations to the players involved. One disappointing aspect to the ANC was that SA very nearly did not field a Youth team (because of a lack of eligible players), and was only able to do so after getting dispensation from the ABF to field an over-age player. (The team that went acquitted themselves very well, by the way). The SABF has now put in place a youth development program run by Phil Gue to try and make sure this does not happen again.

It is finally left to me to thank the (always too) few people who make state-level bridge happen in South Australia: Jinny Fuss and David Anderson for the very well-run Autumn Nationals; David Anderson, again, for his skill and dedication in organising the state championship program and

selection events (with the help of the Tournament Committee); Phil Gue for his efforts to develop youth bridge and the promotion of bridge at the grassroots level; and Gary Deaton and SABA for their contribution to running state-level bridge events. My apologies to those I have left off 'the thank you list'.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the hard work of the Management Committee members. In particular, the most onerous roles in any committee fall on the Secretary and Treasurer and that is certainly the case in the SABF. I extend a big thank you to Paul Walker our Treasurer for more years than I can remember. A special thank you to Margaret Walters, who is stepping down as Secretary after four years of hard labour (but is staying on to represent the Adelaide Bridge Centre).



Canberra Bridge Club

Canberra Bridge Club – Director in Chief

The Canberra Bridge Club (CBC) is seeking a Director in Chief.

The Club has around 650 members, holds 11 sessions of bridge weekly, and has an extensive competition program. Our Learning and Development courses for new and improving players are flourishing. We hold many successful social events during the year. Currently our administration is handled by two part-time job share managers.

We are looking for a Director in Chief who:

- has extensive experience in planning and conducting multi-session events
- is proficient in using and maintaining dealing and scoring systems and software
- will manage CBC participation in the ABF Masterpoint Scheme
- is proficient with Microsoft products
- has demonstrated people and management skills
- can design and run basic, intermediate and advanced lessons as required
- can provide guidance, advice, development and support to the Club director pool to the level of Congress Director accreditation.

The successful applicant will need to provide a proposal for the overall operation of the club and detail the scope of their desired role.

Initial employment will be on a 2-year contract with the option of a third year by mutual agreement.

Applications close on 31st January 2017 and should be emailed to Justine Beaumont at justinebeaumont@icloud.com.

Enquires to Justine via email or phone 0414 637 075.

FROM MINOR PECCADILLOES TO BLATANT CHEATING

Is it a long way or just a short walk?

Written by John Brockwell. The article was previously published in the ABDA Bulletin, Issue 50, September 2016; and is reproduced here per kind permission of the ABDA Editor.

He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone. John 8.7.

Lance Armstrong won the Tour de France in seven consecutive years up to 2005. It was just too good to be true. To achieve the impossible, he must have had help from performance enhancers. The World Anti-Doping Agency investigated. The investigation took seven years necessitating tens of thousands of hours of work and costing millions of dollars. The proof was overwhelming. Armstrong was a blatant CHEAT. It was cycling's greatest scandal.

From 1957 to 1975, the Italian Blue Team won 16 world bridge championships (13 Bermuda Bowls, 3 Olympiads). It was too good to be true. It was whispered, sometimes very loudly, that the Blue Team's secret of success was that some of its members were using illegal means of communication to convey information to their partners. They were not alone. Over eight decades, suspicions of illegal behaviour at the highest levels of bridge competition have surfaced from time to time. The Austrians Schneider and Jelinek were suspect in the 1930s. In 1965, British pair Boris Schapiro and Terence Reese was accused of varying the manner in which they held their cards during the auction. At the Bermuda Bowl in 1975, the Italians Zucchelli and Facchini were observed tapping each other's feet beneath the table, presumably as a means of information exchange. In 1977, the Americans Richard Katz and Larry Cohen (not the Larry Cohen of To Bid or Not to Bid and Following the LAW fame — a much older one) withdrew in the middle of the United States team trials amidst rumours that they were under investigation for illegally exchanging information. As recently as 2013, the German doctors Elinescu and Wladov behaved unconscionably while winning the d'Orsi Cup (the world seniors championship) in Bali. Sometimes, the authorities took action against these players, sometimes not. There were two inter-related

problems. It was difficult if not impossible to know how and what information was transmitted, then to know in what way the information was acted upon.

