

Scarborough Community of Toronto  
**Chess News & Views**

Newsletter of / Le Journal de  
**Scarborough Chess Club**

**“ FRIENDLY Chess Since 1960 ”**

*ITEMS OF INTEREST TO BOTH MEMBERS & NON-MEMBERS*

**Issue # 15 – April 1, 2006**

Do You Know ? / Savez-Vous ?

**Controversy Engulfs Canadian Olympic Teams' Selection**

The relevant CFC Handbook Rule states that the National Team is composed of :

1. the Canadian Champion,
2. the three highest-rated players from a Preliminary Selection Ratings List ( averages the FIDE and CFC ratings ), and
3. 2 players selected by a 2 person Selection Committee appointed by the CFC Executive.

The Women's Team is:

1. the Women's Champion ( as of 180 days prior to the upcoming May 20 Olympiad ),
2. the 2 highest-rated players, and
3. 1 player selected by the Selection Committee.

There is also an “ **activity** “ qualification built into the rule – to qualify for naming/selection, the player must have played at least **10** FIDE-rated and/or CFC-rated **games** in the **qualifying year**, in this case approximately, Nov. 20, 2004 to Nov. 20, 2005.

The controversy that has arisen:

1. National Team - the “ selection “ by the Selection Committee of Yan Teplitsky ( he did not qualify by rating ).

---

SCTCN&V Website : <http://scarboroughchess.webhop.net>  
SCC e – mail : [scarboro@idirect.ca](mailto:scarboro@idirect.ca) SCC Website : <http://www.ScarboroughChessClub.ca>  
Jack Goodlad Community Ctre, 929 Kennedy Road  
( ½ way between Eglinton Ave. and Lawrence Ave. )

2. Women's Team - the " naming " to the team of the 2004 Women's Champion, Dinara Khaziyeva, who is otherwise the Champion referred to in the Rule, **and** the " naming " of Nava Starr, named by rating.

Here are the circumstances and issues, which reveal a pattern of incompetent and dubious goings on :

A) The " Activity " Rule Problem

a) The " Old " Rule ( the Spraggett/Smith Rule of 2003 )

Under this Rule, which was in place until July, 2005, the teams were similarly composed and chosen. The differences were that the activity qualification did not apply to the Canadian Champion, or the players picked by " selection " by the Selection Committee, but only to those players " named " to the team by " rating ". Additionally the qualifying period was 2 years, January 2004 to January, 2006, and the games required were 12 CFC-rated games ( we are relying in part on a ChessTalk post by Denis Allan on this ). Under these Rules, all three disputed players had qualified :

1. Yan Teplitsky qualified for the National Team, since the old " activity " requirement did not apply to players chosen by " selection " by the Selection Committee. This is how Yan was currently chosen for the team.
2. Dinara qualified as Champion, because the " activity " rule at the time did not apply to the Champion; but she also did have more than the 12 games in the qualifying period by Nov., 2004.
3. Nava qualified by rating because in the old qualifying period she would have had the then required 12 CFC-rated games – she also had them by Nov., 2004..

b) The " New " Rules ( the Harper/Charbonneau Rules of July, 2005 )

In July, 2005, the Governors significantly changed the system to one similar to what now exists. The " activity " requirement now applied to all three groups of players : Champion; those " named " by rating; those " selected " by the Selection Committee. The qualifying year was shortened to November, 2004 to November, 2005. The number of games was reduced to 10 CFC-rated games. Under these new rules, the three players in dispute, who were all qualified before the Rule change, became ineligible, because now they failed to comply with the new activity Rule application ( didn't have at that point the necessary 10 CFC-rated games, because their games prior to Nov., 2004, no longer counted – in fact all three had 0 qualifying games between Nov., 2004 and July, 2005 ). But it was only July, 2005, and the new qualifying year ran to November 20, 2005, giving all three players 4 months in which to play the necessary games and become eligible for the Olympic Teams. Yan and Dinara did not play any qualifying games in these four months; Nava played 7 qualifying games ( of 10 ).

