

# **CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA GOVERNORS' LETTER THREE 2004-2005**



**Responses may be mailed, faxed or E-mailed to the Chess Federation of Canada, E-1 2212  
Gladwin Crescent, Ottawa, ON, K1B 5N1, fax: 613-733-5209, E-Mail: [info@chess.ca](mailto:info@chess.ca)**

**ATTENTION ALL GOVERNORS: Anyone with an E-Mail address can have their  
Governors' Letter sent to them via E-Mail and save the CFC paper and postage costs.  
Please E-Mail [info@chess.ca](mailto:info@chess.ca) if interested.**

**Deadline for submissions to GL #4: December 15<sup>th</sup>, 2004**

## **KEEPING GOVERNORS INFORMED**

### **From the President:**

I would like to congratulate our participants in the Chess Olympiad on their performance. Canada's National Team had to compete without two of our GMs. I think the National Team performed very well in difficult circumstances.

I know Governors will join me in thanking IM Brian Harman and our FIDE Representative Nathan Divinsky for their work as team captains.

The Treasurer will report on CFC finances in more detail in the next GL. However, the CFC Executive and the Governors have to concern themselves now with paying for the Chess Olympiad. The cost to the CFC is about \$20,000 and fundraising stands at \$6,500. The shortfall of \$13,500 cannot be paid by the CFC from other sources. The CFC is basically at about break even each year. I urge Governors to donate to the Chess Olympiad fund and to remind chess players and our supporters in their area to do the same. If we fail to fundraise for the Olympiad, the CFC's ability to participate in the event is an open question.

The 2005 CYCC in Victoria will be held March 24-27. It is important for our Provincial Affiliates to hold feeder events into the national championship, the CYCC. Provincial Associations should actively fund the participation of youths from their area in the national championship. Donations to Provincial Chess Associations and their qualifiers are tax deductible if they are passed through the CFC. This takes part of the bite out of the cost of participating in the CYCC and the WYCC. For help in this area please contact our Executive Director, Peter Arseneau or our Youth Coordinator Patrick McDonald.

At the FIDE congress in Spain GM Mark Bluvshstein had his title confirmed and our Youth Coordinator Patrick McDonald became an International Arbiter. I know Governors will

join me in my congratulations to both of them.

I would like to take this opportunity to wish all Governors Happy Holidays and a Happy New Year!

Halldor P. Palsson

### **From the Treasurer:**

I congratulate the Canadian teams for their performance in Olympiad especially for the men considering they played one team member short. I commend Brain Hartman in his role as team captain and I would hope he would volunteer for the position again.

Regarding the WYCC, I also commend Patrick McDonald, the Youth Coordinator for his tireless efforts in making arrangements.

As for the financial state of the CFC, I plan to make a detailed report of the first six months of the CFC. It should include individual reports on the CYCC/WYCC and the Olympiad. It will require working closely together with the Executive Director. I aim to have this report for the next GL time permitting, but if not the report will be issued as its own report and be distributed to governors by 12 January 2005. I apologize in advance for not having a more timely update but right now I am completing a part time university course which will be completed in early December and this course has severely impacted upon my free time.

Right now I can make a small summary report without hard numbers. Both the CYCC/WYCC and the Olympiad were money losers for the CFC. Obviously, the CFC did not and still does not have the fund raising capability regarding the funding of the Olympiad. As for the CYCC/WYCC, this is supposed to be a self-sustaining activity for the CFC but this year's CYCC had poor attendance. The Youth Coordinator has reported to me that he believes that this result is an anomaly as a result of the remoteness of the event and the repeat performance in the same location. CFC sales is

off and is following the same pattern for the last few years. It is my belief that since the CFC is primarily a mail order business, the CFC is primarily impacted from the competition in the marketplace from other internet retailers, in particular Amazon.

All I can say is that the CFC needs to establish a business plan which I would definitely need help from other governors. I can see from reading the Handbook that there is a CFC Management Committee. I would invite some governors to join this committee so that work can be started on the budgeting, cost accounting, and business decision making. I do not have the expertise nor the time to do all of this work but the work is required to be done to be able to make proper recommendations for the deliberation of the governors.

### **From the Secretary:**

Congratulations to Patrick McDonald on his award of the International Arbiter title by FIDE.

Wilf Ferner asked that his vote for 2005-10 be recorded as yes and I am satisfied his vote was properly cast before the voting deadline and that the fault was that of the e-mail server and not Wilf so the vote on 2005-10 is officially amended to 20 Yes, 2 No and 1 abstention. As a matter of policy I do not finalize the vote count for a full day or so after the deadline as I'm aware that e-mail servers sometimes behave in this way.

Please note the bid for the 2005 Canadian Junior in the Appendix at the end of the Governors' Letter

CFC Governors: (Nova Scotia) Eric Newman has been replaced by Mr. Ken Kashin as CFC Governor. He can be reached at:

"Ken Kashin" <[skcashin@ns.sympatico.ca](mailto:skcashin@ns.sympatico.ca)>

### **Results of Votes:**

**Motion 2005-04:** "Protection of Canada Open/CYCC" – (Rutherford/Cohen as amended by Thorvardson/Rohanchuk at the AGM):

Similar events that are two days before the CYCC and after the Canada Open will not be rated by the CFC or advertised in CFC media.

**Yes: (2) Feng, Ferner**  
**No: (6) Cohen, Craver, Denomee, Harper, Pacey, Stockhausen**  
**Abstain: (2) Dixon, Van Dusen**

### ***Motion Defeated***

**Motion 2005-05:** "Post-Secondary Chess" - Dixon/Barron - Post-secondary chess is a new area of affiliation with the CFC. The main goal is to establish the Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association (CPSCA).

**Yes: (9) Cohen, Craver, Denomee, Dixon, Feng, Ferner, Pacey, Stockhausen, Van Dusen**  
**No: (0)**  
**Abstain: (0)**

### ***Motion Passed***

## **Discussion of Motions:**

### **MOTIONS FOR FINAL VOTE:**

**MOTION 2005-08 (Thorvardson / Dutton)**  
**Governors' Letters: Procedures for Introducing Motions**

**Michael Barron:** I strongly oppose this motion, which is undemocratic and attempts to further emasculate the powers of the CFC Governors. As a matter of principle, the powers of the Governors ought to be increased – the rule by Presidential decree in the past few years is the single greatest problem faced by the CFC.

