

CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA GOVERNORS' LETTER TWO 1999-2000



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

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 if interested.

Deadline for next Governors' Letter is November 17, 1999

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

There are two items that I wish to comment on before I move on to the really positive news. The first one concerns the Executive Motion "All pure Junior and Scholastic events will be regular rated unless the average rating is over 1500 or the time control is less than 30 minutes per player per game." I was going to explain this at length, but after having read the Rating Auditor's ruling and detailed explanation which appears near the end of this G.L., I feel that I just need to make the following points.

- a) This motion did not replace any motion that was defeated at the AGM.
- b) The motion was made with the intent to aid the large number of Scholastic and Junior players rated under 1500.
- c) The Executive took the initiative to make this important decision and notified the Governors at the first opportunity, which was G.L.1.

Again, I suggest you read the excellent and detailed explanation by Mr. Cabanas of the entire issue. Then you can see the whole picture and you will realize who understands the issue and who just wants to be critical. Enough said on this one.

The next item I wish to comment on is the chesstalk web site. This is maintained by someone whose own personal agenda appears to be to criticize the C.F.C. at every opportunity. Such a web site is a boon to any one who has an axe to grind or someone who has something bothering him that he wants to get off his chest. The negatives usually far outweigh the positives. However, it should be realized that all this is virtually meaningless. The only forum for the discussion and possible change of C.F.C. policies is the Governors Letter. The proper procedure for any concerned person is to approach their Governor with a printed version of the C.F.C. policy and their suggestion of the change involved and what benefit would result. The Governor can make a motion in the G.L. if he agrees with the proposal. Then the issue can be debated by all the Governors and a decision rendered.

While we are on this type of subject, as you read this G.L. take note of the tone of the different type of comments. Some have suggestions and may have a critical note. Others get personal, involve sarcasm, and have a confrontational tone. The former are from Governors who really wish to improve the C.F.C. The latter are from Governors who have their own personal agendas which include criticizing the C.F.C. and/or the Executive at every opportunity just because they are the C.F.C. and/or the Executive. I really believe you can see the difference in this G.L.

Now for something positive. We have a new Canadian Champion. Congratulations go to Alexandre Lesiege who won the Canadian Closed and Zonal in Brantford, Ontario. I am sure that Alexandre will represent his Country well as we enter the new millennium. Congratulations also go to Tony Ficzer and his Committee for organizing and directing a marvelous tournament in a beautiful location. The new format allowed rising young stars such as Igor Zugic and Stephen Glinert to play against many of the top players in the Country. The success of this tournament dictates a continuation of the format in the future.

We have revised rules for the CYCC. Proof that we do listen and change where it is beneficial to do so. The new rules appear in another part of this G.L. We have already started sending out information to schools and we are on our way to an even better year than last year.

Financially we are holding our own so far. However, this will be a difficult year as we are committed to spending substantial sums for travel expenses for our young players. After last year, it will be hard to still find expenses to cut. Therefore we must rely on increased revenue from memberships, rating fees and sales of supplies. This is where Governors can help by introducing new players to tournaments and clubs. Also, by buying supplies from our Business Office makes a big contribution to the financial situation.

The bottom line to all of this? The C.F.C. is surviving quite nicely and we are improving things that we feel need improving. We welcome complimentary and critical comments and suggestions that are made in an appropriate manner and are designed to benefit the C.F.C.

Maurice Smith
President
Chess Federation Of Canada

KEEPING GOVERNORS INFORMED

- 1) The President has appointed Denis Allan as Women's Coordinator. Mr. Allan returns to a position he once held in the early eighties. He has had a long history in coaching and assisting in women's chess including the Olympics. Therefore, we welcome Mr. Allan back as an Officer of the C.F.C.
- 2) The Executive unanimously approved the new revised rules of the CYCC which appear in this G.L.
- 3) The President has ruled that starting with this issue, the Governors Letter will appear on the C.F.C. web site.

Maurice Smith
President
Chess Federation Of Canada

MOTIONS

99-7 now becomes Motion 00-1

Motion 00-1 (Jaeger-Langen) "That as a matter of policy the CFC should make available to affiliated provincial associations En Passant space for communication to association members.

The aggregate of such space shall be decided annually by the CFC executive and its allocation among associations be proportionate to the square root of CFC provincial ordinary memberships equivalents. (Example: if Province A has 400 CFC ordinary members' equivalents it shall be entitled to twice the space of a province that has 100 membership equivalents).

Where there is no affiliated provincial association the use of space shall be made available to an association in that province/territory from among associations applying for the use of the space".

Motion 00-2 (Bunning-Cabanas) "That the tournament membership fee be increased to \$12 per tournament effective January 1, 2000."

Les Bunning: At the annual meeting it was proposed to raise the tournament membership fee to \$15. This increase was opposed by Francisco Cabanas. After the meeting (where the motion was defeated) Cabanas agreed to second a motion to increase the tournament membership to \$12. The current tournament membership fee of \$6 gives little incentive for players to become full members. This resulted in a loss of income to the CFC last year.

00-1 STRAW VOTE TOPIC (Martin Jaeger) "That for Closed [CYCC National] Events with no upper bound on entry numbers, Northwestern Ontario be allowed to name an entry."

MOTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION

Motion 00-1:

Tom O'Donnell: This strikes me as a reasonable motion, until I read Mr. Allan's commentary. If he is right, then I guess this motion is really improper. Could the movers rework it?

David Ottosen: I have no real interest in this as the ACA would likely use it very little. Besides, don't "Upcoming Tournaments" and "Across Canada" already provide this space?

Lyle Craver: Vote No. If Troy and David have a problem with doing what's desired by this motion I don't think they should be in the Business Office. Having talked with both, I do not feel that this is their attitude at all. Accordingly this appears to be a 'solution' in search of a problem.

Peter Stockhausen: This is not the purpose of the "National Magazine." Communication for strictly provincial matters (other than tournament advertising & tournament reporting) should be left as a provincial responsibility.

Motion 00-2:

Tom O'Donnell: I am completely opposed to this. "The current tournament fee of \$6 gives little incentive for players to become full members." Yes, this may be true. Perhaps these people want to play tournament chess, but don't believe that becoming a member of this organization is worth the extra \$\$\$. At the moment, this point of view is hard to argue with.

David Ottosen: Well, when the tournament membership was implemented a few years ago, the idea was that people would get to play a couple of cheap tournaments, fall in love, and keep playing. I'm not sure if we have given enough time for those people to make that decision. However, since I never liked the idea of a tournament membership anyways, I will probably vote for this idea.

Toni Deline: At the 1999 AGM the motion to increase tournament membership fees was defeated by more than a single vote. Further, the business office was asked to produce and later provide harder data about the real economic impact of tournament memberships. Governors wanted to know how many tournament memberships were from former full members who did not renew, how many from potential future full members testing the waters, and even how many actually later became full members. The number of tournament memberships the average such person buys in a year needs to be known. Also to be calculated into the equation of economic impact is the cost of servicing the full members (e.g. En Passant and membership cards) v. the nearly non-existent costs of a tournament member. Only with real data can one attempt to show that there is any adverse impact to the CFC in these memberships, and not actually a favourable one.

This motion seems as though it is a knee-jerk reaction to a decrease in full memberships. And this although there is no evidence that raising the tournament membership fees will induce a person (who may have limited funds in any event) to actually buy full membership. It is also possible that it will prevent some players from participating, resulting in lower turnouts, smaller prizes and reduced revenue to the CFC.

In B.C. in 1999, regardless of the current tournament membership fees, we managed to raise ours at all membership levels. On the other hand there was a report of an organizer in Ontario, where the biggest decrease took place, refusing to sell any full memberships and only vending tournament memberships. It is too easy to blame the tournament fee. Perhaps organizers in a given area aren't offering much to attract or keep full members. Perhaps the CFC should concentrate our efforts on converting those part-time members to be full members. Certainly outrageous tournament membership fees will only discourage people, who potentially may become full members, from trying tournament chess.

In any event as the instructions given to the business office in this matter have not been fulfilled this motion is, at best, premature. For that reason alone, other good ones notwithstanding, this motion should be withdrawn and if not voted soundly down again.

Lyle Craver: Vote No. (a) This was agreed at the AGM to be discussed further in the GL - so where's the discussion, (b) this is yet another precipitate move done without the analysis the Governors were promised when the original motion was passed. Troy simply saying '235 Tournament Memberships nation-wide' does not amount to analysis in my books.

In the AGM minutes Mr. Keshet is quoted as saying he was discouraged by the Business Office from sending addresses for tournament members - surely this defeats the whole purpose of having the tournament membership class? Isn't the main point of having tournament members being so we can market to them and encourage them to take out regular (i.e. O and J) memberships?

When the whole idea of the Tournament Membership was raised the Governors were promised statistics concerning how many such memberships were sold and by province. Now Bunning and Stockhausen want to greatly increase the cost of a tournament membership without these statistics being released. Have these statistics even been collected? One year ago Cabanas suggested it would take two years for the impact to be fully felt. To what extent has the Executive been keeping track? To me the details of when and where tournament memberships are being sold would be of great importance particularly since membership gains/losses are NOT evenly spread cross the country.

Peter Stockhausen: I know that it is still a bit early to assess the full consequences of the tournament membership, but a change upward appears necessary from a financial perspective.

Lyle Craver: Re Mr. Allan's 99-5 comments: I'm too young to have known Mr. Anderson personally, but I understood his withdrawal from active play was due to illness. Biyasas and Ivanov moved to the USA, one for a lucrative job offer the other for a far more lucrative tournament circuit which had more to do with the respective size of our two countries than anything Ottawa or New Windsor could or should have done. Actually the one case where Allan DOES have a case is with Suttles who he didn't mention! In any case Allan's comments about passports are well-taken particularly since when we are discussing players returning to their country of birth where the principle has been shown numerous times that if the second country claims them 'as their own' (e.g. with respect to military service and other issues) a Canadian passport is a thin reed to rely on. Frankly as someone who knows him well, I was surprised Yan was willing to go to Elista in the first place.

Allan does however make a number of valid points concerning Olympic selection and ratings and I would welcome motions which bring the selection rules more in line with what we actually do. I agree with him concerning the role of Governors and the AGM.