### c) The Amended “ New “ Rule

In November, 2005, the Governors again revised the Olympiad selection Rules. One of the changes was to expand the scope of the games that would qualify as “ played “ games. Now the games could be either CFC-rated or FIDE-rated. The problem with this change was that it could not help out anyone who had not already played some FIDE-rated games in the qualifying year to date. This is because the qualifying year remained the same, ending about Nov. 20, 2005, and it was already early Nov., 2005 when the amended rule was passed. So it was virtually impossible for anyone to get in some FIDE-rated games in the few days remaining of the qualifying year. None of the three players in dispute had any FIDE-rated games in the qualifying year to date. So this expansion of the Rule was of no help to them in qualifying.

### d) The Issue

Is there an issue of fairness here ? The new July, 2005 Rule’s intent was that there be 1 year for the players to play their qualifying games. However, because the new Rule only came in in July, 2005, it made the relevant year Nov., 2004 to Nov., 2005. So 8 months of the qualifying year had already gone by. This gave players with no games yet, 4 months to play the 10 qualifying games. What is problematic is that there was no obligation on the three players under the old Rules to play in the 8 month period of Nov., 2004 to July, 2005. The old activity rule didn’t apply to Yan and Dinara ( plus she already had the required games anyway before Nov., 2004 ). Nava as well already had the needed games by Nov., 2004. So there was no obligation on any of them to play between Nov., 2004 and July, 2005, because they were all already eligible. But then with the new July, 2005 Rule, that 8 month period became relevant, since it was now 2/3 of the new Nov., 2004 to Nov., 2005 qualifying year. All of a sudden, there was an 8 month period in which they had no qualifying games, where previously they had not needed to play any games in that period. And now they could do nothing, because now the 8 month period had passed. So even though it was the Rule’s intent to give a full year to play the qualifying games, in fact these three now only had 4 months left in the new qualifying year, in which to play the 10 games.

So who should take the blame when all three players failed to qualify ? The players did have some time to get in their games ( 4 months ), but none of them got in the 10 games required ( Yan and Dinara played no games; Nava played only 7 games ). They cannot really be blamed, however, for not playing from Nov., 2004 to July, 2005, because under the old Rule, they didn’t need to – they were already eligible without needing any more games. Yet this 8 months was considered under the new Rule as part of their “ qualifying year “. So they effectively lost the benefit of that 8 month period. Nevertheless, having 4 months, was it therefore the players own fault that they didn’t play the 10 required games, and became ineligible for the teams? Additionally, the whole intent of the “ new “ Rules was not to have to appoint inactive, or minimally active, players to our Olympic teams. Yan and Dinara are “ inactive “, and Nava is “ insufficiently “ active. As well, 7 of the 10 other team members did qualify under the

Rules because they had been “ active “. So must these three take responsibility for the position in which they now find themselves?

Or is the problem at the feet of the Governors, because the new Rules implemented some unfairness toward the candidates for the team, including these three? Were any of the Governors aware of this problem when they passed the “ new “ Rules ? If so, did they consider them “ fair “ ? If not, should they have passed some type of additional Rule which somehow changed the implementation of the Rule to make it fair? If there is unfairness, is it such a substantial unfairness that the Governors must take steps to legalize the membership of these three players on the teams, by now exempting them from the activity qualification ?

## B) The Preliminary Selection Ratings List. Problem

### a) The Yan Teplitsky Issue

The “ Preliminary Selection Rating List “, issued in Nov. 2005, set out a list of players, the number of qualifying games they had played, and their position on the rating list. It was to be used by an “ Olympic administrator “ to “ name “ the Champion and the three “ rating “ players to the team. It was also part of the material available to help the Selection Committee choose the two “ selected “ team members. It was not created by the Selection Committee, just received by them. It incorrectly claimed that Teplitsky had played " 10+ " qualifying games when he had not. His last FIDE-rated games were in October of 2004, from the last Olympiad, and his last CFC-rated games were in August, 2004, from the Montreal International. These do not qualify, so he has 0 qualifying games. We are not yet sure who actually created this list and is responsible for the error. The Rule creates the position of “ Olympiad Coordinator “, who seems to oversee all Olympic Team matters. Brian Hartman, National Team captain, in his posting on ChessTalk, stated “ I am not the Coordinator “. Team Chess Inc., the entity managing the Canadian Olympic Teams, would apparently not be the one issuing the list, since “ selection “ is not part of their agreement with the CFC Executive, according to Brian. Chris Mallon, CFC president, just referred re the List to “ clerical error “ in a posting on the CFC Discussion Board, and didn't say if it was the " Olympiad Coordinator " named in the regulation who was responsible, or who the person was who was responsible. It was this error which MAY have led the Selection Committee to wrongly believe that Teplitsky was eligible for “ selection “ ( We find it hard to believe, however, that no one was aware that the Ratings List was wrong re Teplitsky's qualifying games ).