Everything changed in mid-2015. Norwegian international Boye Brogland was knocked out in a late stage of a US national teams championship. While going over the BBO record of the hands, he found that some of the results obtained at another table by his opponents, Israeli pair Lotan Fischer and Ron Schwartz, were just too good to be true. For instance, after an uncontested, uncommunicative auction to 3NT, how on earth does one manage to make the opening lead of king from king doubleton and find partner with AQJxx — the only lead to beat the contract. There was a heap of other suspicious stuff besides. Brogland decided that it would be fruitless to do what he should have done according to long-standing convention — that is, voice his suspicions to the chief tournament director. Instead, he went public on social media. In so doing he put his reputation, indeed his whole life as a bridge professional, at risk. He knew that the authorities would not take kindly to his break from convention, that he would be accused of sour grapes, and that there were plenty of people ready and willing to shoot the messenger. Most importantly, he was well aware that he did not know just how Fischer and Swartz were transmitting their illegal communications. Brogland's immediate concern was to do something about players whose actions were besmirching the game of bridge. There were two things going for him. There were video records of all important matches and those records were widely available. And there were leading players world-wide, led by top American analyst Kit Woolsey, who were willing to spend considerable amounts of their time studying the videos. Within a few weeks the Fischer/Schwartz code was broken. It was proven beyond doubt

FROM MINOR PECCADILLOES TO BLATANT CHEATING (Continued)

that the Israelis conveyed information to one another by the positions in which they placed the bidding tray and the board on the table. Israel withdrew its team from the up-coming Bermuda Bowl in Chennai. Other pairs fell under suspicion. Almost immediately, it was found that Italians Fulvio Fantoni and Claudio Nunes, who were the top pair in the world and who had transferred their international allegiance to Monaco, transmitted information by the angles — vertical, horizontal or in-between — at which they placed their cards on the table during the play of the hand. Monaco also withdrew from the Bermuda Bowl. The Germans Piekarek and Smirnov didn't wait for exposure. They admitted improper communication and Germany too withdrew from Chennai. The Polish pairing of Balicki and Zmudzinski had their credentials withdrawn by the World Bridge Federation for unspecified reasons but, curiously perhaps, Poland was permitted to play in (and win) the Bermuda Bowl. The blatant cheating by these top players amounted to bridge's greatest scandal.

"All very interesting and most alarming" you might say "but what's it got to do with bridge in Australia, in my club or at my table". The answer is simple — "it's got everything to do with you". Sure, Fischer, Schwartz et al. are in a league of their own. They contravened Law 73B which states "The gravest possible offence is for a partnership to exchange information through prearranged methods of communication". That is heinous behaviour. However, if it is possible to do so, let us look at it dispassionately. What Fischer and company did with their cheating methods was to take unfair advantage of their opponents. There are scores of other ways, nowhere nearly as heinous of course, of doing exactly the same thing. It happens in every session in your club and mine, and often at our own table. There are literally dozens and dozens of these situations. Here are just a few examples of unfair treatment of one's opponents: (i) Are you sometimes slow to alert your partner's conventional bid or perhaps forget to do so altogether? If so, you are in contravention of clauses of Law 40. (ii) Do you always play at an even tempo? No, of course you

don't. However good your intentions, it's quite impossible always to play at an even tempo because sometimes you have to stop and think. But when the break in tempo conveys unauthorised information to your partner, you have breached Law 16. (iii) You become declarer after an auction in which your partner has given a mistaken explanation of one of your calls. Before a defender makes the opening lead, you are obliged to draw the opponents' attention to partner's mistake — Law 21. (You can even go further. You can ask the opponents whether they think that they are disadvantaged by the mis-explanation. If they feel that they are, then call the director and explain the circumstances. The director will probably ask that the hand be played out before giving a ruling.) (iv) As declarer, when calling for a card from dummy, it is correct always to name the denomination and suit as required by Law 45. Even the law-makers recognise that this Law is often not observed. Notwithstanding, simply calling for a card by saying "low" or "top" or "ruff it" is a breach that might very occasionally confuse an opponent and cause him to err. (v) When bidding boxes are in use, do you replace the bidding cards in the box immediately the auction is complete? ABF regulations relating to the use of bidding boxes require that you leave your bidding cards on the table until the opening lead has been made. (vi) We all know the player in our club who, when the Jack is led towards AK10 on the table, will hesitate briefly before playing a card even though he does not hold the Queen. Or the player who tanks briefly before playing his singleton. Not only are these stupid habits to get into, they also contravene Law 73. Not for one moment am I suggesting that any of these things amounts to cheating. Of course I'm not! Almost invariably, they are unintentional, merely peccadilloes, bad habits or accidents. But they are bad for the game.