GENERAL REMARKS ON CFC BUSINESS

(i) 2001 Canadian Open Chess Championship

Grant Brown: Regarding the bid for the 2001 Canadian Open Chess Championships: I strongly oppose this bid. I don't think that the Canadian Open should be held in the same city, much less the same hotel, twice in three years. Furthermore, I resent the apparent power-politics being played by the bidders when they impose an acceptance deadline of October 31, 1999. There is no valid reason why they need to know that they have the bid some 20 months in advance of the event. It seems the only reasons for imposing the deadline are to pre-empt other bids, to pre-empt discussion of the details of the proposal by the governors, and to force the friendly Executive's hand. I understand that my own bid for the 2000 Canadian Open received a fair bit of rather small-minded fussing over details at the AGM before it was finally accepted -- in spite of the fact that we had already secured \$25,000 in funding (which is, you might say, \$26,000 more than the 2001 bid, and \$29,000 more than the 1999 bid). Surely if the governors feel this strongly about examining bids for the Canadian Open, then they should be permitted to have their say before any bid is accepted. But what bothers me the most about this bid is that it requests a subsidy from the CFC of \$1000. I don't think it is appropriate for the CFC to be expending (i.e. making a net loss of) \$1000 on a Canadian Open at any time, but especially not when the organizer is hosting the event at the very hotel which he manages.

The 1999 Canadian Open evidently went well enough that the hotel wants our repeat business; indeed, I understand the hotel made upwards of \$100,000 in sales from the event. To me, this bid smacks of a conflict of interest which is, to put it diplomatically, almost Prime Ministerial.

Peter Stockhausen: 2001 Canadian Open Chess Championship and Grant Brown's Comments:

"...the Canadian Open should not be held...in the same city twice in three years.."

Actually, if you consider the Canadian Open also a promotional and advertising tool for the enhancement of chess in the various regions of Canada, then this argument is faulty. Marketing and Sales research have shown that repeated "hits" within a short time frame, yield very positive results. There can be no doubt, that the "double" of '94 and '97 in Winnipeg has greatly helped chess in general in Manitoba. This of course only holds true if the tournament is considered by a substantial majority of participants as high quality event.

...."much less the same hotel.."

Is most likely another faulty argument. If the majority considers the first site of good all around quality, then why tinker with "success", particularly when similar quality sites are not available at reasonable costs.

"...apparent power-politics being played by the bidders....There is no valid reason why they need to know that they have the bid 20 months in advance."

Again, this is faulty reasoning on a number of fronts:

1, Medium size convention hotels have certain tentative to definitive booking parameters, depending on a variety of circumstances. In this case 19 months is just about acceptable.

2, Having been involved in a few Canadian Opens, my own guideline are actually 24 months advance certainty. So reducing it to 19 months is the maximum compromise that I personally am willing to accept. More time simply assures that a reasonably good job can be done, even in an absolutely "have not province" like BC (Chess wise I mean). The USCF for example requires 36 months lead time for 1 US Open bids.

No power politics here.

"..preempt discussion of the details of the bid by the Governors.."

How can it preempt discussion? The details of the bid are published in GL#1. So any comments can be submitted for GL#2 and published in it. No doubt, the Executive will take guidance from those comments.

"But what bothers me the most about this bid is that it requests a subsidy from the CFC of \$1000. I don't think it is appropriate for the CFC to be expending (i.e. making a net loss of) \$1000 on a Canadian Open at any time,..."

1, Please have a look at what the Organizers provide at no cost to the CFC for this event and assign a monetary value to this "in kind" compensation.. Then add the profit from about \$15,000 revenue from book and equipment sale. And once you enter into the equation the benefits of new CFC members attracted by the event, you might come to the conclusion that the \$1,000 is a prudent investment.

2, Why would you be opposed to having the national federation invest 0.3% of it's annual revenue into the Canadian Open when at the same time you support to have a provincial federation expend 20% or even more of it's annual revenue on the same event?

“..but especially not when the organizer is hosting the event at the very hotel which he manages.

The 1999 Canadian Open evidently went well enough that the hotel wants our repeat business; indeed, I understand the hotel made upwards of \$100,000 in sales from the event. To me, this bid smacks of a conflict of interest which is, to put it diplomatically, almost Prime Ministerial.”

You have obviously decided to ignore my request sent to you on September 24th with copy to the Executive and have decided to let these statements stand for general publication in GL#2.

I find these statements highly offensive and defamatory. They publicly assault my reputation .

The GL is designed for Governors to exchange views and debate actions designed to further the cause of promoting chess in Canada from a national perspective. The GL is not a vehicle for personal attacks on integrity, honesty and decency.

For the record, I have been a Governor of the CFC for almost eighteen (18) years. As you know, I am (since more than two (2) years) the Treasurer of the CFC. All of course, on a volunteer basis. As a Hotel General Manager for well over twenty (20) years I have pursued my profession in six different provinces of Canada in a number of large corporations.

I ask you to:

1, instruct the Secretary of the CFC to strike the above quoted portions of your comments from the GL #2 by October 12th 1999, and copy me on the instruction

2, write an unequivocal letter of apology and retraction of the above statements to me no later than October 12th 1999 with copies to all CFC Governors via e-mail, or regular postal service, as maybe applicable.

I would also ask the Secretary to publish these to items in full in GL#3.

I appreciate if you attend to this matter by the time indicated. Please rest assured that I do not wish this issue to escalate any further than absolutely necessary.