### b) The Dinara Khaziyeva Issue

Dinara Khaziyeva was named to the women's team, even though the Preliminary Selection Ratings List showed she had only " 6 " qualifying games, not the required 10. We find it impossible to believe that whoever is responsible for this final naming to the team made an honest mistake on this one. But it also appears that the Selection List is wrong, and she in fact has " 0 " games in the qualifying year. Her last CFC-rated games were in the 2004 Canadian Closed in August, 2004, and do not qualify. Her last FIDE

rated games are from the Calvia Olympiad in October, 2004, and these games also do not qualify. So she has " 0 " games in the qualifying period ( as does Yan Teplitsky for the National Team ), and yet she was named to the team.

c) The Nava Starr Issue

Nava Starr was named as the second-highest rated player on the Preliminary Selection Ratings List. The List shows her as having " 10+ " games in the qualifying year. This allegedly qualified her for the team. But the List appears wrong, and she in fact has only 7 qualifying games, not the 10 required. Her most recent CFC-rated tournament in the qualifying year is the 2005 Toronto Women's Championship, played in Sept./Oct., 2005. Although it was a 7 player round robin, Nava played only 2 games and then withdrew. Her qualifying CFC tournament, prior to this, was the Toronto Macedonian Labour Day tournament, played in September, 2005. Although it was a 6 round tournament, Nava had a bye in the fourth round, and thus played only 5 games. This gives her a qualifying total of only 7 games. She has 0 additional FIDE-rated games in the qualifying year ( her last additional games were from the Calvia Olympiad in October, 2004, and so do not qualify ). Despite having only 7 qualifying games, the person responsible named her to the team.

d) The General Issue

The Selection Committee and the person responsible for “ naming “ to the team the Champion and the players by “ rating “, may have made some honest mistakes. This is unfortunate for other potential candidates for the team who did qualify. And if they made mistakes, is it not incumbent on the Governors to immediately correct these mistakes? OR, did the person responsible and the Selection Committee, simply take matters into their own hands, and ignore the relevant rules to be followed in naming/selecting? If so, rogue administrators/committees are never helpful to good administration of a system. If they wanted to circumvent rules that seemed to get an undesirable result, it was incumbent on them to go back to the Board of Governors who passed the regulation, and get exemptions for Yan, Dinara, and Nava. They did not do this. And in any event, is it not now the duty of the Governors to deal with their own administrator/committee who blatantly decided not to follow the Governors' Rules?

C) The Management of the Olympiad Teams

Brian Hartman's ChessTalk post stated – “ Team Chess Inc. was formed, and entered into an agreement with the CFC to manage the 2006 Olympiad (aside from selection), regardless of the "rules" (as, from my read, they were impossible to adhere to from a business perspective) - i.e., our agreement overrides these rules for the 2006 edition.”

We assume that the agreement is between Team Chess Inc. and the CFC Executive. We are not aware of what rules passed by the Governors were impossible for Team Chess Inc. to follow practically. We hope there is some agreement between the 2 parties clarifying what rules need not be followed. We'll take Brian at his word that there was a practicality problem. Here, if the rules are not to be followed, at least an exemption was obtained from the relevant legal body. But was this agreement ever put to the Governors by the executive for a confirmation vote, that they agreed to their rules not being followed ? And if the rules are impossible to follow, then why have the Governors not brought amendments to these rules to correct the situation for next time ? It seems that it is partly their rule implementation that led to all this in the first place.

