

QC Agenda Krakow, Poland 2011

Minutes of Preliminary Meeting of Councillors Staunton Hotel, London, 13/14 Sep, 2011

Day 1, 12 noon to 6pm 13th Sep

Present MikkoMarkkula, Chairman (MM)
Nick Faulks, Secretary (NF)
AndrzejFilipowicz (AF)
Stewart Reuben (SR)
Werner Stubenvoll (WS)

1. Report since Khanty-Mansiysk

1.1 Titles awarded since Khanty-Mansiysk

To be sent later

1.2 Chess in School Ratings

Two meetings held in Athens. A separate rating system proposed for Chess in Schools Commission. Ratings are not (at least yet) connected to FIDE ratings, although they are suggested to be shown in queries from the data base, these ratings are specially marked.

MM reported on the above meetings. QC will be ready to consider a CIS proposal if one appears in Krakow, preferably with advance notice.

1.3 Future FIDE Rating System

Contest (Kaggle) to find the best solutions. Rating Experts' meeting postponed

See 5.2 and 5.3 below.

2. Titles

2.1 List of titles applied for, but not approved since Khanty-Mansiysk

To be sent later

2.2 1.42f Interpretation

Conditions for approving interim results to be decided: RR tournaments where achieving of an interim result requires special order of games played. DRR where the applicant meets the required titled opponents only once Special cases Czonka Attila HUN HeydarliKanan AZE

AF felt that the wording of 1.42f remains unclear, we shall review this. NF is opposed in general to RR norms before the conclusion of the event, this will be considered in major changes for 2012. Random drawing of lots is covered by Tournament Rules, but these are not mandatory. NF and WS felt that they should be mandatory where title norms are achieved. We shall consider whether the DRR rule needs further tightening.

2.3 Swiss Pairing Systems allowed for Titles

Should the pairing in Swiss system tournaments be regulated, if title results are wanted. Special case: Using 3-1-0 points for pairing is very different from 1-1/2-0 for title result purposes.

Several councillors are nervous of 3-1-0 tournaments being accepted for title norms, or even ratings. After long discussion it was agreed that, since there have been so few so far (that we know of) these will be accepted while the results are studied. NF warned that, if the format

increases in popularity, this decision will be very hard to reverse.

The scoring is one of several additional pieces of information which should be included in the tournament registration.

2.4 Title applications

The comments by the QC Chairman will be sent closer to the congress.

3. Matters concerning Title Regulations

3.1 Direct titles

3.1.1 Competitions giving titles

The list of competitions, especially regional competitions giving titles to be reviewed. FM titles awarded in youth competitions?

It was agreed that the direct titles and norms offered by subdivisions of continents should be of lower status than those from continental competitions. NF will produce a suggested revised schedule, to be considered in 2012. Some guidelines were discussed, for both adult and junior events.

3.1.2 CM Titles

The CM titles awarded based on various competitions to be reviewed. Special case: Anna Matlin (too few participants).

See 3.1.1 above. The Matlin case was discussed in detail, it was felt that the organizer had acted incorrectly. MM said that he had dealt with the issues relating to the 2009 North American Regional tournament.

3.2 Tournament Composition for GM/IM Norms

There are proposals to change the regulations, also to change the floor where the lowest opponent can be raised, now depending on the title applied.

These will be put to the QC in Krakow, but the meeting saw little to recommend them.

3.3 Old Regulations, Relevance to Current Applications

Some applications include norms from old competitions. The regulations at the time of the competitions are not found easily. So far, the QC Chairman has checked the old norms. The QC Chairman has tried to create a complete history of changes in regulations.

MM reported that this work is ongoing, and progress is being made. He will provide some interim documentation in Krakow.

The councillors are unhappy that the QC still has to check very old norms when title applications are received. It was suggested that there should be a deadline for federations to register norms more than ten years old, after which they will no longer be accepted. This will be discussed in Krakow. Federations will have to be given fair notice of this.

The words "applied retrospectively" should have been added to 1.24, notes d and e, but that has not happened. Once this has been addressed, federations must be made aware that many players are now eligible for FM and CM titles based on old Olympiad performances. The difficulty of ensuring that federations are aware of such news was discussed, a QC website might be helpful. Even in the absence of this, an easily accessed FAQ list would be helpful.

3.4 Rates of play

From the documents it is impossible to see which time controls were used. Some tournaments may have been reported as using approved time controls and played with the old controls used for that tournament through years. In some federations (especially US) different times can be used in different round in a tournament, in some cases the branches played at different rates in the first rounds merge later in the tournament. Special case; 40 moves in 2h, SD/1h in the US, is Bronstein system allowed?