Is all of this very petty? Perhaps it is. But the law makers don't seem to think so. Anything that one does, however petty it might seem, that damages an opponent or places him at a disadvantage is not fair. As with any game, bridge is meant to be played on a level playing field. So, what can be

FROM MINOR PECCADILLOES TO BLATANT CHEATING (Continued)

done? Much of it is in our own hands. No player, not me, not you, not anyone, is immune from minor peccadilloes but let us try, insofar as it is possible, to eliminate them. Let us always alert our partners' conventional calls, let us try to bid and play at an even tempo, let us not fiddle with the bidding box before choosing a call, and so on. Even a saint couldn't possibly achieve perfection in all of these things. All that we ordinary human beings can do is the best that we can.

The director has a huge role in ensuring fair play. The good director is the pro-active one. He is the director who spends a good deal of his time walking the floor between the aisles of tables with his eyes wide open. He is aware of the table where things are getting a little heated and can interpose a calming word to cool things down. The good director will notice those players who habitually remove their bidding cards before the opening lead has been made and will remind them not to do so. The good director is also reactive. He should be intolerant of repeated violations of the Laws, even minor ones. It is not good enough to say to the player who habitually forgets to alert his partner's conventional bids "don't do it again". There comes a point when it is time to award a disciplinary penalty, perhaps a match point or half an IMP. Minor disciplinary penalties only very rarely affect the outcome of a match but they can have a salutary effect on the offender. And, if they don't, the penalty can be increased next time. The good director has to walk a fine line between having a good relationship with all of his players and maintaining discipline. Theodore Roosevelt's advice "speak softly and carry a big stick" might have been intended for a bridge director.

The player/director relationship also goes some way to ensuring fair play. The Laws require that the director be summoned to deal with any infraction however insignificant it might seem. (For a player to give a table ruling in the absence of the director is in itself an infraction.) No player need be embarrassed when an opponent calls a director. If you perceive that an inexperienced opponent might be intimidated by the

summoning of the director, the situation can sometimes be eased a little by using words like "I think something has happened; do you mind if we call the director?". By the same token, no player should seek to embarrass another by the manner of his summoning a director. Courtesy never does any harm. Even when one feels damaged by the action of an opponent perhaps, as a result of a hesitation, it is in everyone's interest to remain calm when addressing the director. It is better to speak in the third person. For instance, it is better to say "there was a break in tempo" than "South hesitated before passing". (Whatever else you do, never ever say "South cheated". That is a grossly insulting thing to say, it is rarely if ever true and, in the worst-case scenario, it could lead to litigation. The good director will deal sternly with any player who calls another a cheat.) It is a curiosity that no-one seems to mind a director call for a lead out of turn but that a call following a break in tempo often generates bad feeling. It shouldn't be that way. However disciplined, no-one in the world can always maintain perfect tempo. Whenever a player feels that he might have been damaged by a break in tempo, it is a matter for a director. Provided that the hesitation is agreed, the director need not be summoned until the end of the hand. Quite often by then it will be obvious that no damage has occurred; otherwise, the director will come, ascertain the facts and give a ruling. It is a courtesy to one's opponents, if you or your partner has made a call out of tempo, to agree the hesitation without prompting and to invite them to seek the director's advice if they feel unhappy about the outcome. Mind you, the Laws do not require you to be a goody two-shoes. For instance, if the opponents do not notice it, neither you nor your partner is required to draw attention to your own revoke. (But of course you must not attempt to conceal that revoke, say by revoking again).