#### D) The Appeal Problem

Is there no clear mechanism in place to appeal the decision of the Selection Committee or the person responsible for the Ratings List and the naming of the Champion/ " Rating " players? The Rule does not set one out. If there in fact is, then where is it set out, and is it clear about who has standing to bring such an appeal – e.g. Eric Lawson, runner-up in the 2004 Canadian Championship, who was a potential " selection " choice, if Teplitsky had not been named - can he appeal, even though he is not assured that he would be chosen to fill any vacancy created by the appeal; Valentina Goutor, the next qualifying woman on the women's rating list, and on last year's team, who would have been the alternate by rating to fill the vacancy if Khaziyeva and Starr had not been named? Is it clear whether there is a time limit within which the appeal must be brought ( those selected have to know quickly whether they are about to be booted off the team i.e. could Eric/Valentina for example still launch an appeal now, if they felt strongly about it? )

#### E) The Solution

An ill result of all of these problems, and possible appeals, is their possible effect on the chemistry, preparation, and performance of our Olympic team. It looks like quite a mess to us. In any event, the CFC should make a clear statement of admission of error in this process. And the Governors must decide whether:

- i. they want the new rules to apply because having the team members be " active" is the major issue, despite some possible unfairness; they then have to set aside the naming/selection of Yan, Dinara, and Nava, and have the people responsible go back and finish the naming/selection according to the current rules; OR
- ii. they don't want the new Rules to apply, because they feel the implementing of the new rules was substantially unfair to the three; in that case they must pass a motion exempting Yan, Dinara and Nava from the activity rule, so they are legally on the teams.

The Governors should not be allowed to hide behind bureaucratic bangles, or rogue administrators/committees. Other potential team members have been affected, and they have at least the right to demand that the Governors make the decision, and that the final result be legal, even if it may be offensive to them personally.

[ NOTE : The selection issues were brought before the Governors near the end of last month, and this article was presented to them as a background paper on the issues. As a result, one of the Governors is now bringing a Point Of Order as follows :

"Since the Olympiad regulations were changed twice during the activity period, players who qualify under any of the three versions of the activity rules are eligible for selection for 2006 Olympiad Team".

Assuming this is accepted by the Chair ( the CFC President ), then all three players in dispute will be legally on the teams, since all three were eligible under the original 2003 Spraggett/Smith Rules. ]

### **2006 FIDE Women's World Chess Championship**

This knockout championship was played from March 10 – 27, in Ekaterinburg, Russia. It consists of 64 players. The 2004 Women's World Champion, GM Antoaneta Stefanova ( Bulgaria ), was back to defend her title.

Our 2006 Canadian Women's Champion, WIM Natalia Khoudgarian ( 2106 ), was knocked out in the first round 2-0 by Russian WGM Alexandra Kosteniuk ( 2514 ). As well, 1 of the 6 2500+ players also was defeated: IM Kateryna Lahno ( Ukraine – 2500 ), European Women's Champion.

In Rd. 2, the Champion, GM Stefanova ( 2499 ) was knocked out of the championship, along with 2 of the 5 2500+ remaining players: GM Humpy Koneru ( India - 2537 ) and GM Pia Cramling ( Sweden - 2515 ). This left 3 players still in the running at 2500+: GM Kosteniuk; GM Maia Chuburdanidze ( Georgia - 2511 ); WGM Yuhua Xu ( China - 2502 ).

In Rd. 3, one of the remaining 2500+ players again got eliminated : Kosteniuk. Also eliminated was the 12-year old Chinese player, Yifan Hou. In fact, 11 of the top 13 players had been eliminated at this point. It tends to support the opinion that 2-game knockout matches are like a lottery in result.

In Rd. 4, Chuburdanidze, who was Women's World Champion from 1978 – 91, was defeated. This left only Xu of the original 2500+ players.

The semi-final matches were: Viktoria Cmilyte ( Lithuania – 2475 ) vs. Alisa Galliamova ( Russia – 2467 ); Svetlana Matveeva ( Russia – 2428 ) vs. Xu. The winners were: Galliamova and Xu.