Peter Stockhausen
Treasurer
CFC

David Ottosen: I can only echo Grant Browns comments about the nit picking of the governors about every detail of the Canadian Open 2000 bid. I find it amazing that after all the continual talk for the last 10 (20? 50?) years about the #1 priority of the CFC being to find sponsorship and get some money into chess, the biggest concern for governors is whether the tournament will be held downtown or at the University. Had I been at the governors meeting, I would have been sorely tempted to discuss with the other committee members the idea of withdrawing the bid.

Phil Haley : " Nit picking" is far from the appropriate terminology. Governors participating in the annual meeting do so with the best interests of Canadian chess at heart and constructive discussion is valuable. We have had a number of Canadian Opens that left a lot to be desired. The governors have an obligation to ensure that future Canadian Opens are high quality ones. This does not mean that a University site is not acceptable, only that if a University site is selected, it should be a quality one. The first Canadian Open was at Redpath Library at McGill University and this was an excellent site. The same holds true for the Canadian Open held at Grant Hall at Queen's University. It is my understanding from the discussion that the University of Alberta site will also be a high quality one. The Canadian Opens in Winnipeg organized by Peter Stockhausen set a high standard that we should strive to maintain.

Lyle Craver: During the presentation of the Edmonton Canadian Open bid there was a strong philosophical difference between Messrs. Quiring and Mr Haley concerning the type of event the Canadian Open should be. I think there's a role for both types of events and I'm not convinced the two gentlemen agree. This needs to be discussed at the Governors.

(ii) 2000 CYCC

The Rules for the 2000 Canadian Youth Championship Cycle

National Championships (2000 Canadian Open in Edmonton)

Date: The tournament will run from Wednesday July 5th to Friday July 7th, 2000.

Tournament Format:

- 1) Six-round Swiss System tournament.
- 2) Time control will be 40/90 SD/60 for the U10, U12 and U14 sections. 40/120 SD/60 for the U16 and U18.
- 3) Players will be required to play by all C.F.C. regular rated rules.

If there is a tie for any of the top three positions overall and/or the top three positions among the Boys and/or the Girls, the tie will be broken by:

- a. Two 15-minute games if two are tied.
- b. Single Round-Robin 15-minute games if 3 or 4 are tied.
- c. Left to TD discretion if more are tied.

Should the players still be tied, a series of more 5-minute matches in a similar format will be held until the tie is finally broken. The top boys and top girls from each age group will qualify for the World Championship in their age group (up to three boys and three girls per age group if FIDE allows).

- 4) The tournament will be rated regular C.F.C.

Entry Fee: \$150 per participant.

Who Qualifies:

- 1) The top three boys and the top three girls in each age category at the provincial/territorial championships will qualify. The qualifiers as mentioned above have until Monday May 15th, 2000 at 4:00 EST submit their entry to the business office.
- 2) The top 7 boys and the top 3 girls from the April 4th, 2000 CFC rating list will be by registered letter and will have until May 15th, 2000 to submit their entry to the business office.
- 3) The total number of spots per age category is capped at 40. Any spots still available after May 15th will be awarded to individuals from the Tuesday May 16th, 2000 rating list. Registered letters will go out May 16th and the individuals will have until June 1st to submit their entry fee to the office. For example: if an age category has 2 spots open, 2 letters will go out.
- 4) After June 1st, available spots will be awarded on a first come first serve basis until June 23rd. After this date, no other entries will be accepted.

What the CFC will provide:

- 1) Trophies to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd place finishers in each age and gender category.
- 2) All participants will receive T-shirts.
- 3) Invitations to the World Championships will be given out to the top 3 finishers in each age and gender category.
- 4) The 1st place winner in each category and the top finishing girl will have their flight to the World Championship paid for by the CFC.
- 5) The 2nd and 3rd place boys and girls finishers will receive invitations to the Worlds but must pay their own way. No other invitations to the Worlds will be sent.

Provincial Championships:

Provincial Championships details (i.e.: dates, entry fees, who qualifies, etc.) are to be the Provincial organization's discretion.

Fees submitted to the CFC:

\$7 per CFC member and \$10 per non-CFC member.

What the CFC will provide:

- 1) Medals to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd place boys and girls finishers. There will only be 1 medal provided for each of the top three, therefore playoffs (if needed) must be run. These playoffs will also be necessary to determine the representatives to the CYCC finals.
- 2) Information packages for each of the top three finishers indicating the entry fee and deadlines for the National Championship.

3) Regular rating of the tournament.

Regional/City Championships

Fees submitted to the CFC:

\$3 per CFC member and \$6 per non-CFC member

What the CFC will provide:

- 1) Buttons personalized for each tournament, certificates for the provincial qualifiers from each event and colour flyers for the tournament to advertise their event (all this is provided we receive the information on the event at least 3 weeks before it is to take place).
- 2) Regular rating of the tournament.

From the Junior Coordinator:

1. We seek the help of all the governors in all the provinces and territories to help us with the CYCC 2000 by naming provincial coordinators for all the provinces. These coordinators will be responsible to coordinating local qualifiers and provincial finals. We would also like to see the following scheduling of the events:
 - a. Region / City qualifiers during December - February.
 - b. Provincial events during March - Early April.
2. Please note that we do take special interest in promoting chess among girls and we would like the governors feedback on the new format.
3. We would also like to hear the governors' feedback regarding the rating of CYCC 2000 and the rating of junior events in general. Please refer to previous proposals, discussions and motions.