NF commented that since the tournament registration form was devised several additional pieces of information had become relevant. He will draft a revised version.

For tournaments taking advantage of the faster time controls acceptable when there is no participant above a given rating, we need to check that the condition is fulfilled. There may be a registration problem with tournaments where the highest competitor's rating cannot be known in advance.

SR felt that title norms should only be available when all games in any single round are played using the same time control. This will be put forward as the councillors' recommended interpretation of 1.42g. The question of whether all rounds must follow the same time control for title purposes will be discussed in Krakow.

There was long discussion of the acceptance of title norms from events using delay mode (Bronstein). The recommendation is that these should not be disqualified for tournaments starting before 1st September 2011. This is seen as a major dispensation, and it is hoped that federations which benefit will respond by adhering strictly to all regulations after that date.

3.5 Removal of Players from Rating List

For different reasons federations ask players to be removed from the rating list. What should FIDE do, the players are still active, they have rating, but no federation pays for them? Special case: India has another national association whose players have been asked to be removed. Some players have wanted their ratings or personal data to be removed.

The councillors are all troubled by the events in India, where the federation has removed a group of its players from the FIDE rating list. They appear to have the right to do so, but the Commission will be asked in Krakow whether it wishes formally to express its disquiet regarding the issue. There are other cases of lower profile.

A few players have expressed a desire to have their personal data (age, sex) kept confidential. The ramifications of this will be investigated.

The question of players returning to the list after long inactivity was discussed. Further consideration is required.

3.6 No service federations players in tournaments

The players invited may have "lost" the rating after the invitation. The ratings are available from the FIDE office, but cause extra work. FIDE should charge the organiser (or player) for this. The players are often ready to pay something, if their federation is in arrears.

The councillors felt that it is reasonable to charge an "inconvenience fee".

3.7 No service federations title applications

Should no service federation application be handled when they are in no service status?

It seemed clear to all that they should not, what else does "no service" mean? The player may

apply personally.

3.8 Players registered to organizing federation

To enter the results to the FIDE rating server, the organizer has to register the new players, the organizer can only register players to the organizing federation. Thus the players get registered with wrong federation, to correct this is often very difficult. FIDE rating office might have a solution for this?

A problem is also that, as far as I know, there is only one ID per federation to the server, this causes some delay in some cases.

It is believed that it should be possible for players to be registered automatically to their home federations, though there is anecdotal evidence that this is not so easy. The question will be discussed with Elista.

Multiple IDs per federation is a difficult issue, with arguments both ways.

3.9 Players banned by their federations

What to do with players who have been banned by their federations, we do not have an international database of banned players (as in some other sports).

The councillors did not see how the QC could maintain or police such a list, but nor did they feel that it is the QC's problem.

3.10 Titles (FM/WFM) not applied by the federations, other players harmed

This is related to the previous item. This is harming other players very often, as the rating 2300+ (2100+) is not any more worth FM (WFM) as it used to be. The requirement of having at least 50 percent of opponents to be title holders is often depending on this. Should it be possible to have the applicant (or the applicant's federation) pay for having the opponent considered as a titled player (not award the title).

SR suggested that the applicant needing the titled opponent should be able to pay an incremental fee, possibly as high as the fee for the relevant title. The opponent would then, for the sole purpose of the application, be regarded as having the necessary title. This would confer no benefit upon the second player. This idea will be discussed in Krakow.

3.11a Penalty fees for late applications should be same before PB and congress

For the moment, there is a 50/100 percent surcharge for late applications before congress, such rule is not for applications sent to the PB meetings. There should be a penalty for late applications, two months before is a bit too long nowadays, the deadlines should be refined, and also the penalties.

This was agreed as a proposal.

3.11b Penalty fee should be waived, if the last norm is so late that dead lines cannot be met.

To be discussed, there is also a view that such applications should be carried over to the next period.

3.12 Penalties for late reporting of tournaments

The late tournament reports cause a mess. The titles may be depending on ratings, the missed report may change the situation so that the title awarded should not have been awarded, or vice versa. There has to be a significant penalty for late reports to get rid of them.

NF expressed the view that the new, tighter timings for submission of reports puts great pressure on ratings officers, particularly those keen to carry out full checks. The principle has the unanimous support of councillors, the details must be worked out. Perhaps more onerous requirements should be placed on top level events.