The recorder also has a function in ensuring fair play. Every club should have at least one. Sometimes you may feel uncomfortable about

FROM MINOR PECCADILLOES TO BLATANT CHEATING (Continued)

something that has happened at the table. If that something is not really a matter for the director, you should tell your recorder about it. The recorder's duties cover a wide spectrum. For the most part, he (or she — women make particularly good recorders) is there to provide a sympathetic ear for a player who wants to get something off his chest — argumentative or rude opponents, chronically slow play, post mortems before the end of the round, psyches, etc. Occasionally, the opponents will have an auction that you feel is illogical — tell your recorder about it. Sometimes it can be rather more serious — bullying is a nasty business and is something about which recorders take a particularly dim view. In all of these circumstances the recorder will listen to your complaint, speak to the offender and usually submit a brief report to the appropriate authority. Very, very rarely opponents will do something unusual that leads to a result that is too good to be true. It does no harm to be suspicious. Should you find yourself in such a situation, it's best not to say anything at the table. Take a note of the auction and the play, then report the matter to your recorder at the earliest opportunity. There may be a perfectly logical explanation but, if there is not, the recorder will know what steps to take. Recorders' roles in curbing bad behaviour and in ensuring fair play cannot be overestimated. If players were to make more use of the recorder system than they presently do, the bridge club would probably be a more pleasant place to play and the game itself would probably be fairer to all the players.

It is a fair question to ask just why such famously successful players as Nunes and Fantoni should resort to cheating. Psychoanalysts may have some idea but we mere mortals can only speculate. But there's one thing for sure. We can be certain that they were not cleanskins one day and cheaters the next. We know that, like all of us, they must have always committed minor infractions — peccadilloes if you like. Then, one day perhaps, they recognised that a minor tempo break in a particular situation paid a dividend, they then succumbed to temptation and things escalated from there. It is fruitless as well as a little distasteful to speculate further. But there's one other thing that we know for sure; once upon a time Nunes and Fantoni were bridge players just like you and I — warts and all.

Someone once said that bridge is a beautiful game. That is absolutely correct. We all have a role in keeping it that way. A good way to start for all of us — you, me, everybody — would be to try our utmost to eliminate, insofar as we can, the peccadilloes from our game. Alert conscientiously, bid and play at even tempo, do not remove the bidding cards until the opening lead has been made and so on. If we can manage to do these things most of the time as well as all the other "petty" things that the Laws require, if we are pleasant to our opponents and our partner, if we respect the director (even when he rules wrongly — the Laws provide recourse against incorrect rulings), and if we make use of our recorder, we will have gone a long way towards making bridge an even more beautiful game than it is today.



Gawler Teams Congress

By Cathy Chua

Twenty-four teams in high spirits turned up to do battle in the 2016 Gawler Teams. Although the scoreboard says our team won easily, it didn't feel that easy to me! I've been living in Switzerland for the last 6 years or so and played very little bridge in that period. Well done to my teammates in getting me through the day.

The following is an interesting hand from just after lunch.

North

♠ KT4

♥ A94

♦ T3

♣ JT872

South

♠ AJ86

♥ KQJT5

♦ AK54

♣ -----

Contract: 6H

Opening lead: ♣4

On the ♣J from dummy, East played the queen, ruffed in hand. As East did not open the bidding second in hand, my teammate George Evans figured that the ♠Q must be with West, so at trick two he played a spade to the ten and it lost to the queen. Ouch! East returned a diamond. George now played diamond and diamond ruff, crossed to a big heart, ruffed another diamond high and now as long as trumps broke he had twelve tricks. But they didn't, and so he was one down.

Interesting to note that if East, who had already done well on the hand by not opening, had continued instead with a club tapping declarer at trick three, declarer would have been forced to make. Communication issues are such that he would need spades to break. Once that's the case, it's easy to make. You ruff the second club, three rounds of diamonds ruffing, cash two spades and now it's a high cross ruff, one of the ruffs being of the winning last spade. This needs spades to break, but caters for any heart break once they both follow to the third diamond which you need to ruff low.