In the final match of best of 4 games, game one was won by Xu, game 2 was drawn, and then Xu won the third game, ending the match, and winning the Women's World Chess Championship. Here is the final game:

## Galliamova, A (2467) – Xu, Y (2502) [A00]

FIDE Women's World CC Ekaterinburg, Russia, 25.03.2006

1.d4 e6 2.Nf3 Nf6 3.c4 b6 4.Nc3 Bb4 5.Qc2 Bb7 6.Bg5 h6 7.Bh4 c5 8.a3 Bxc3+ 9.Qxc3 cxd4  
10.Nxd4 Ne4 11.Bxd8 Nxc3 12.Bc7 Na6 13.Bf4 Ne4 14.Nb5 g5 15.Be3 Ke7 16.Rd1 d5 17.f3 Nf6  
18.Bd4 Rhd8 19.e3 Rd7 20.h4 Nc7 21.hxg5 hxg5 22.c5 a6 23.Nxc7 Rxc7 24.cxb6 Rc6 25.a4 Nd7  
26.a5 Nc5 27.Bc3 Na4 28.Bb4+ Kf6 29.b3 Nc5 30.Rb1 Nd7 31.Be2 Rc2 32.Rh6+ Kg7 33.Rh5  
Kf6 34.g3 Rac8 35.f4 gxf4 36.gxf4 Ra2 37.Rd1 Nc5 38.Bc3+ Ke7 39.f5 Ne4 40.Bb4+ Kf6 41.Bd3  
Rg8 42.Rh6+ Ke5 43.Rh1 Rg3 44.Bxe4 Rxe3+ 45.Kf1 dxe4 46.fxe6 Kxe6 47.Rh6+ Kf5 48.Rd7  
Rf3+ 49.Ke1 Rxb3 50.Bd2 e3 51.Bc1 Rb1 52.Rc7 Bf3 53.Rhc6 Bxc6 54.Rxc6 Raa1 55.Ke2 Rxa5  
56.Bxe3 Rb2+ 57.Kf3 Rb3 58.Rc7 Ke5 0-1

Position after 58. Ke5



## La Roche Sur Yon, France, Tournament

This 10-player round-robin was played March 14 – 25. It was a FIDE Category XII Event ( Average Rating – 2530 ). It was won by Krishnan Sasikiran ( India – 2670 ), with 6/9 pts.. 2004 Canadian Champion, GM-elect Pascal Charbonneau ( 2496 ) finished 8<sup>th</sup> with 4/9 pts..

## Toronto March Open - Results

This one-section swiss was played at the Bayview Games Club from March 17-19, and attracted 53 entries. The top section was very strong, including Ron Livshits, Robert Hamilton, Nikolay Noritsyn and Leonid Gerzhoy. The winners of the Open and the various sections were:

Open : 1<sup>st</sup> – Ron Livshits – 5/5 ( an excellent showing – 5 straight wins )

2<sup>nd</sup> – Robert Hamilton – 4 ½

3<sup>rd</sup> – Sasa Kulic – 4

A Section – Arthur Calugar – 4



B Section – Brendan Fan – 4  
 C Section – Sadiq Juma – 3.5  
 D Section – John Chidley-Hill – 3  
               Fred Henderson – 3  
               Aquino Inigo – 3  
 E Section – Gordana Maric – 3  
 F Section – Edward Phung – 2.5  
               Alexandru Florea – 2.5  
 G Section – Kelvin Xu - 2

### SCC Early Spring Swiss Continues


This one-section swiss started on Thursday, March 16, and attracted 26 players. In the lead after three rounds is Bryan Lamb, the highest rated player in the club ( 2105 ), and last year's club champion, who is undefeated. In 2<sup>nd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> with 2.5/3 pts. are Rick Garel, John Hall, and Michael Perez.

In Rd. 3, Bryan met and defeated one of this year's club co-champions, Donal Deiseach. Here is their game ( annotations by Bob Armstrong, using Fritz ) :