Motion 2005-08 obviously was moved to the contrary to the Motion published in the 03-04GL6 and skipped in the 04-05GL1 without any discussion or voting at AGM:

**Lyle Craver:** I strongly oppose this motion which I consider the most undemocratic proposal to come before the Governors in the past decade. Even if the proposal had merit, it

should have been ruled out of order by the President due to lack of a seconder – the Governors’ Letter is not an appropriate venue for a motion without a seconder to seek one.

**Jason Feng:** I strongly oppose this motion, as it decreases the powers of the Governors. The opposite of this motion should occur.

**Bruce Harper:** Nothing that has been said on behalf of this motion has rehabilitated it. It is likely to cause many Governors to give up on organized Canadian chess at a national level. Perhaps this is the intent of the motion - I can't see any legitimate point to it.

**Peter Stockhausen:** There is little to add to this discussion, except to reiterate that the motion runs contrary to basic democratic principles. Why was this “motion” not ruled out of order? It does not have a seconder.

#### **MOTION 2005-09 Mallon/Dénommée On-Line Discussion Board**

**Michael Barron:** I support this motion, for exactly the same reasons I oppose Motion 2005-08.

**Jason Feng:** This motion is exactly what I mean in referring to Motion 2005-09.

**Bruce Harper:** Still a good idea in principle, although I personally do not find the one currently being tested to be user friendly and therefore do not use it.

**Peter Stockhausen:** This is necessary if we wish to have a vibrant and timely process in place. Is there a way to make the discussion board as “user friendly” as possible, maybe even provide a “help” file? The current set up is totally “user unfriendly”.

#### **MOTIONS FOR SECOND DISCUSSION:**

**Motion 2005-11** (Motion by Jason Feng, seconded by Peter Stockhausen, to send Governors Letter to all CFC Governors at least

once a month)

**Michael Barron:** I support this motion; because more frequent Governors Letters are greatly increase the ability of the Governors to conduct the business of the CFC.

**Jason Feng** I have been a governor since May and have received two Governor’s Letters. Considering all that has gone on with the CFC and chess in general, two GL’s in five months is insufficient

**Bruce Harper:** This is a step in the right direction, but it is no accident that the most effective exercise of power by the CFC Governors in recent memory occurred as a result of e-mail discussion. GLs are not necessary at all – the Secretary should be sending out motions as they arise, with schedules for discussion and voting.

**Motion 2005-12** (Motion by Bruce Harper, seconded by Chris Mallon, to establish a CFC committee to consider and analyze various options for holding the Canadian Championship and the Canadian Women’s Championship)

**Motion:** That a committee be formed to consider and analyze various options for holding the Canadian Championship and the Canadian Women’s Championship and report to the Governors on the results of their deliberations and with their recommendations for a suitable format for these events.

The committee shall consist of Eddie Urquhart (Masters Representative), Jack Yoos, Nava Starr, (all of whom have indicated they are prepared to serve on such a commitment), Pascal Charbonneau (Canadian Champion) and Sid Belzberg. If Pascal Charbonneau and Sid Belzberg are unable or unwilling to serve, the other three committee members shall select suitable replacements.

The committee shall submit a report to the Governors, with their recommendations, by December 31, 2004.

**Michael Barron** I support this motion, because we need a basis for a consistent and stable series

of Canadian Championships for the foreseeable future.

*Jason Feng* Absolutely.

**Bruce Harper:** I made this motion so I favour it. There are many different possibilities, and a panel of experts to sort through them and report could do only good.

**Peter Stockhausen:** I strongly support the idea of a committee such as proposed by Harper/Mallon to make recommendations for the next Canadian Zonal. Therefore, I am not in favour of 2004-13 but suggest to Barron and Dixon to submit their suggestion to the committee.

**Motion 2005-13** (Motion by Michael Barron, seconded by Frank Dixon, to hold Canadian Closed Championship in 2 sections)

[**Special Note:** I received e-mail from Mr. Barron wishing to withdraw 2005-13 so I referred it to the President for a ruling. (LC)]

**Halldor Palsson:** I rule: Unless there is an objection I grant Mr. Barron permission to withdraw 2005-13. The comments by Mr. Dixon go into the GL and he or any other Governor may object to the withdrawal of 2005-13. RONR (10th ed.), p.285.]

"To hold Canadian Closed Championship in 2 sections at the same site:

1) Premier section: 12-player round robin comprising of all Canadian GMs, 3 top finishers from the previous Canadian Closed Championship, reigning Canadian Junior Champion and the highest rated players in the sequence of the current FIDE Rating List until a total of 12 players is reached.

2) Reserves section: 11-round Swiss system tournament comprising of all past Canadian Champions, past members of Canadian Olympic teams, past Canadian Junior Champions, reigning Provincial Champions, reigning Canadian Youth Champions for different age categories, candidates for Canadian Women's

Olympic Team, 2 players chosen by the organizer and the highest rated players in the sequence of the Canadian Rating List until a total number of players is reached provided that every participant has a FIDE or CFC rating of not less than 2000. The total number of players shall be determined by the CFC Board of Directors. 2 top finishers from the Reserves section have right to play in the Premier section next year."

**Michael Barron** I withdraw this motion, because it address the same issue as Motion 2005-12, and now it should be considered as suggestion for the CFC committee established according to Motion 2005-12.

**Bruce Harper:** This is premature. Michael and Frank should withdraw the motion. The suggested format may be the very best format human ingenuity can devise, but I for one am interested in what others, including those who would be playing in it, have to say. Even if it were somehow passed, it would be repealed if a better format was developed. Be patient.

**Frank Dixon:**

Discussion on motion Barron / Dixon (format of Canadian Championship in the future):

The striking of a new Committee to examine future formats for the Canadian Championship is a positive step. Canadian chess has developed more strong players in recent years, through our excellent youth programs, both in the CFC and in Chess 'N Math, as well as attracting some strong immigrant players.

By expanding the structure of the Canadian Championship into a two-part system, a Premier Round Robin of 12 players, together with a fairly large-sized Open Swiss of 11 rounds, available to players rated over 2000, held together at the same site and time, we will be able to build up increased interest in the Championship, both among potential participants, and across the country through the media, as well as providing a high-level competitive opportunity for a greater number of strong players.