3.13 Rating of Tournaments Registered Late

The regulations require tournaments to be registered at least 30 days before the start. A lot of tournaments are registered late, some even after the tournament. Can the tournaments registered after the tournament be rated? Should there be a penalty fee?

It was agreed that 30 days is much too long, and is in fact never enforced. For events without title norms, NF felt that registration any time before the start of the first round should be acceptable, MM had no problem with this. The Title Regulations could specify a different requirement.

3.14 (additional item)

There is widespread dissatisfaction with the different fees applied the rating of Swiss and RR events. This will be investigated, it is possible that the justification for any differential no long exists. It was appreciated that it may be fairer to charge more for events of higher status.

4. Matters concerning Rating Regulations

4.1 K factor issues

K factor was changed for players having fewer than 30 rated games was changed to 30 from 1.7.2011. The other K values were kept as they were earlier. No change is planned before the next amendment cycle in 2012.

WS suggested that a player's K factor should appear as part of his personal data. This was agreed by all.

SR felt that we might need higher K factors for U-18 players, or all players with rapidly changing ratings. This will be added to the ideas under consideration.

4.2 400 point rule

Maximum We should be mathematically 1.00, this means that a high rated player can only lose points in the game. Politically, the player should always be rewarded for a win. The effects need to be monitored. Postponed to the 2012 amendments if any.

To be discussed in Krakow.

4.3 Rating new players in Swiss and Round-Robin different

In round-robin tournaments a new player gets a rating even if he scores zero against rated players. In Swiss tournaments one point is needed.

The questions of reducing the score required in the first Swiss event to a half point, and of requiring the first nine rated games to take place within two years, were once again discussed, with no agreement. NF did not understand the need for at least three games to be played in the first event.

4.4 Rating of unplayed games (Proposal by Hungary)

The Hungarian federation suggests that games where one of the players does not come to play, could still be rated.

This is a technical matter, but if the drafting does indeed allow this, it should be amended. In cases where one player has willfully caused a game to be void, there should be a penalty.

5. Developing regulations

5.1 Title regulations

The title regulations are not changed now (unless there is an urgent need), but the regulations can and must be discussed in Krakow.

Agreed

5.12 New Title above GM (EGM?)

The idea of a higher title was not approved in Dresden, there is still interest to have it.

SR will review the old proposal, for which there remains enthusiasm among the councillors. This will be presented to the QC in Krakow.

5.13 Muradian's proposal to lower rating requirement, if more norms

Sevan Muradian has proposed that if the player has more norms than needed, then the rating requirement can be lowered.

There was no support for this idea.

5.2 Rating regulations

There is a plan to develop the rating system significantly in 2012 congress. The issues should be discussed in Krakow. There are some proposals to change rating regulations, they should be handled at the next amendment cycle.

Matters relating to K factors, initial ratings and the Glicko system will be discussed in a preliminary manner in Krakow. The Kaggle competition entrant chosen to present to the expert group in Athens will be known by then. Discussions after that will lead to a firm recommendation from the QC meeting in Istanbul.

5.3 Presentation by Michalis Kaloumenos on Glicko system

QC member Michalis Kaloumenos has prepared an excellent document about the Glicko rating system. He will give a presentation on Glicko system.

NF said we should agree a firm time for this presentation, otherwise there is the danger that it could get squeezed out. SR suggested that 9am to 11am on day 3 should work well, NF will confirm with FIDE that this can be inserted into the schedule.

Day 2, 9am to 12 noon, 14th Sep.

Present - as above

6. Rapid and Blitz Ratings

The PB decided in Al Ain meeting that rapid and blitz ratings will be started from 1.1.2012. The details have to be decided: Starting rating (normal rating or normal rating only for a restricted period) Rating calculation rules, Elo (K factor), Glicko or something else.

A. How will the list get started?

It was agreed that games played in events commencing on or before 31st December 2011 should not be rated. The players in games played before any decision taken in Krakow would not have been aware that their results were to be rated, and it would be quite unfair to do so retrospectively. After that, it will take some time to make federations aware of the need to register rapid and blitz tournaments.

It was also agreed that the first list should be published on 1st July 2012. Any list before then would contain too few games to be of much interest. Subsequent lists will be published on the

first of each month, in line with the main rating list. NF wondered whether lists should be produced on 1st March and 1st May, to look as if we are doing something, even though they might be of little value. The consensus was that we should not follow that course.