#### **Deiseach, D (1944) – Lamb, B (2104) [E92]**

SCC Early Spring Swiss SCC, Toronto (3), 30.03.2006

**1.d4 Nf6 2.c4 g6± 3.Nc3 Bg7 4.Nf3 d6 5.e4 0-0 6.Be2 e5** [6...c5 7.d5 Bg4 8.0-0 Nbd7 9.Ng5 Bxe2 10.Qxe2 Re8±] **7.Be3?±** [7.dxe5 dxe5 8.Qxd8 Rxd8 9.Bg5 Nbd7±; 7.d5 a5 8.0-0 Nbd7 9.Be3 Nc5 10.Qc2 Ng4 11.Bxc5 dxc5±] **7...Nc6?±** [7...exd4 8.Nxd4 Re8 9.f3 Nbd7 10.0-0 Ne5=] **8.d5** [8.dxe5 dxe5 9.Bg5 Qe8 10.0-0 Bg4 11.Bxf6 Bxf6 12.Nd5 Bd8±] **8...Ne7 9.h3?±** [9.Qd3±] **9...Nh5?±** [9...Nd7=] **10.Qd2?±** [10.g4 Nf6 11.Qb3 Ne8 12.0-0-0 a5±] **10...f5 11.Bh6 f4?±** [11...fxe4 12.Bxg7 Kxg7 13.Nxe4 Bf5 14.Nc3 Nf4 15.g3 Nxe2 16.Qxe2 c6=] **12.Bxg7 Kxg7 13.0-0 a6 14.Kb1 Bd7?±** [14...Nf6±] **15.Rdg1??±** Donal misses the win of a P [15.Nxe5! dxe5 16.Bxh5 gxh5 17.d6 Be6 18.dxe7 Qxe7±] **15...Nf6 16.g3?±** [16.Bd3=] **16...b5??±** [16...fxg3 17.fxg3 b5 18.g4 bxc4 19.Rd1 Qb8±] **17.gxf4 b4 18.fxe5 dxe5 19.Nd1 Nxe4 20.Qxb4 Rb8 21.Qa5 Bf5 22.Ka1 Qd6 23.Nh4 Bd7 24.f3 Nc5 25.Ne3?±** [25.Nf2±] **25...Rb3! 26.Ng4?±** Donal is starting to get himself into difficulties [26.Qd2 Rfb8 27.Rb1 c6 28.Nhg2 Bf5 29.Nxf5+ Nxf5=] **26...Rfb8 27.Rb1 R3b4**



---

a b c d e f g h

**28.Qa3??-+** Donal blunders; he'll now have to give up his Q for a N to stop mate [28.b3 c6 29.Rhc1 g5 30.Ng2 Bf5 31.Rb2 Na4 32.N2e3 Bxg4 33.hxg4 Nxb2 34.Kxb2 cxd5 35.Qxd5 Qf6?] **28...Ra4** Donal see his mistake and resigns. The game would have continued **29.Qxa4** [29.Qc3? Nb3+ 30.Qxb3 Rxb3-+] **29...Nxa4 30.Bd1 Nc5-+ 0-1**

### **GTCL Annual General Meeting**

This meeting, open to all CFC members in the GTA, will be held on Friday, April 14 at 6:30 PM at the Greek Orthodox Metropolis of Toronto, 86 Overlea Blvd. ( 2<sup>nd</sup> building east of the Macedonian Church where the Labour Day tournament is traditionally held ). It will deal with many items, including election of OCA Board members, election of CFC Governors for the GTA, and election of a new GTCL Executive. Come out and express your views.

### **New Chess Club Wanted for Markham**

The City of Markham wishes to start a city chess club. It is looking for an organizer. It will be located near McCowan, south of Hwy. 7. If you would like to participate, call Jim Roe – 905-209-0815.

### **Toronto Open – Upcoming Tournament**

This 6 round swiss will be held at the Bayview Games Club, 1681 Bayview Avenue, on April 15 – 17. Time control will be Game/150 min.. Rounds are : 11:00 am & 5:30 pm. Entry Fee is \$55 ( payable in cash by April 14 ). Late Fee - \$ 10. Non-members of BGC - \$ 15 extra. This is a CFC – rated tournament – membership required or \$ 10 tournament membership. There is also a draw for an early bird door prize, for those who register by April 7 – full entry fee rebate ( \$ 55 ). There is a 60 player maximum capacity. For further information : Vlad Dobrich 416-722-9709.

---

A - Members/ non-members may contact Bob Armstrong, ed. , directly, at [bobarm@sympatico.ca](mailto:bobarm@sympatico.ca) or through SCC e-mail, to :

1. Be added to the free e-mail list; 2. Submit content ( fact, opinion, criticism, recommendations! ).
- B – An item in any language may be submitted for publication, if accompanied by an English translation.  
C – The opinions expressed here are those of the editor, and not necessarily those of the Scarborough CC.  
D - To review this newsletter after it has been deleted, or any of the archived newsletters back one year, visit our own SCTCN&V official website at : <http://scarboroughchess.webhop.net>.  
E – Please notify us if you wish to be removed from the free subscription list