The success of the recent Toronto Zonal, which attracted both the largest entry list (69 players) and the largest prize fund ever, shows the possibilities. Also, several of our top women players took part in the Zonal, for the first time! I want to commend and thank the organizers and directors of the Toronto Zonal for a well-run event and a super website; chess fans across the country and around the world were able to follow the top five games live over the internet! Also, Mr. Sid Belzberg deserves great credit and gratitude from all of us, for his tremendous effort and support in generously sponsoring this tournament!

However, determining the overall champion, as well as possible norm / title qualifications, by a fairly short nine-round Swiss system event with a field this large (nearly 70 players), and with the strength of players so divergent (CFC 2600 - 2000), does run the risk of producing some randomized results, as the Toronto event also showed. Eric Lawson, who tied for first place in the Toronto Zonal, played a comparatively weak field for the first six rounds of the tournament (his first six opponents averaged under 2200 rating), then shot up the standings towards the end. IM (elect) Lawson took advantage of the system, to post what was certainly a fine result, but he did play a very much weaker set of opponents than the other top contenders, including the eventual champion, IM Pascal Charbonneau, who defeated Mr. Lawson for the 2004 Canadian title in a short playoff match. Do we really want an IM title in our Zonal to be potentially achieved in this fashion!? I don't think so. Fortunately, Mr. Lawson did earn two more IM norms within the last year, at Hastings and the Montreal International, so he does deserve the IM title. The other IM norm at the Toronto Zonal was scored by IM (elect) Tomas Krnan, who has also scored two more norms within the last 15 months; again, his title is deserved. But it could have been otherwise, under the format used this year.

I believe we need to strengthen the fairness of the process by which we determine our national champion, and that this can best be achieved in a round-robin Premier event which includes our top players, while using a coincident 11-round

(up from nine in 2004) Reserve Swiss event as a training ground for the future, as a competitive opportunity for the next group of our strong players, as a possible funding source for the top group, and as a method of qualifying directly into the next Premier Championship. I don't advocate the possibility of international norms being earned in the Reserve Group.

With respect to the rating qualifications for the top group (Premier), perhaps some sort of combination of FIDE and CFC ratings can be created, to determine the fairest set of qualifiers. After all, some of our top players play many events outside Canada, and these results are often not reflected in their CFC ratings, while other strong Masters may play most of their chess in Canada, according to the time they have available to prepare and compete, with many of the events they play in Canada not being FIDE-rated.

## **MOTIONS FOR FIRST DISCUSSION:**

**Motion 2005-14:** Moved by David Cohen, Seconded Kevin Pacey  
That CFC Handbook 375 Tournament Playing Fee be amended by adding the sentence: "At any national Championship, this fee is not permitted as a substitute for CFC membership."

**Motion 2005-15:** Moved by Michael Barron, Seconded by Frank Dixon/Bela Kosoian that the CFC Handbook should include the following regulation:

“The procedure of motion submission to CFC:  
1. Every CFC Governor can submit a motion in his response to Governors’ Letter.  
2. If one of the CFC Directors preparing current Governors’ Letter has found this motion important for CFC, he can second this motion and call for vote in the current Governors’ Letter.  
3. Otherwise, this motion called for discussion in the current Governors’ Letter.

4. If one of CFC Governors (besides the motion originator) has found this motion important for CFC, he can second this motion and call for vote in the next Governors' Letter."

*Rationale:*

**Michael Barron:** I think, this is a very important issue for the future of the CFC: will it be more democratic or more bureaucratic organization?

**Motion 2005-16:** Moved by Frank Dixon, and seconded by Patrick McDonald:  
Pending the approval of the new organization by CFC Governors, to be voted upon this time, the Coordinator of the Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association (currently myself) will report to the CFC Youth Coordinator.

*Rationale:*

**Frank Dixon:** CFC Youth Coordinator Patrick McDonald and I have discussed this, and agreed to it. Patrick and I have been in frequent discussion.

**Motion 2005-17:** Moved by Pierre Denomme and seconded by Michael Barron:

**Motion:** That the CFC initiates the process of becoming compliant to all Sports Canada Eligibility criteria, except criteria A1 which is the only one that we cannot currently meet. We should also lobby for the modification of the definition of sport in Canada.

That we immediately add the following to the CFC Handbook:

"Chess Federation of Canada Appeals Policy

#### SCOPE OF APPEAL

1. Any member of the Chess Federation of Canada who is affected by a decision of the Board of Directors, of any Committee of the Board of Directors, or of any body or individual who has been delegated authority to make decisions on behalf of the Board of Director, shall have the right to appeal that decision, provided there are sufficient grounds for the appeal as set out in Paragraph 5 of this Policy.

Such decisions may include, but are not limited to, employment, contract matters, harassment, selection and discipline.

2. This policy shall not apply to matters relating to the rules of Chess, which may not be appealed under this policy.

#### TIMING OF APPEAL

3. Members who wish to appeal a decision shall have 21 days from the date on which they received notice of the decision, to submit written notice of their intention to appeal, along with detailed reasons for the appeal, to the Chairperson of Appeal Panel.

4. Any party wishing to initiate an appeal beyond the 21 days period must provide a written request stating reasons for an exemption to this requirement. The decision to allow or not allow an appeal outside of the 21-day period shall be at the sole discretion of the Executive Director.

#### GROUNDINGS FOR APPEAL

5. A decision cannot be appealed on its merits alone. An appeal may be heard only if there are sufficient grounds for the appeal. To have sufficient grounds, the appeal must be based on one or more of the followings potential errors having been made by the respondent:

- a) making a decision for which it did not have authority or jurisdiction as set out in governing documents;
- b) failing to follow procedures as laid out in the By-Laws or approved policies of the CFC;
- c) making a decision which was influenced by bias, where bias is defined as a lack of neutrality to such an extent that the decision maker is unable to consider other views;
- d) exercising its discretion for an improper purpose;
- e) making a decision which was grossly unreasonable.

#### SCREENING OF APPEAL

6. Within 3 days of receiving notice of appeal

the chairperson shall decide whether or not the appeal is based on one or more of the categories of possible error by the respondent as set out in Section 5. The chairperson shall not determine if an error has been made, only if the appeal is based on such an allegation of error by the respondent. In the absence of the chairperson, a member of the Executive shall perform this function.