AF reminded the meeting that there had been a previous rapid list in the 1990s, which collapsed from lack of interest. Final ratings from that list could be used, where available, as initial ratings for this one. The consensus was that these ratings were too old to be of relevance.

There are also various national rapid lists, but it was agreed that there are inevitably too many problems with trying to use such data.

B. Rating system to be used.

It was agreed that there is no case for launching the new list using anything but the standard Elo system. SR suggested that rapid and blitz ratings should be three digits only, so 275 instead of 2750, to avoid confusion between the two. There was support for this idea, but WS pointed out that commercially available software requires a four digit number, so it was abandoned.

Colour coding in the lists might be helpful, black for standard, red for rapid, blue for blitz.

C. Initial rating.

This should be the player's established FIDE rating at the start of the first period during which he plays a rated rapid game. For players without a prior rating, initial ratings will be calculated using the existing framework.

D. K factor.

This was discussed at length. It is possible to make a case for a wide variety of parameters. The councillors' recommendation is that there should initially be only one factor for all rating levels, and that it should be 20. This is considered quite high, and will allow speedy adjustment for players whose rapid and slow play strengths are significantly different. It will also lead to large fluctuations, a single tournament could move a player's rating by over 100 points. The QC need not express a view on whether this is desirable, but FIDE must understand the point.

With a greater number of games possible in a given period, the problem of a rating "turning over" within one period needs to be addressed. The solution in cases where more than 35 (or some other number) games are played is for the new rating to be the rating performance (suitably defined) in that period.

It was stressed that the value selected for the K factor is not set in stone, and may be subject to change in the light of results. In particular, it may be too low for new players. WS has the full results of the 2011 European rapid championships, a large event, and will analyse how the proposed system would have turned out in that case.

E. General regulations.

The definition of a rapid game should be that found in the FIDE Laws of Chess, and these must be followed in all rated games.

Tournaments should be registered at least two days in advance, we shall see how this works.

The question of titles specific to rapid chess was not considered, this is for the future.

It was felt strongly that the success of this venture will depend heavily upon the level of fees being low or zero. It is understood that FIDE will be amenable to this for a period of time.

We would welcome comments from any players, and particularly professionals, either directly or through their associations.

F. Blitz Ratings

The list can be constructed in a manner identical to the rapid list, until the data suggests the need for amendment.

It was agreed that there must be a minimum length of games – ie “bullet games” will not be rated. Article 1 of Appendix B to the FIDE Laws of Chess reads “A ‘blitz game’ is one where all the moves must be made in a fixed time of less than 15 minutes for each player; or the time allotted plus 60 times any increment is less than 15 minutes. For the purpose of the Blitz rating list this will in each case be taken to read “less than 15 minutes but no less than 5 minutes”.

For clarity, games where the players have unequal times, such as Armageddon, will not be rated.

7. Other matters

Senior events. Given the increasing popularity of over 60 competitions, SR suggested that a new range of over 70 events should be added, an idea which found support. He also felt that, while Senior Chess did not need its own commission, one individual within FIDE, devoted to this area, would be very helpful. SR stressed that he was not necessarily volunteering for this position.

One federation has evidently encountered confusion as to whether the term “rating” may be construed to include a partial rating, since these are now shown for information on the website. The meeting was surprised by this, but will consider a minor wording change to Ratings Regulation 6.41. This might replace the words “against rated opponents” with “against opponents that appear in the FIDE rating list”. This will be discussed in Krakow.

There are occasions when the regulations for which the QC is responsible interact with those of other commissions, notably RTR. Better lines of communication would be helpful and, given the overlap of councillors, this should be possible to arrange.

Performance ratings / rating performances. Should the regulations specify the precise meaning of these terms, and how they should be calculated? SR has seen a suggested method of calculation which may be an improvement on those currently used. It might be included as a recommended method for tiebreak purposes.

There has been a suggestion that, where a nation’s championship tournament is composed entirely of GMs, a lesser national event might be accepted as offering title norms without the normal requirement for foreign players. This did not find favour.

There is a proposal that players who have changed federation should for a certain time continue to count in their new domicile as foreign for the purposes of title norms. This did not find favour, but will be brought up in Krakow.

It has been suggested that foreign FMs should count towards the quota of foreign titled players. This will be considered in Krakow, along with other matters relating to FMs.

SR suggested that title applications should where possible contain the email address of the player. This is not controversial and, not being a change, can be acted upon forthwith.

We have been promised that a list of unrated titled players will once again be available, but cannot find it. NF will ask Elista.