The whole hand:

Board : 1

	♠ KT4	
	♥ A94	
	♦ T3	
	♣ JT872	
♠ 532		♠ Q97
♥ 7632		♥ 8
♦ QJ8		♦ 9762
♣ 543		♣ AKQ96
	♠ AJ86	
	♥ KQJT5	
	♦ AK54	
	♣ -	

It's worth making the point that East had no reason to play the ♣Q on the first trick. That makes this a case of 'beware bridge players bearing gifts', a Bols Tip by Jim Jacoby. At the same time, East in exiting a diamond rather than a club executed another Bols Bridge tip, this one by Australian star Tim Seres 'Give Declarer Enough Rope'. Moral here: read your Bols Tips.

It was a fun day with a magnificent lunch spread - thanks Gawler Bridge Club; we look forward to coming back!

RESULTS

SABF COMPETITIONS

State Pairs Qualifying

1. Therese Demarco & Judy Hocking
2. David Middleton & Zolly Nagy
3. Jarrad Dunbar & Justin Williams

Under Life Pairs Championship

1. Terry Driver & David Schofield
2. Jim & Wendy Smith
3. Bevin Brooks & Ingrid Cooke

CONGRESS RESULTS

Gawler Teams Congress

1. Travis – Lauren Travis, George Evans, Cathy Chua, Justin Williams
2. De Luca – Attilio De Luca, Peter Colmer, Sue Emerson, Rosemary Grund
3. Allanson – Evan Allanson, Neil Welch, Dianne Marler, Jill Allanson

Masterpoint Session Awards for Major Duplicate Matchpoint Events

The late Dr. David Askew, the originator of the modern masterpoint scheme, had a strong preference for the teams format, and it shows in the session award rates: for a similar number of tables the duplicate session awards are less than 70% of that for teams!

This bias was in part redressed for club green point sessions when the duplicate award rates were increased by 50% some twenty years ago, however the imbalance has continued for all higher rated competitions.

Further, in a duplicate session the winners get the lion's share, while those lower down get just a fraction. This is best illustrated by referring to the Gold Coast Congress, where a pair winning one 14 board match out of two in a session will get 1.12 gold points each, whereas a score of 50% in a session of the Open Pairs Qualifying will gain them very little at all.

With this in mind, the following alternative method of masterpointing Congresses, State and National matchpoint duplicate events has been introduced, effective from 1 October 2014:

For a session score in excess of 45%, a player will receive

$$[2 * (\text{score less } 45.00, \text{ rounded down}) * W] / 100$$

(W is the Masterpoint Weighting for the Competition.)

This is much more in line with the teams masterpointing approach, since pairs will get masterpoints based on their score, rather than their placing. Further, if they get 46% or more, they will be guaranteed of some reward for their efforts.

Some Examples:

Gold Coast Congress, W = 10, a 46% score earns 0.20, 50% score 1.00, 60% 3.00

State Pairs Championship, W = 5, 46% is worth 0.10, 50% earns 0.50, 60% 1.50

Congress (B4) Pairs Championship, W = 2.5, 46% will get you 0.05, 50% 0.25, 60% 0.75

Final placing awards will remain the same, and shall continue to go to the top half of the field, rounded down.

Please note that the new system is optional, with competition convenors having the option of continuing to follow the old methods.

Finally, should you have any queries about the above, please contact your State Masterpoint Secretary, or else you can write to me at revoke1@live.com

David Anderson,
ABF Masterpoint Unit

SABF EVENTS

2017 SABF Club Congresses

Thursday 26 January	ABC	Australia Day Congress
Sunday 12 February	SABA	Swiss Pairs Congress
Saturday 11 March	Gawler	Inter-Club Challenge - Pairs
Monday 13 March	ABC	Adelaide Cup Congress
Friday 14 April	Edwardstown	Golden Bunny Teams
Tuesday 25 April	ABC	ANZAC Day Congress
Sunday 4 June	SABA	Rotary Pairs
Saturday 1 July	Tanunda	Barossa Bridge Congress Pairs
Sunday 2 July	Tanunda	Barossa Bridge Congress Teams
Saturday 2 September	Glenelg	Glenelg Congress
Sunday 8 October	Edwardstown	Bridge in the City Congress
Saturday 28 October	Loxton	Riverland Congress – Pairs
Sunday 29 October	Loxton	Riverland Congress – Teams
Saturday 4 November	Gawler	Gawler Teams Congress
Sunday 31 December	Adelaide Bridge Centre	New Year's Eve Congress