7. If the appeal is denied on the basis of insufficient grounds, the appellant shall be notified of this decision in writing, stating reasons. This decision is at the sole discretion of the chairperson and may not be appealed.

#### APPEALS PANEL

8. If the chairperson is satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for an appeal, within 10 days of having received the original notice of appeal, he or she shall establish an Appeal Panel, with the "Panel" as follows:

- a) The Panel shall be comprised of three individuals who shall have no significant relationship with the affected parties, shall have had no involvement with the decision being appealed, and shall be free from any other actual or perceived bias or conflict.
- b) At least one of the Panel's members shall be from among the appellant's peers.
- c) The appellant shall be given the opportunity to recommend the peer member on the Panel, provided that member satisfies criteria (a), above.
- d) Should the appellant not recommend the Panel member as set out in c), above, within 5 days, the President shall appoint the peer member of the Panel.

#### PRELIMINARY CONFERENCE

9. The Panel may determine that the circumstances of the dispute warrant a preliminary conference:

- a) The matters which may be considered at a preliminary conference include the date and location of hearing, timelines for exchange of documents, format for the appeal, clarification of issues in dispute, any procedural matter, order and procedure of hearing, remedies being

sought, identification of witnesses, and any other matter which may assist in expediting the appeal proceedings.

b) The Panel may delegate to its Chairperson the authority to deal with these preliminary matters.

#### PROCEDURE FOR THE APPEAL

10. The Panel shall govern the appeal by such procedures as it deems appropriate, provided that:

- a) The appeal hearing shall be held within 21 days of the Panel's appointment;
- b) The appellant, respondent and affected parties shall be given 14 days written notice of the date, time and place of the appeal hearing;
- c) The Panel's members shall select from themselves a Chairperson;
- d) A quorum shall be all three Panel members;
- e) Decisions shall be by majority vote, where the Chairperson carries a vote.;
- f) Copies of any written documents which any of the parties would like the Panel to consider shall be provided to the Panel and to all other parties, at least 5 days in advance of the hearing;
- g) Any of the parties may be accompanied by a representative or advisor, including legal counsel.
- h) If the matter under appeal relates to team selection, any person potentially affected by the decision of the Panel shall become a party to the appeal;
- i) The Panel may direct that any other individual participate in the appeal;
- j) In the event that one of the Panel's members is unable or unwilling to continue with the appeal the matter will be concluded by the remaining two panel members;
- k) Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, there shall be no communication between Panel members and the parties except in the presence of, or by copy to, the other parties.

11. In order to keep costs to a reasonable level, the Panel may conduct the appeal by means of a conference call or video conference.

#### APPEAL DECISION

12. Within 7 days of concluding the appeal, the Panel shall issue its written decision, with



reasons. In making its decision, the Panel shall have no greater authority than that of the original decision maker. The Panel may decide:

- a) To void or confirm the decision being appealed;
- b) To refer the matter back to the initial decision-maker for a new decision; and
- c) To vary the decision where it is found that an error occurred and such an error cannot be corrected by the original decision-maker for reasons which included, but are not limited to, lack of clear procedure, lack of time, or lack of neutrality;
- d) To determine how costs of the appeal shall be allocated, if at all.

13. A copy of this decision shall be provided to each of the parties and to the President.

#### TIMELINES

14. If the circumstances of the dispute are such that this policy will not allow a timely appeal the Panel may direct that these timelines be abridged. If the circumstances of the disputes are such the appeal cannot be concluded within the timelines dictated in this Policy, the Panel may direct that these timelines be extended.

#### DOCUMENTARY APPEAL

15. Any party to the appeal may request that the Panel conduct the appeal by way of documentary evidence. The Panel may seek agreement from the other parties to proceed in this fashion. If agreement is not forthcoming, the Panel shall decide whether the appeal shall proceed by way of documentary evidence, or in-person hearing.

#### ARBITRATION

16. All differences or disputes shall first be submitted to appeal pursuant to the appeal process set out in this Policy. If any party believes the Appeal Panel has made an error such as those described in Paragraph 5 of this Policy, the matter shall be referred to arbitration, such arbitration to be administered under the Alternate Dispute (ADR) Program for Amateur

Sport and its Rules of Arbitration, as amended from time to time.

17. Should a matter be referred to arbitration, all parties to the original appeal shall be parties to the arbitration.

18. The parties to an arbitration shall enter into a formal Arbitration Agreement and the decision of any arbitration shall be final and binding and not subject to any further review by any court of competent jurisdiction or any other body.

#### LOCATION AND JURISDICTION

19. Any appeal shall take place in the National Capital Region, unless held by way of telephone conference call or held elsewhere as may be decided by the Panel as a preliminary matter.

20. This policy shall be governed and construed in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario.

21. No action or legal proceeding shall be commenced against the Chess Federation of Canada in respect of a dispute, unless Chess Federation of Canada has refused or failed to abide by the provisions for appeal and/or arbitration of the dispute, as set out in this policy."

*Rationale:* The CFC should seek for public and government support. For this purpose it is important to recognize chess as sport in Canada.

**Motion 2005-18:** Moved by Michael Barron, seconded by Michael Dougherty:

To encourage chess organizers in Canada to hold FIDE-Rated events and to resolve discrepancy between the current FIDE regulations (<http://www.fide.com/official/handbook.asp?level=b03>):

"03. FIDE Registration of International Competitions

Approved by the 1980 General Assembly.  
Amended by the 1984, 1995 and 1996 General Assemblies and 1999 Executive Board.

FIDE provides an umbrella for vital services such as categorisation of tournaments and title norms. For these services FIDE should be properly funded. On registration FIDE shall supervise the proper scheduling of important events to avoid conflicts in the chess calendar. Registration shall consist of:

a. Certification by the national federation that it approves the event.

b. Arbiter's report submitted not later than two weeks after conclusion of the event, including details of results, tournament category, norms, ratings of players, protests and other significant incidents.

c. The national federations in whose territories international chess competitions are held, are to register these tournaments at the FIDE Secretariat; a list of the registered tournaments will be published regularly; the federations will be invoiced once a year, effective with events beginning on or after January 1st, 1981, on the basis of the following division:

d. The registration fee is calculated on the basis of the following division: (GA '95)

Tournaments of categories 0 to 3 - 50 Swiss Francs (EB '99)

Tournaments of categories 4 and 5 - 100 Swiss Francs

Tournaments of categories 6 and 7 - 150 Swiss Francs

Tournaments of categories 8 to 10 - 200 Swiss Francs

Other categories multiply 40 Swiss Francs by the category.