Joshua Keshet, CFC Junior Coordinator

(iii) Comments on CYCC Issues

Grant Brown: There was a fair bit of self-congratulation going on in GL#1 over the success of the 1999 CYCC. Certainly, it was better attended than I, personally, had been expecting -- and a good thing, too. But I suggest it is too early to claim any kind of victory yet. 100 or so players, in 6 age categories, from a country the size of Canada, is still not stellar performance; and it is difficult to say to what extent the CFC was simply reaping the crops that AEM had sown the past few years. To keep the ball rolling in the coming years, the CFC still has its work cut out for it. For example, we still don't know how or when the Canadian Junior (Under 20) is going to be decided for the coming year. Traditionally, the tournament has been held over Christmas-New Years, and provincial representatives had to be selected in the Fall. The Alberta Chess Association still doesn't know whether to proceed with our provincial championships this Fall, or whether the Junior will be incorporated into the CYCC next year, in which case it would make more sense to crown our champions in the Spring of 2000. The lack of organization and communication on this front from the CFC does not inspire confidence.

Lyle Craver: I found Mr. Keshet's junior report very valuable but disagree with his point I. Which essentially basically suggests that no event can be successful outside Ontario and Quebec - I assume neither the last Canadian Junior Championship or Canadian Open are included in this! In other words I don't think it's fair to say the present CYCC format is the only format capable of success.

I strongly question the wisdom of inviting Mr. Berube (or other FQE executive members) to take part in the CYCC event - certainly on any national level.

Martin Jaeger: There is no valid reason not to hold the under 20 junior along with the rest of the youth tournament. The argument that holding it separately allows players to participate in another age group tourney also, is not logical since we accept that a player will not play in both under 18 and under 16.

Martin Jaeger: Recently, Mr. Rutherford has circulated an initiative in favour of recognition of Northern Ontario as a zone for qualification for the Youth Championships. It is difficult to judge the matter since the current rules are unpublished. However, integrating activities of Southern and Northern Ontario has proved difficult for the OCA because of distances. I suggest that Mr. Rutherford be given a sympathetic ear, and accordingly **I move the following for straw vote:** "That for Closed Events with no upper bound on entry numbers, Northwestern Ontario be allowed to name an entry."

Halldor Palsson: I asked the CFC office to verify the claims made by John Rutherford on participation in Northern Ontario children's tournaments. The reply I got was: "The total number of participants from John Rutherford tournaments in last years CYCC is 0. Total

number of participants from the "P" postal code (which is very large) [was] 43 plus 5 to the Ontario finals. These came from two tournaments, one in Sault Ste Marie and Red Lake, neither had anything to do with John".

Whether NWOCL should be a separate region for CYCC purposes can be debated. The real problem here is with John Rutherford. We all know he ran tournaments for children last year but this was outside the CYCC and the CFC. If between 400-500 children participate in NWOCL CYCC events and are paid for to the CFC according to the rules, I would favour giving the Junior Coordinator the mandate to add a maximum of two-four spots in each age category to a NWOCL CYCC zone, if it gets created.

(iv) The Rating of Junior Events

Tom O'Donnell: By far the most revealing part of the Latest GL is the "interesting" way that the CFC Executive has circumvented the Governors. I of course refer to the "reworking" of the supposedly dead 99-6. First, the Business Office, with or without Executive approval, starts rating Active tournaments as Regular in certain Junior events. Why? We are never told. Then two members of the same Executive attempt to pass a motion (99-6) to justify their behaviour, or perhaps only the behaviour of the office staff; this point is not clear. Again, we are left in the dark as to why. This motion looks like it will be soundly defeated at the Annual General Meeting. The mover, a member of the Executive, withdraws the motion. Democracy, through the voice of the Governors, has spoken. But wait! Now we come to "Keeping Governors Informed" on the bottom of the inside front cover of the GL. "The Executive has made the following decisions:

Executive Motion Stockhausen/Bunning: All pure Junior and Scholastic tournaments will be regular rated unless 50% of the participants are over 1500 or the time control is less than 30 minutes per player per game. Motion carried unanimously."

Incredible. The same two movers of 99-6 decide to circumvent the process by introducing a "new" motion, that looks suspiciously like the original. I assume that the title: "Keeping Governors Informed" is some kind of joke. May I suggest "Keeping Governors Informed of How Little the CFC Executive Cares About Their Opinions and the Democratic Process" would be more accurate, though not as catchy.

A number of players from the Maritimes have commented to me that the ratings there are deflated. Would it be possible for the Rating Auditor to use the recently completed Canadian Open/Canadian Closed/CYCC tournaments to calculate by how much? Rating deflation will have an impact on the ability for these areas to be properly represented in national championships, especially considering how many places are at stake in each of them.

In case any Governor out there is interested, you will find a great deal of discussion about this topic and many others on our website: www.chesstalk.com. We welcome comment from everyone.

Deen Hergott: There has been considerable discussion of Motion 99-6 in the past few GL's. More than a few people were not happy with the intention and impact of this motion, and in GL #1, 1999-2000, the last page ends either a comment from our President, Maurice Smith:

"99-6 died at the AGM and is not being reintroduced."

