RTRC MEETING 4-6 JUNE 2014

Minutes

Present: Geurt Gijssen (NLD) chairman, Stewart Reuben (ENG) Secretary, Councillors Franca Dapiran (ITA), Shaun Press (PNG), Ashot Vardapetian (ARM), invitees Thomas Luther (GER, Chess for the Disabled), Roberto Ricca (ITA, Systems of Pairings and Programs), observers Nigel Freeman (BER, Executive Director), Georgios Makropoulos (GRE Deputy President), Panagiotis Nikolopoulos (GRE, Arbiters Commission) all three part of the time.

1. The Chairman welcomed the members and also the visitors.
2. The matter of incorrect results and thus incorrect pairings, particularly in Swisses, was discussed. The matters of security of the results and pairings on the internet would be discussed with Heinz Herzog. The possibility of publishing interim pairings, which would be finalised at a later time, was considered. It is feared that some people would think the pairings were final and prepare accordingly. It was suggested the results be published as soon as possible and the next round pairings then only published later, giving time for the players to make corrections. Whatever system is used, the Swiss Pairings Controller needs to check the results asap.
   The matter of correction of results later is already covered in the rules. But the results must stand after the conclusion of the tournament and prize distribution.
3. The problems of coordination of regulations between different commissions need to be addressed. The work of the RTRC impinges on several commissions. The new practice of inviting members of other commissions is to be commended.
4. There is a mistake in the Varma tables where players 11 and 12 need to be transposed. Roberto would liaise with Geurt about further amendments.
5. Ashot proposed that the rates of play recommended for blitz chess in the Competition Rules be amended. It was decided to leave them as they were.
6. Tiebreak document. Much of the meeting for the rest of the day and following afternoon concerned modifying the tiebreak rules. The document to be submitted to the full RTRC, Executive Board, Presidential Board and finally the General Assembly thus provides much of the substance of the meeting.
7. Roberto presented his findings concern the efficiency of variance tiebreak systems. This is very valuable. But not everybody will necessarily have the same objectives. Take the tiebreak: the greatest number of wins. There is no reason to think this will have any great predictive value. That is not the objective; greatest number of wins (which translates to the greatest number of losses on a given scoregroup) is used to encourage people to play for a win.
   Roberto concludes that the following tiebreaks, in order, provide the ‘best’ predictive value choosing one version of tiebreak from each group: Median Bucholz; Apro; Progressive Scores; Number of wins. Median Bucholz was chosen to best represent that type of tiebreak. He was surprised, even disappointed, that Sonneborn-Berger did not list higher. Apro is an acronym for Average Performance Rating of Opponents. But using tiebreaks based on rating, as with Apro, isn’t feasible unless a very high proportion of the players in the tournament
are rated and the CA has confidence that the ratings are reliable.

8. Some tiebreaks can only be applied if the scoring system is 1, \( \frac{1}{2} \), 0, 3, 1, 0 would require modification.

9. Some will be surprised at the reappearance of Sum of Progressive Scores. But, although there are certain examples where the results will be incorrect, it scores very highly in simplicity.

10. Stewart offered the opinion that, anybody, who had won a game by default or having a win bye, had scored a tremendous advantage over somebody who had to play every game. Thus such players should be listed at the bottom of any tiebreak order. It is true that the player hadn’t chosen to win in this manner, but nor had all the other players in the competition. This system did not meet with general approval.

11. A considerable amount of time was spent discussing the implications of Roberto’s analysis of tiebreak systems. We would like to see some worked examples, especially some from real tournaments (not simulated) where people don’t play all the games. The material is too dense for the general public but, if condensed, would be welcome.

12. It was decided not to mention the implications 3/1/0 on tiebreaks, although it is realised that Sonneborn-Berger, for example, would change. \{an aside, after the meetings. If there were a large number of 3/1/0 competitions, there would have to be a separate rating list. The QC decided some years ago not to bother at that time as the numbers are small.\}

13. Each tiebreak system is finished with before going down the list. Once it has been used and the tiebreak analysis has moved on, there is no return to a previous system.