Swiss Tournaments (Number of players multiplied by Sfr.2 for up to 300 players and then multiply by SFr.1)

Team Tournaments (SFr.30 per team, except for national championship which will pay a maximum of SFr.200)

Matches, according to category above

e. (GA '95) However, in no case shall a federation be charged more than SFr.4,000. per year.

f. For the time being no registration fees will be required for ladies' tournaments although these tournaments as a matter of course should be registered.

g. Small tournaments such as local Swiss tournaments shall be exempt from registration fees. (GA '80)

h. Secretariat will exempt from registration fee an event in which less than five rateable results have been reported. (GA '80)

i. (GA '96) Announcements of open tournaments should also be sent by email in ASCII text to FIDE for publication on the FIDE Web site."

and the current CFC regulations ([http://chess.ca/section\\_7.htm](http://chess.ca/section_7.htm)):

"790. FIDE-Rated Events

Events may be rated by FIDE if they meet the following requirements:

a) In a Round-Robin, at least 3 of the players must be rated.

b) In a Swiss or Team event, only games against rated players are counted. If a player meets less than 3 rated opponents in an event, that event will not count towards his rating.

c) Each player must have a minimum of 120 minutes. No more than two rounds per day are allowed.

d) The event must be pre-registered with the CFC office at least four months before the start of the event. The FIDE Events pre-registration form to be sent to the CFC office is here. The crosstable must be sent to the CFC within one week of the completion of the event along with an updated event registration form, and the FIDE rating fee payment.

e) The following scheduled FIDE rating fee structure is payable to the CFC provided the event is submitted within 1 week to the CFC office. If the event is submitted to the CFC

office after 1 week, then there is a \$110 late fee due to the policies of FIDE. [see Motion 2003-05; 02-03GL4, January 2003]

Round Robin & Matches: Category 0 - 3 \$55, Category 4 & 5 \$110, Category 6 & 7 \$165, Category 8 to 10 \$220. For higher categories, multiply category by \$44.

Swiss Tournaments: Players 1 to 300 = \$2.20 per player; Players 301 & up = \$1.10 per player. **In addition, there is a \$100 flat fee per tournament.** So, if there are several FIDE rated sections in one tournament, you would still pay \$100.

Team Tournaments: Per Team = \$33.

FIDE Regulation B.01/8.11 states that "Games played against opponents who do not belong to FIDE-Federations or who belong to Federations which have been temporarily excluded are not included" in the composition of a Title Tournament. Accordingly, the CFC requires that all Canadian players who compete in a FIDE registered event be members in good standing of the CFC.

Upon completion of a FIDE-registered event, the CFC will put the crosstable in the required form and send it along to FIDE. Note that rated in a) and b) means FIDE-rated. Lists of Canadian FIDE-rated players are regularly published in our En Passant magazine, and available from the ratings page on our website. (FIDE congress 1982)",

the regulation 790 of the CFC Handbook should be repealed and replaced by the following:

"790. FIDE-Rated Events

Events may be rated by FIDE if they meet the following requirements:

a) In a Round-Robin, at least 4 of the players must be rated.

b) In a Swiss or Team event, only games against rated players are counted. If a player meets less

than 3 rated opponents in an event, that event will not count towards his rating.

c) Each player must have a minimum of 120 minutes for a game, assuming the game lasts 60 moves. No more than three rounds per day and a total playing time of no more than 12 hours per day are allowed.

d) The event must be pre-registered with the CFC office. The FIDE Events pre-registration form to be sent to the CFC office is here (<http://www.chess.ca/pdf/FideEventReg.pdf>). The crosstable must be sent to the CFC within one week of the completion of the event along with an updated event registration form, and the FIDE rating fee payment.

e) The following scheduled FIDE rating fee structure is payable to the CFC provided the event is submitted within 1 week to the CFC office. If the event is submitted to the CFC office after 1 week, then there is a \$110 late fee due to the policies of FIDE. [see Motion 2003-05; 02-03GL4, January 2003]

Round Robin & Matches: Category 0 to 3 - \$55, Category 4 & 5 - \$110, Category 6 & 7 - \$165, Category 8 to 10 - \$220. For higher categories, multiply category by \$44.

Swiss Tournaments: Number of players multiplied by \$2.20 for up to 300 players and then multiply by \$1.10.

Team Tournaments: \$33 Per Team.

**f) For the time being no FIDE rating fees will be required for ladies' tournaments although these tournaments as a matter of course should be registered.**

**g) Small tournaments such as local Swiss tournaments shall be exempt from FIDE rating fees.**

h) All Canadian players who compete in a FIDE registered event should be members in good standing of the CFC.

Upon completion of a FIDE-registered event, the

CFC will put the crosstable in the required form and send it along to FIDE. Note that rated in a) and b) means FIDE-rated. Lists of Canadian FIDE-rated players are available from the ratings page on our website."

*Rationale:* The FIDE rating is important for Canadian players who are already "regular" masters but who are aiming for more. We need to create for them more opportunities to play in Canada instead of going to United States to play in FIDE-rated events.

**Motion 2005-19:** Moved by Bruce Harper,  
Seconded Peter Stockhausen  
That rule 1014 be amended to read as follows:

1014. Organization:  
Bids for the CYCC shall be submitted to the CFC in the same manner as bids for other national events.

(a) Bids to hold the CYCC shall be reviewed by the Junior Coordinator for conformity with the general CFC standard for bids and to ensure that the particular requirements of the CYCC are met. Bids that meet CFC standards shall be put before the Governors for selection of a winning bid for the year in question.

(b) All bids for the CYCC must set out the anticipated expenses related to the event, including site rental, trophies and medals, prizes, publicity and advertising, tournament director and organizer fees, equipment costs and other expenses.

(c) The entry fee to the CYCC shall be \$150 per player, paid directly to the CFC. For each entry fee:

(i) \$100 per player shall be retained by the CFC to cover the costs of trips to the WYCC for the year in question.

