

Report

FIDE TECHNICAL COMMISSION

Meeting Prague CZE

“Amarilis” Hotel, April 25-26, 2015

***Present:** Bharat SINGH (Chairman) Andrzej FILIPOWICZ (Secretary), Sultan AL TAHER, Chanda NSAKANYA, Jan MAZUCH and Roberto RICCA*

Agenda for the FIDE Technical Commission

TEC Meeting, Prague CZE, April 25-26, 2015

10:00-13.00 and 15:00-20:00

Chairman: Bharat Singh

Secretary: Andrzej Filipowicz

1. Opening by chairman
 - a) Final text of the Separate Chapter of the Technical matters in the FIDE Handbook & Website Including Tournament hall requirements
 - b) Chess equipments
 - c) Internet Broadcast
 - d) Guidelines on treatment of disabled chess players
 - e) Electronic scoresheet – remarks and recommendation
 - f) Testing of chess clocks - procedure
2. The proposal of the Hungarian CF regarding the tie-break system of Olympiads.
3. Tie-break system in FIDE and Continental events –remarks of Mr. R. Anantharam of India and the official proposal to the FIDE PB
4. The theory of the FIDE tie-break system was removed from the FIDE Rules of Chess and we have to publish in the Technical matters as a separate chapter.
5. Miscellaneous – Committee for the Tie-break system

Report FIDE TECHNICAL COMMISSION

1. **Chairman** Bharat Singh welcomed the participants of the meeting and introduced details of Agenda.
2. **The Commission** once again passed throughout the proposed Chapter of the Technical matters be published in the FIDE Handbook & Website (see TEC Tromso Annex 1). After discussion TEC decided to wait for remarks of the FIDE Presidential Board be held at the end of April 2015 in China and the to make corrections.

TEC discussed the electronic scoresheet and expressed the opinion, that this scoresheet requires the further to more investigation regarding the cheating and price.

3. The proposal of the Hungarian CF regarding the tie-break system of Olympiads was discussed long time

TEC thanks to Dr. Gusztav Font, the representative of the Hungarian Chess Federation for his remarks, concerning the tie-break system of Olympiads. He draws our attention to the current system, that may have some weak points.

However the given example, that according to the present system 3-1 (or higher difference) against a relatively weaker opponent was far much more valuable than 2.5-1.5 victory (let alone 2-2) against the best team is not solved by the proposal of using Buchholz cut 1.

- A) The idea to use Buchholz cut 1 as the first TB means that game points are not used and the result of the match is not important. Winning 4-0 or 2,5-1,5 or losing the match gives the same Buchholz
- B) Using this proposal means that the game points are not important and therefore the team competition is basically managed like individual tournament and we feel that is not right.
- C) The TB system used in the Olympiad U-16 where the games points, are the first TB is contrasting the example given in the proposal.
- D) According to the TEC opinion, the Berger system is a good compromise. However the system of counting Berger can be discussed.

4. The Hungarian Chess Federation also proposed to use a different pairing system for the Olympiad

Currently, the pairing system used at the Olympiad tries to pair teams with the same number of match-points, after ranking them based on their game points and then initial rating.

The HCF is proposing to use a kind of seeding system usually used at open tournaments, which basically means that just rating should be used. It is obviously true that, if game points are not taken into consideration, the top rated teams, as long as they keep winning their games, will not meet in the early rounds. However, is this a good enough reason to change the pairing system? The proposed system, as well as the current one, cannot guarantee that, at the end of the tournament, some teams, just by the luck of the draw, will not have had an easier path than others.

In order to at least try to guarantee a more even field for all teams involved, it could be used a system that has the goal to level the average of opponents' rating (something like: in each scoregroup, the team with the highest ARO indicatively meet the team with the lowest rating) . However, if some pairs look weird in the current pairing system, there will be a lot weirder pairs in a system like the one depicted above.

5. The new idea to be discussed

In meantime the TEC discussed also the change of match points which is used for instance in volleyball and in soccer.

We discussed also the following solution:

The new idea

Match result	Match points		or
2-2	2 - 2		2-2
	won - lost		
2,5-1,5	3 - 1		4-1
3-1	3 - 1		4-1
3,5-0,5	4 - 0		5-0
4-0	4 - 0		5-0

6. Tie-break system in FIDE and Continental events – remarks of Mr. R. Anantharam of India and the official proposal to the FIDE PB.