Why then is there a nearly identical Executive Motion being passed in the same GL on the first page (under the heading "Keeping Governors Informed", item b))?? Does the Executive honestly believe the Governors to be such dullards as to not recognize what is happening? Maybe they are hoping that we don't read the GL?

I ask the Executive quite pointedly, "What purpose do the Governors have as a democratic body if our decisions can be overruled and reversed so easily?" Yes, the Executive has the ultimate say, but going against the Governors wishes in such a technical way, without any further discussion, seems rather backhanded at the very least.

It seems, to this Governor, that our opinions are simply not valued and all too easily dismissed...perhaps when it comes time to vote, the Executive will be more interested in them!?

On behalf of all my fellow Governors, particularly those that voted against 99-6, I expect an explanation for 99-6's "reincarnation" and a reopening for discussion of this issue which proposes substantial changes to the rating system, in many ways the backbone of tournament chess in this country, and certainly of qualification for international representation.

In recent correspondence, the CFC has been patting itself on the back for its recent foray into Junior chess - and yet, this latest decision will undoubtedly irritate and anger many of the top Juniors in the country...as has already been evidenced (see Brent Rolfe's enclosed email in GL #1). If you are interested in more evidence, check out the postings on www.chesstalk.com, a recently formed Open Forum into many topical chess issues - the matter is clearly a controversial one. There are some who believe the CFC's motivation for involvement in Junior chess is purely financial - this is a rather cynical outlook, but certainly, there seems little concern

amongst the Executive with this latest decision (against the will of the Governors) for the Junior players themselves and the effects this decision will have on them.

Does the CFC really want to risk fomenting dissension amongst our top Juniors, and their parents and coaches? This is my prediction of what will befall the CFC if the matter is not re-addressed now while it is early, but clearly the Executive "knows best" and will do what they want...consider this a warning from an ignorant Governor, and let the chips lie where they fall.

David Ottosen: Finally, while I actually am probably one of the few people in the country who did not hate 99-6, I do have serious problems with the way the CFC simply implemented it over the governors. I can accept that the Executive or the Office wants to run the CFC and have the governors be a figurehead; but I would at least like to be told that!

My next question is regarding Other Business (1). A whole section of rules replaced as "Other Business"?? Rules relating to, as Troy states on the next page, EIGHTEEN percent of CFC business? The new rules NOT attached to the GL? I have never found the old CFC active rules wanting. I have no idea what justification caused this rule to pass without due consideration.

Lyle Craver: At the Annual General Meeting this issue was discussed at length and the decision was made to refer it to the next Governors Letter. What happened? In my view a motion of this importance has no business being decided by the Executive alone, particularly since such a change is not a pressing and urgent matter that requires a rapid response.

(iv) Other Issues

Lyle Craver: It is good to see the President has taken note of the importance of volunteers. I've long felt it was amazing we have as many TDs and organizers as we do given how the CFC neglects them. While I appreciate Mr. O'Donnell's comments I have to say masters get a lot more respect than tournament directors and I hope the President's remarks are a sign of good things to come.

Martin Jaeger: My thanks and congratulations to the Secretary for his fine and prompt AGM minutes. However, please number the pages in the GL. Also could the Treasurer detail 1998/99 event support, even at this late date?

Lyle Craver: The present layout of the website rating lists needs to be changed to make them more useful to tournament directors - it is not reasonable for the CFC to expect directors to process the TDLIST.TXT file which is the master list of ratings so as to have them on hand for tournaments. For major tournaments a laptop is often available - at the 1999 Keres Memorial I had the master list on the laptop while we mostly worked from the BC listing. (In 1998 I printed off the entire list which was 45 pages in 5 point type, 4 columns to a page!)

In my view two main changes need to be made: (1) players whose membership has expired need to appear on the list for a reasonable period following their expiration. Three or six months should be a reasonable period to retain someone on the list. (The way expiry dates work for 'tournament members' their rating NEVER appears on this list) (2) TDs need access to juniors' birth dates - the Business Office has previously bemoaned certain directors' failure to include this info with their membership reports. How do Troy and David expect the rest of us to help them get this info if we don't know what to ask for? Perhaps it could be available on the TDLIST.TXT if they don't feel it's necessary on the provincial lists (which is what most TDs are currently using).

A key role of TDs is to bring in new members and to renew existing members who usually renew at tournaments and thus may have a one or two month hiatus in their memberships - that's why we need to keep players on the provincial lists for a time after their expiry as a player may or may not know his own rating otherwise.

Lyle Craver: Mr. Bunning says he has made changes to the CFC Handbook - how do the governors (and others) get replacement pages to ensure their copies of the Handbook are up to date? I assume this includes Cabanas' motion concerning FIDE Active rules? [The Handbook is posted on the CFC website. Halldor Palsson]

Martin Jaeger: The current framework for the CFC is provided by constitution, and by bylaws, adopted motions, executive decisions, and presidential rulings with continuing force. I suggest that any new edition of the Handbook should include all of the above.

Martin Jaeger: The Closed attracted 26 players, less I think than had been anticipated by the Executive. I think financial considerations are involved. By and large the event had little support from either the CFC or provincial associations, and I think the results favour financing the event largely by CFC and provincial associations rather than by the players, and making the event more attractive by making it also serve as a team qualifier.