(ii) Up to \$50 per player shall be used to reimburse the organizers of the CYCC for expenses incurred in relation to the event.

(iii) Any surplus funds remaining after the expenses of the event are paid shall be used by the CFC for future Junior activities or transferred to the Junior (Kalev Pugi) Fund).

(d) If circumstances, including the scheduling of the WYCC, permit, it is desirable that the CYCC be held shortly before, and at the same location as, the Canadian Open for that year.

**Motion 2005-20,** moved by Bruce Harper,  
seconded by Jason Feng:

That 1. Article 5 of the CFC Olympiad Regulations ("The Selection Committee") be amended by replacing

"To avoid any conflict of interest, neither member of this committee can become part of the Canadian National Team for the Olympiad in question"

with

"Neither member of the Selection Committee may play for the Canadian National Team in the Olympiad in question".

**Motion 2005-21,** moved by Bruce Harper,  
seconded by Jason Feng:

2. The CFC Governors endorse Brian Hartman as Team Captain for the 2004 Olympiad and recommend that he be appointed Team Captain by the CFC Executive.

REPLACE WITH:

2a. The CFC Governors endorse Brian Hartman actions as Team Captain for the 2004 Olympiad.

**Halldor P. Palsson:** This is moot and I rule this out of order. The Governors have already voted and endorsed the appointment of Mr. Hartmann. The online vote for Mr. Hartman was 19-12 with 4 abstentions. Thank you for your support of Brian Hartman as Team Captain for the 2004 Olympiad.

**Motion 2005-22,** moved by Bruce Harper,  
seconded by Jason Feng:

3. The CFC President be censured for appointing Brian Hartman Team Captain in contravention of the existing CFC Regulations.

**Halldor P. Palsson:** This is moot. I rule this motion out of order. Governor Harper is factually incorrect. The Executive voted for Mr. Hartmann and his appointment then went to a confirmation vote to the Governors. The vote for Mr. Hartman was 19-12 with 4 abstentions. This matter is closed.

## **General comments from Governors:**

**Ari Mendrinis:** I agree 100% with Nava as we badly need some funds to continue surviving.

I wish I were 10 years younger to overtake this position of funds raiser. I've been suggesting in the past many times when I was President of GTCL (Greater Toronto Chess League) to obtain funds from the lottery corporation without being a burden to the tax payers. Finding funds for the chess community is like going to one thousand miles trip.

Only the first step is the most difficult one.

The CFC should work out this suggestion.

**Michael Barron:** In general, GL is much more convenient to read from the screen, if it formatted in 1 column, like previous GL 1.

Motion 2004-05-03 (Motion awarding the 2006 Canadian Youth Championship and Canadian Open to Kitchener Ontario)

Motion 2005-04 (Motion by John Rutherford, seconded by David Cohen, prohibiting the organization of events similar to the Canadian Open during that time period)

I oppose this motion as being unnecessary, antagonistic and foolish, and vote against it.

If the CFC bidding procedures for national events such as the Canadian Open is transparent and fair, this will not be a problem. Further, in situation where the Canadian Open is held at remote locations (such as in 2003 and 2004), there is nothing wrong with have comparable events held in other locations, as this would not materially reduce the number of attendees at the

Canadian Open.

The Canadian Open should stand on its own merits (location, site, funding, participation of known players) and should not need or receive special protection.

If this motion were to be passed, all it would do is trigger the organization of unrated events were organizers be inclined to hold them.

Motion 2005-05 (Motion by Frank Dixon, seconded by Michael Barron, establishing the Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association)

I support this motion provided the new body does not detract from other CFC organizational efforts, and vote in favour of it.

**Frank Dixon:** Post-Secondary Chess portfolio update:

Note that the remote-site competitive capability referred to in my submission to the last GL will not happen for the 2005 tournament. This is an intriguing idea, but we are not yet ready to implement it. Perhaps next year! This topic is already on the agenda for the 2005 meeting of the Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association, Toronto, January 2005.

**Frank Dixon:** New Fundraising Coordinator:

I applaud the initiative by WIM Nava Starr on the potential new position of CFC Fundraising Coordinator. I think it makes much more sense to centralize this function under one (hopefully strong) leader, who will interact with organizers, TDs, the CFC Executive and Governors, potential sponsors, government organizations, and other interested parties, to improve fundraising capabilities for Canadian chess.

**Frank Dixon:** Hartman Captaincy of Men's Olympiad Team:

I think that IM Brian Hartman is an excellent choice for this role. It is too bad that there was so much confusion and hard feeling over this,

with conflict about whether IM Hartman, having served as an Olympiad Team Selector, could then continue on to join the team in Spain in the role of Captain, with the CFC's vote on this taking place the day the tournament actually started. This timing is unacceptably bad. I believe that the new Olympiad rules, used for the first time in 2004, were framed to prevent a Selector from selecting himself / herself as a PLAYING member of the team (which IM Hartman subsequently became for 2004, because of the emergency with GM LeSiege being unable to play at the last minute). Indeed, I would argue the reverse, that it could be advantageous for a Selector to also serve as Captain, since he / she would be very familiar with the players on the team, from the Selector's role. In any case, this confusion needs to be cleaned up in the Olympiad Regulations for next time.

In a general sense, the planning for the 2004 Olympiad was left too late, leading to a compressed schedule for decisions, and while Canada is doing quite well after nine rounds as I write this report, two players who were originally selected to the team, GM Spraggett and GM LeSiege, did not actually play for our team in Spain in the Championships, leading to a lower-rated lineup, with IM Teplitsky fortunately being available to fill in at the last minute. If IM Teplitsky had not been available on short notice, then the dropoff in quality is quite dramatic, to our next conceivable strong player who could have stepped in, and who has been active and successful in recent years.

Governors, the CFC Executive, and specifically the CFC President, need to be much more involved at an earlier stage, which is problematic with a July Executive election and an October Olympiad tournament, with only three months between them. There was almost no discussion at the CFC Annual General Meeting in Kapuskasing, July 2004, about this topic. Also, the timing of the hiring of the new CFC Executive Director (in April, 2004) did not help in this respect. Perhaps some sort of carry-over capability and responsibility from an earlier stage in time needs to be implemented here, and perhaps a Final Olympiad Team Selection

Rating List dated earlier than three months before the tournament would be better, to improve the flow and timing of decisions involving Canada's participation in this premier International event. The Selectors IM Hartman and IM Deen Hergott did do an excellent job, but if they had been able to start their task three months earlier, the results would have been better for all of us.