14. Roberto would provide further data about the efficacy of direct encounter.

15. It is logical that ‘greater number of blacks’ does not have a high predictive value. If a player has 6 whites and 4 blacks, he would be expected to score 5.08 against opponents of the same rating as himself. If he had 4 blacks and 6 whites his expected score would be 4.92 (based on the statistics of 54% for white). The value of greater number of blacks as a tiebreak is social, not technical. It would help diminish moaning about having more blacks.

16. The Hort System is popular. Half the prize money goes according to the tiebreak (whatever the system) and half is shared equally, among the players with the same score.

Anti-Cheating Committee

17. The report that is to be considered in Tromso was scrutinised. Our comments will mainly go back via Shaun Press, who is also a member of that committee.

18. It was noted that so far they have only been considering the urgent problem of the alleged use of computers and electronic communication devices. Some comparisons were made with such as bridge and poker which have far bigger problems in other matters. We should learn from bridge and not put players off due to the anti-cheating devices being too onerous.

19. It is not the job of the ACC to specify penalties before matters have been presented to them.

20. 11.3b of the ACC document is simply wrong.

"In tournaments open to amateur players, the prohibition to introduce electronic devices in the playing venue may, and indeed should be waived. However, under no circumstances a player shall be allowed to carry an electronic device, whether switched on or off, working or not, on his body
during play. This includes, but is not limited to, carrying a device in a bag or in the pocket of a jacket. Any player found carrying such a device shall immediately be forfeited his game, with rating points calculated. A second offence during the same tournament shall imply an immediate ban from the tournament, with the player’s name forwarded to the ACC for further investigation.”

First it says waive the rule and then that the player shall be forfeited. Since the meeting there has been some clarification. The idea is that a player can put the device in his bag probably by his chair, but never access it, nor carry it anywhere, during the game.

21. Complaints by players against others must be in writing to the arbiters in the first place.

22. The RTRC feel it is inappropriate for the ACC also to be the judging unit. Perhaps it should be a function of an arm of the Ethics Commission.

23. The RTRC observed that in some cases complaints may need to be signed on behalf of the complainant (for example, parent or head of delegation for junior players). We recommend that the guidelines protect such persons from adverse action if it is clear they have acted in good faith.

24. The RTRC discussed the difficulty of remaining incognito when inspecting an event. This was due to a probable need to liaise with the event organisers to provide access to the entire playing venue. But the Inspector does not need to give advance warning of their visit.

25. If a file is opened on a player, then it is likely the player must be told of this. Lawyers should be consulted about this.

26. Where a player is banned, the FIDE Rating List must show this. Possible AN Other B to 2018 should be shown on the site if a player is banned until 2018. Simply leaving the name off the list is inadequate. A player from a non-service federation may be confused with a proven cheat.

27. The RTRC was deeply concerned about the possibility of a player being convicted of cheating solely because of the games being a close match with the computer moves. Some analogy was made with DNA sampling.

Competition Rules

28. The draft Competition (formerly Tournament) Rules are shown as a separate attachment.

Discussion of the Regulations Regarding Disabled Players

29. The requirements are in a separate document.

30. The meeting was led by GM Thomas Luther GER who is in charge of this topic for FIDE.

31. The approximate number of federations which have organisations for players living with disabilities are:
   - IBCA  80
   - IDCA  50
   - IPCA  30

32. All the federations should be asked to communicate with FIDE and name the officer responsible for providing support for players with disabilities.

33. All organisers should be encouraged to offer lower entry fees to disabled players.

34. Stewart offered to look at the IOC Regulations for the Paralympic Games and see whether these can be amended for the IPCA.
Final Comments

35. Thomas, who left after the second day, thanked everybody for their help and felt his section of the meetings had been very productive.

36. The chairman was thanked for his work