This year the CFC provided \$3000 (or was it \$4000) on support to the Canadian Open. That support was decided on during the presidency during which losses of \$32,000 were experienced. The zero support for the Closed was decided on after the \$32,000 loss had been reported.

Supporting the Closed is more difficult if it is an annual event. On several occasions (if I do not misinterpret him) Mr. Haley has asserted that an annual FIDE championship cycle requires that we hold the Canadian Championship annually. Even if FIDE has an annual cycle I believe that we should hold the Canadian Zonal biennially with the winner eligible for the FIDE event till the next Zonal is held. If there is some insurmountable barrier to this, perhaps Mr. Haley could cite it.

Phil Haley: "Contrary to Mr. Jaeger's recollection, I never have asserted that FIDE requires the Zonal to be held yearly although I favor this approach. As Canada is a separate zone, we can make our own decision but in my opinion we should be happy to run the Canadian Zonal on a yearly basis as long as the World Championship Knockout event continues on a yearly basis. GM Lesiege won the recent Zonal and has now qualified to represent Canada in the year 2000 World Knockout Championship that will be held in November/December 2000 in Hong Kong, Dortmund or Sun City. I would suggest that the CFC would want to hold their next Zonal in 2001 to qualify the winner for the 2001 World Knockout Championship. This would, in fact, in this instance, be two years from the just concluded Zonal. However, I would suggest that from that time on, we would want to have a Zonal every year to qualify for that year's World Knockout Championship. The Zonal provides excellent opportunities for obtaining titles and I would suggest that the Zonal and the Canadian Open are both premier events that we should strive to organize on a yearly basis.

Lyle Craver: As a BC Governor (and a small businessman to whom mail order is very important in my "day job") I disagree with Mr. Vail that 7-10 days (longer outside the major centers) is an acceptable delivery time. If he prefers Canada Post to UPS, has he explored the Canada Post ExpressPost prepaid products? We use them all the time quite successfully to many of our customers throughout Canada. These cost \$3-7 based on size and region with discounts available for volume.

Martin Jaeger: The preface to the Laws of Chess recognizes that judgment is to be exercised by Arbiters. This results in different judgments on the same set of facts being possible. I suggest that the Appeal Committee's mandate should be restricted so as to not include reversal of reasonable decisions by an Arbiter/Appeals Committee. I suggest (and will formally propose later) that the NAC process comprise two parts.

Question 1) - Is the existing ruling reasonable (even if some individuals on the NAC might have made an alternative ruling)?

Question 2) - If so, how should the ruling be altered?

In my opinion only if all members of a 3 person panel of 4 or more members of a 5 member panel find the existing decision unreasonable should the ruling be altered.

Martin Jaeger: Mr. Allan has suggested that the rule involving a penalty if someone withdraws non promptly from a team is obsolete. This suggestion I believe is wrong. Other people should not be made to scramble. The rule is not hopelessly flawed. It can be mended.

Mr. Allan also suggests that matches should be rateable for team selection purposes with the Executive or the rating auditor given the right to decline to have a match rated. Apparently, nothing is difficult if someone else has to take the flak (or faces the suit). Incidentally, running the rating machine twice - once with files for matches included and once without files for matches is not difficult in this era of computers.

RATING AUDITOR'S RULING on the 1999 CYCC Rating Complaint.

I will divide my response in two parts. The first part is my formal ruling as Rating Auditor. The second part will comprise of general comments and recommendations.

Rating Auditor's Ruling:

1) The tournaments in question are:

199906016 1999/05/08 ON <http://www.chess.ca/crosstables/199906016.html> CYCC Ontario Prov Champ U18
199906015 1999/05/08 ON <http://www.chess.ca/crosstables/199906015.html> CYCC Ontario Prov Champ U16
199906014 1999/05/08 ON <http://www.chess.ca/crosstables/199906014.html> CYCC Ontario Prov Champ U14
199906013 1999/05/08 ON <http://www.chess.ca/crosstables/199906013.html> CYCC Ontario Prov Champ U12
199906012 1999/05/08 ON <http://www.chess.ca/crosstables/199906012.html> CYCC Ontario Prov Champ U10

2) The nature of the dispute:

The tournaments in question were rated regular by the Executive Director even though an active time control of game/30 was used. In addition some of the players could have felt that to rated active only to find out after the event that it was rated regular. This claim is based on that the pre tournament publicity indicated "all players will receive a CFC rating" without specifying if this rating was regular or active.

3) The Relevant Regulation:

711. Rateable Tournaments. To be rated under the CFC "standard" rating system the maximum game time must be at least 120 minutes. To be rated under the CFC Active rating system the maximum game time must be at least 50 minutes but less than 120 minutes.

There may be many complicated time controls. The intention is to stick to the maximum game time. Non sudden death time controls shall not have a rate of play exceeding one move per minute. For both rating systems, all secondary time controls must be a minimum of 5 minutes long.

All games in a tournament should fit the same category. All time controls of a tournament must be advertised and/or posted prior to the tournament. Any Active rated tournament must be advertised as such prior to the tournament.

The Executive Director has discretion to accept or refuse any tournament for rating where the intent of this rule has not been followed. [see Motion 90-11, as amended, GL, September 1990, p. 1-13 - 1-14]

4) The Remedy Sought:

A ruling has been requested from myself as Rating Auditor.