While I am suggesting that we must do better with the logistics of our team selection process, I am in no way criticizing the performances of our teams and players in Calvia. On the contrary, I am very impressed with their efforts, reacting to last-minute changes to form a strong team bond and to play some excellent chess, and we all should be proud of them!

I am asking the CFC President, whom I have supported twice in his candidacies, to explain in some detail at this time, about what happened in our logistical preparations for Calvia 2004, with a view to providing solutions, so that in future we can avoid these sorts of mistakes, which seem to plague the CFC on a regular basis. I believe the problem is of a systemic nature.

**Frank Dixon:** Samuel Lipnowski matter:

I support the Executive's decision. This affair has been difficult for everyone concerned -- the players, arbiters, Appeals' Committees, Governors. I am confident that Sam has learned his lesson, and that he will go on to make positive contributions to Canadian chess in the future; I would encourage him to do so.

(Addendum) I served as Arbiter in Kapuskasing for the 2004 Canadian Open, for an honorarium. Also, I wrote the report for the tournament in Chess Canada Echecs, again for a small honorarium. And, I am a Governor. So, I declared a conflict of interest, according to the CFC Handbook regulation for this, and didn't report on the Lipnowski matter for CCE, advising Editor FM Hans Jung, CFC President Halldor Palsson, and OCA President Barry Thorvardson of this, after conferring with my attorney, at the end of August, 2004. The CCE coverage of this situation in the October issue

consisted of the report from the National Appeals' Committee; this removed the journalistic bias angle for this sensitive topic.

**Frank Dixon:** Proposed reduction in Governors:

With respect to the proposal by Governor Smith to reduce the number of CFC Governors, I am against this. It is not only the number of CFC members, actual and potential, within a certain region that a given Governor must be concerned with, it is also often the geographical size of a region which matters. I remind Governor Smith, who lives in Toronto, Canada's most densely populated area, that Canada is a vast country, with its population widely dispersed across six time zones. In Kingston, I am the only Governor between Toronto and Ottawa, which are more than four hours' drive apart. Would Governor Smith wish to eliminate Kingston's representation!? If not, then which Governors would he advocate be eliminated!? Governor Smith claims that if there is a reduction in Governors, the remaining Governors would be more active. Well, for the first four months of 2004, I averaged 20 volunteer hours per week spent on chess, running tournaments (17 in all, not all CFC-rated), attending meetings, giving instruction to juniors, drafting proposals, etc. What more does Governor Smith want!?

**Frank Dixon:** Abortive Toronto bid for 2006 Canadian Open:

At the CFC's AGM 2004 in Kapuskasing, Governor Smith, in no uncertain terms, proclaimed that there WOULD DEFINITELY BE a Toronto bid for 2006, and this is in the minutes of the meeting. The promise of this purported bid, which wound up not happening in fact, consumed close to an hour of valuable meeting time, which could have been much more profitably spent on discussion of any number of issues (post-secondary chess, for example, which got closed out by time pressure at the end of BOTH days of meetings, with no progress), and which then delayed a final vote on the 2006 Canadian Open by three more months. Governor Smith, care to explain!?

**Frank Dixon:** 2006 Canadian Open vote:

I did vote for the Kitchener bid, having earlier promised its organizer Hal Bond that I would do so. However, I want to put on the record that I am impressed with David Cohen's idea to take the Open to Nova Scotia, where it has never been held. I would advise Mr. Cohen to bid again with his idea, and to seek out the necessary ties to local Nova Scotia organizers who could facilitate the project.

**Jason Feng: 2004-05-03** I vote NO to this motion. This is not because I think the Kitchener bid is bad or unsatisfactory, but because it is just too early to decide on this youth event. As evidenced from the 2005 CYCC, it is too early to decide on this.

**Bruce Harper:** On the general issue of fundraising, the requests for assistance are being made in a vacuum. I would like to see a financial statement for the CFC every quarter, so the Governors have some factual basis for any requests they might make for money or for their donations. It is also important that the money be spent wisely, and this cannot be determined without information as to the CFC's finances.

**Bruce Harper :** I think the NAC reached the correct decision on the Lipnowski incident, but I think the suspension by the CFC Executive was too short.

**Bruce Harper:** Regarding the 2006 Canadian Open and CYCC, I don't think we even know when the 2006 WYCC will be held, and unless there is some pressing reason for the bid to be awarded right now (and this has never been articulated), I for one would like to see the details of the bids in the standard, CFC-mandated format. It was not difficult to use this format for the Victoria 2005 CYCC bid, and in fact it was helpful in making sure that important details weren't overlooked.

**Peter Stockhausen:** Thank you Mr. Secretary for returning the GL to the readable format. One further improvement might be to number the pages.

***Peter Stockhausen:*** Finances

This is presumably a very difficult year for the finances of the CFC with both an Olympiad and the WYCC taking place. About half of the year has passed. When can we expect a comprehensive financial update overall, for the CYCC/WYCC, Olympiad and Canadian Closed individually?

***Peter Stockhausen:*** 2006 Canadian Open/CYCC

Again, we are not living up to our own rules and regulations. In this case, there was no rush, the bid(s) could have been easily sent back to make them conform. Am I the only one who finds it remarkable that this Executive actually recommends bids to us Governors, which are non-compliant? In addition, the President acts again in such a fashion as to circumvent proper discussion and vote in the Governor Letter.



**Appendix:**

**Chess Federation of Canada  
2005 Canadian Junior Chess Championship  
Bid**

**Organizing Body:** Brantford Chess Club

**Chief Organizer:** Christopher Mallon, 93 William Street Unit 2, Brantford, ON. (519)720-0209.  
[dcmallon@rogers.com](mailto:dcmallon@rogers.com)

**Organizing Committee:** Christopher Mallon – Advertising, Site; Patrick McDonald – DGT Boards; Rob Gashgarian – Assistant.

**Advertising:** Chess Canada Echecs (2 issues), CFC Web Site, Invitations to Provincial Associations.

**Publicity:** Brantford Expositor and CKPC Radio. On TV we will contact Rogers, as well as CTV affiliates in Hamilton and Kitchener. Press Releases will also be submitted to the National Post and Globe and Mail.