6.1. The TEC thanks to IA R. Anantharam of India for his remarks regarding the system of TB in World and Continental Events and discussed the matter carefully.

5.2. TEC found interesting the mathematical/statistical approach of the tie-break theory for individual Swiss tournaments presented by **Roberto Ricca** and adopted his conclusion.

Tie-breaks can be basically divided in four groups, listed in order of recommendation:

A.1	(Opponents') Score	Based on the score achieved in the tournament by the met opponents, but not strictly on the results of the games played with the opponents. <i>To clarify: if player X met A and B and scored 1 point, for this kind of tie-breaks, it is meaningless if X beat A and lost by B, or beat B and lost by A or drew both.</i>
A.2	(Opponents') Rating	It is a principle similar to A.1, but based on the ratings of the met opponents.
B	Results	Based on the results achieved by the player or on the moment that these results were achieved.
C	Situational	Based on particular situations.

In a tie-break list, it is recommended to use tie-breaks of different types in order to measure different achievements.

- 1) The first tie-break criterion should be **Median Buchholz** (if all positions in the standings matter) or **Buchholz Cut-1** (if only positions at the top of the standings are important)
- 2) After that, when all people are rated and ratings are reliable, put **APRO** [Average (Tournament) Performance Rating of Opponents] after **Median**.
- 3) As the rating criterion to be placed after **Buchholz Cut-1**, there is no meaningful difference among ARO [Average Rating of Opponents] [or TPR Tournament Performance Rating (given by ARO + rating points-displacement depending on the percentage of points achieved), AROC [ARO Cut-1 (the lowest rated opponent is escluded] and APRO, hence, for uniformity, give the preference to APRO.

Note: Criteria based on ratings can still be used when not all people are rated or ratings are unreliable, but some adjustment is needed, for instance using TPR as a provisional rating for an unrated player.

- 4) If ratings are not reliable, use Sum of Progressive Points (also known as **Progressive Score**) as the second tie-break.
- 5) The third tie-break should be **Number of Wins** (when there is an odd number of rounds in a tournament) or **Number of Blacks** (when there is an even number of rounds)
- 6) **Direct Encounter** is neither a good nor a bad tie-break. It is basically meaningless, so it is a choice of the tournament director whether to use it. When used, it is recommended to have it as the **second** criterion.

In order to have a unique list of tie-break, usable in all kinds of world tournaments patronized by FIDE, the following one is recommended:

- | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Buchholz Cut-1 | <i>In many instances, Median gives better confidence marks, but Cut-1 is the best criterion with the top positions, which usually matter more. In any case, it is an excellent approximation of Median in the situations where the latter would be better.</i> |
| 2. APRO | |
| 3. Progressive Scores | <i>When APRO is used it is meaningless, otherwise it got the best marks as the second criterion (see considerations on Direct Encounter)</i> |
| 4. Number of Wins | <i>Tournaments with an odd number of rounds are the majority, and in these tournaments it is better to reward the wins than the number of blacks.</i> |

TEC asks Roberto Ricca to complete the analysis with recommendations also for the management of unplayed games, currently not included in his study.

7. Miscellaneous

- 6.1.** We discussed the 2014 CBC proposal in Tromso and we think it is necessary to create the separate committee regarding the tie-break. This is open for members of other commissions.

The TEC propose to include:

IA Andrzej Filipowicz

IA Roberto Ricca

IA R. Anantharam

.....

- 6.2.** TEC proposes to FIDE Secretariat to inform and ask all producers of digital clocks to start workshops in all continents to repair clocks.
- 6.3.** TEC has accepted the proposal of Dutch Chess federation to include Mr. Albert Vasse as a member of TEC.
- 6.4.** TEC commemorated a minute of silence for the victims of the earthquake in Nepal and India
- 6.5.** The next meeting is foreseen in Abu Dhabi UAE during the FIDE Congress

Chairman thanked all the participants for very fruitful meeting and discussion.

FIDE Technical Commission

Chairman

Bharat Singh

Secretary

Andrzej Filipowicz