5) My Ruling:

The rating of the tournaments in question as Regular will stand.

6) Rationale:

The relevant regulation gives the Executive Director the discretion "to accept or refuse any tournament for rating where the intent of this rule has not been followed." This discretionary authority was granted to the Executive Director by a motion of the Assembly of Governors in 1990 and has been in force since then. This is simply a case where the Executive Director used this discretionary authority. As a consequence of this section 711 of the CFC Handbook was not violated. I must also add that any claim that the players were not informed in advance whether the tournament was to be rated regular or active cannot be used as a valid argument against rating regular, it is however a possible claim against rating the tournament active. This is due to the following portion of section 711: "Any Active rated tournament must be advertised as such prior to the tournament." There is no such requirement for regular rated events.

7) Subsequent Event:

The CFC Executive passed the following motion:

Stockhausen/Bunning. All pure Junior and Scholastic tournaments will be regular rated unless 50% of the participants are over 1500 or the time control is less than 30 minutes per player per game.

The primary impact of this motion is to restrict the Executive Director's discretion under 711 in the case of pure Junior and Scholastic tournaments. In the case at hand the 199906016 1999/05/08 ON <http://www.chess.ca/crosstables/199906016.html> "CYCC Ontario Prov Champ U18" would have to be rated active if this had been in force at the time. While 199906015 1999/05/08 ON <http://www.chess.ca/crosstables/199906015.html> "CYCC Ontario Prov Champ U16" would have barely qualified for regular rating with 5 out of 12 players over 1500. However this motion was not in effect at the time of the events in question.

Francisco Cabañas
Rating Auditor

General Comments and Recommendations:

This first thing that comes to mind here is that a time control of game/30 min is really inappropriate for a Provincial or Territorial Championship regardless of the age group of the participants. This is an entirely separate question than whether the tournament should be rated regular or active. I will make the following analogy. The fact the we rate an adult tournament consisting of game/60 min under the regular rating system does not mean that game/60 min is a reasonable time control for the Ontario Closed. A reasonable time control for example would be 40/90 game/60 for the U18 and U16 and 30/60 game/60 for the U14, U12 and U10. Slower if possible

for the older age groups. If a Province or Territory really wants to prepare their players for the National Finals they should use the same time controls as in the National Finals which is even slower than what I have suggested above.

When it comes to Junior or Scholastic events that are not Provincial/Territorial or Canadian Championships then the use of game/30 time control together with rating the event regular is in many but not all cases very appropriate.

I will digress here to make some observations about the rating system and the necessary compromises that are inherent in it at all levels of play. If we consider the basic rating formula: $R_n = R_o + K (S - S_x)$ (R_n is the new rating, R_o is the old rating S is the score and S_x is the expected score) we find that the parameter K controls the relative weight given to the most recent results. A small K produces an average over more games and is suitable for players whose ratings change slowly. For example Adult players rated over 2400. Here the emphasis is on accuracy at the expense of detecting change. The quality as opposed to the quantity of the data is paramount. A strict requirement on time controls for example in this case a very useful. The CFC uses a $K=16$ and FIDE uses $K=10$ in this case. A large K on the other hand emphasizes the most recent results at the expense of accuracy. This is suitable for a player whose ratings change fast. For example players under the age of 10 rated under 800. Here the emphasis must be on obtaining the most recent data in order to detect change even at the expense of accuracy or quality of data. If we try to average over many games or exclude lower quality data for example games played at game/30 we will actually in many cases end up with a less accurate result. For example consider a player who at the age of 9 obtains a CFC rating of 500 in by playing in an event at game/60. In the following 9 months this player plays in a series of game/30 events and improves to a strength of say 1000. This is not unreasonable for this kind of player. If we discard the game/30 results we will end up with a very inaccurate CFC regular rating of 500 when the player's strength at game/60 is closer to 1000. On the other hand including the game/30 results will result in a CFC rating of 1000 which is closer to the true strength of the player. If we come back to our adult rated over 2400 it is very unlikely that this player has become 2600 let alone the never achieved rating of 2900 the over a period of 9 months so we need not concern ourselves with including game/30 events in order to measure the latest performance of our strong adult player.

I will now deal with the Executive motion. The impact of this motion on the rating system is to include the lower quality data (game/30 results) that was in many cases discarded while only targeting the very group of players where the benefits outweigh the possible disadvantages (low rated juniors). The concept is fundamentally sound, is certainly very workable and practical, and will lead to more accurate ratings. I will add that when dealing with young juniors it is particularly important to use only one rating system because of the potential for rapid change in the player's strength over a relatively short period of time.

I will close by mentioning what the USCF does when it comes ratings. They use two rating systems. Regular for games/30 and faster and quick for game/10 to game/29.

They also use different K s for a given player depending on the time control by having certain tournaments designated as "1/2K" and "1/4K". This allows the inclusion of "lower quality data" at a lower weight. A more interesting result is that the USCF has over 80000 members with a very large Junior / Scholastic contingent. This makes their per capita membership rate more than twice that of the CFC and FQE combined in Canada. It is fair to say that rating certain Junior tournaments under the regular rating system even though they played at game/30 may well have other benefits for the CFC apart from just improving the accuracy of the rating system.

Francisco Cabañas