SABF Events January – April 2017

The full **Calendar of Events for 2017** is available online at:-

http://www.sabridgefederation.com.au/docs/Calendar_of_Events/SABF_Calendar_2017.pdf

Daytime State Teams Venue: SABA Wednesdays 10.30am	1 February; 8 February; 15 February; 1 March
Daytime State Teams – Final and Consolation Venue: SABA Wednesdays 10.30am	8 March; 15 March; 22 March; 29 March (Final)
Open Trials Final and Plate Venue: SABA Thursdays 7.30pm	2 February; 9 February; 16 February; 2 March; 9 March; 16 March
Under Life Butler Pairs Venue: SABA Thursday 7.30pm	2 February; 9 February; 16 February
SABA GNOT Qualifying Venue: SABA Thursdays 7.30pm	23 March; 30 March; 6 April; 20 April; 27 April
Women's State Team Trials Venue: SABA Fri, Sat, Sun	7.30pm Friday 24 March; 9.30am Saturday 25 March; 10.00am Sunday 26 March
Seniors State Team Trials Venue: SABA Fri, Sat, Sun	7.30pm Friday 7 April; 9.30am Saturday 8 April; 9.30am Sunday 9 April
Youth State Team Trials Venue: SABA Saturday 9.30am	Saturday 8 April
ANC Restricted Butler Trials Venue: SABA Sunday 9.30am	Sunday 9 April
Autumn National Teams Venue: Wayville Showgrounds	Thursday 4 May – Monday 8 May

SABF MATTERS

2017 Management Committee

President	John Zollo	gzollo@bigpond.net.au
Secretary	Angela Norris	southaustbridgefed@gmail.com
Treasurer	Paul Walker	pvwalker@gmail.com
Education & Training	David Parrott	yadi.david@bigpond.com
Chairperson of the Tournament Subcommittee	David Anderson	revoke1@live.com
Youth Coordinator	Phil Gue	adelaidebridge@bigpond.com
Committee	David Anderson	revoke1@live.com
Committee	Bob Clarke	rclark01@ozemail.com.au
Committee	Jeanette Lunnie	jeanette.lunnie@bigpond.com
Committee	Jill Allanson	ejallanson@bigpond.com.au
Committee	David Parrott	yadi.david@bigpond.com
Committee	Sue Phillips	suejohnp@tpg.com.au
Committee	Margaret Walters	margaret.walters@bigpond.com
Committee	Jinny Fuss	jinny@panorama.sa.co

Tournament Committee

- David Anderson
- David Parrott
- Phil Gue
- Carole Foreman
- Bob Clarke
- John Smith
- Arthur Porter

Contact members of this committee about issues relating to the timing, format, and organizing of SABF events.

This newsletter is published quarterly. Send contributions by email to the Editor. **Copy deadline** for the next issue is **1 Mar 2017**

2017 Under Life Butler Pairs

Venue: SABA

Starting: 7.30pm; Played over 3 weeks

Thursday 2 February, Thursday 9 February, Thursday 16 February

Entries close Monday 30 January. To enter: Complete the nomination form on the SABA noticeboard; enter online at the SABF website; or email David Anderson at revoke1@live.com

Entry is restricted to an even number of pairs and players under Life Master ranking as at 30th September 2016.

2017 ANC Restricted Butler Trials

Venue: SABA

9:30am – 5.00pm Sunday 9 April

Eligible players will have less than 300 MP on 31 December 2016

The first two placegetters will be given free entry into the ANC Butler Pairs which will be held in Canberra in late July 2017. The ABF will also award a substantial subsidy to cover travel and accommodation costs.

Free Entry Vouchers

For two Novice Pairs for the Summer Festival of Bridge

Contact Margaret Walters by phone (Mb. 0439 446 555) or email to receive a voucher that will give you and your partner free entry into a Novice event (fewer than 100 masterpoints) at the Summer Festival of Bridge.

*The Summer Festival of Bridge is held in Canberra 10-22 January 2017.
To be eligible for the free entry you must register before 31 December 2016.*