**Internet Site:** An internet site including live games for the top five boards will be created.

**City:** Brantford, Ontario

**Address:** Days Inn, 460 Fairview Drive

**Location Description:** Hotel with meeting room is a five minute walk to a major shopping mall, various retail outlets, and over 30 restaurants, and is located just off Highway 403.

**Tournament Rooms:** Medium-sized boardroom with space for over 40 players. Washrooms close by and good lighting.

**Analysis Rooms:** A section of the tournament room will be closed off with dividers to reduce sound for quiet analysis only. We are working on getting a small room next door for other analysis, or weather permitting an outdoors area.

**Registration:** Advance registration no later than one week prior to event.

**Dates:** To be held either Saturday April 30<sup>th</sup> through Wednesday May 4<sup>th</sup> or Saturday April 23<sup>rd</sup> through Wednesday April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2005 depending on when Days Inn can guarantee available rooms for lodging.

**Format:** 9 Round Swiss, Maximum 40 players. Provincial Champions plus other players in descending order on rating list until reaching maximum. Organizers reserve the right to name one player as per handbook paragraph 1053 (d).

**Time Controls:** FIDE Control of Sudden Death 90 minutes with 30 second increment.

**Rounds:** 11am and 4pm each day, final round 11am.

**Playoffs:** To be played as soon as possible after the final round, if needed. The hotel room will be available the Thursday after the event should additional time be needed.

**Rated By:** The CFC and FIDE.

**Equipment Provided:** DGT Sets for top 5 boards, wooden boards/pieces for remaining boards. Digital clocks also provided.

**Prize Fund:** Minimum of \$1800 towards travel expenses for winner to World Junior 2005.

**Entry Fees:** \$150 Entry fee. \$10 Late fee if registering after 45 days prior to the event. \$25 Late fee for registering on site.

**TDs:** Christopher Mallon. Assistant Patrick McDonald.

**Side Events:** Closing Ceremony (probably a dinner) following the final round (Probably around 5pm).

**Accommodation:** Double rooms available for SPECIAL discounted rate of \$79 per night plus tax if you mention the chess tournament. Only 20 rooms are reserved so book ASAP. Regular rate \$99. There is a Best Western quite close as well should more rooms be needed.

**Budget:** See next page.

**Additional Notes:** Days Inn is sponsoring us already for up to \$2330 in room discounts. We are currently seeking more sponsors, specifically a restaurant to sponsor the closing ceremony dinner. A fundraising tournament the week prior might also be held. The budget on the next page assumes 20 entries – although we expect actually 25 to 30 and can handle up to 40 players. Any additional funds will be given to the CFC with the suggestion that a player also be sent using that money to the World Women's Junior.

**Date Submitted:** *November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2004*

**Submitted By:** *Christopher Mallon*

**Accepted By:**  
**Chess Federation of Canada**  
**2005 Canadian Junior Chess Championship**  
**Proposed Budget (based on 20 entries)**

**Income**

Entry Fees	3 000	
Sponsors <sup>1</sup>		500
Total	3 500	

**Expenses**

Site Fees		380
Advertising/Media	300	
Trophy awards		150
Water and Snacks	100	
CFC Rating Fees	10	
FIDE Rating Fees	44	
FIDE Other Fees <sup>2</sup>	100	
TD Fees		300
Equipment Fees		100
Incidental Costs	16	
Total	1 500 <sup>3</sup>	

**Notes**

1. Conservative estimate of possible sponsorship
2. A governor's motion is proposed that would remove this fee, in which case the CFC would still get the money in the end so it doesn't really matter in this case
3. The remaining estimated \$2000 will cover flight expenses for the winner (and hopefully the top female player) to attend the World Junior 2005 which has not yet been officially announced so exact costs cannot be estimated.

## **Deadline for Submissions to GL #4: December 5, 2004**

### **Motions For Vote:**

#### **2005-08: Governors' Motions**

Moved by Barry Thorvardson, Seconded by Mark Dutton

To change the operation and priorities of the CFC Governors Letters to focus on Executive Direction, Major activities in Chess, Sponsorships and Corporate Decision Making. To start this process, only the CFC President, a majority of the CFC Executive, or a direction by 25% of CFC Governors, can authorize a Motion to be included, and voted on in by Governors Letter. Secondly to setup and use Internet Discussion Boards and Email for discussions and procedural development, and/or special committees, so that only supported, well written motions are brought to any meeting, or Governors Letter.

**Vote: YES NO Abstain**

#### **2005-09: Governors' Online Message Forum**

Moved by Christopher Mallon. Seconded by Pierre Dénommée.

- a. It is moved that the CFC Assembly and Executive adopt an online discussion board, to be linked from [www.chess.ca/forum](http://www.chess.ca/forum), as an official means of communication between Governors, and also the Executive.
- b. The board will have three sections, public forums in English and French, a private Governors-only forum, and a private Executive-only forum.
- c. The board will be moderated. Moderators will

include the CFC President, the current Forum Administrator, and any other assistants as designated by mutual agreement of the CFC President and Forum Administrator.

d. The Forum Administrator is appointed by the Executive and may be anyone other than the CFC President. The Administrator should have some experience with web design (specifically PHP script).

e. All Governors and Executive, to gain access to the private forums, must be using their real first and last names. The Forum Administrator has the ability to edit and modify names.

**Vote: YES NO Abstain**

### **Motions for Second Discussion:**

#### **2005-11: Monthly Governors Letter**

#### **2005-12: National Championship Committee**

#### **2005-13: Canadian Closed Format**

(this motion has been withdrawn so any comments will be under "General Comments from Governors")

### **Motions for First Discussion:**

#### **2005-14: Membership requirements for national events**

#### **2005-15: Motions by Governors**

#### **2005-16: Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association**

#### **2005-17: Appeals**

#### **2005-18: Registration of FIDE rated Events**

#### **2005-19: CYCC Bid Procedures**

#### **2005-20: Olympic Team captain resolution**

## **Deadline for Submissions to GL #4: December 14, 2004**

**Responses may be mailed, faxed or E-mailed to the Chess Federation of Canada, E-1 2212 Gladwin Crescent, Ottawa, ON, K1B 5N1, fax: 613-733-5209, E-Mail: [info@chess.ca](mailto:info@chess.ca)**