04.1. Swiss System Based on Rating (The Dutch System)

Comments on the new version as proposal to the FIDE Congress Krakow 2011, (Version of 2011-09-30)

Preface:

During the meeting 2010 we found out that the Dutch Swiss Rules could not be amended because of many unclear rules which give room to different interpretations. Therefore any amendment created more problems than they solved. It was decided to try to find a new wording that avoids such problems.

The task was to find a more precise explanation without any substantial change to the rules.

Now we have a result which with one exception (see C.4) follows as close as possible the old rules.

I cannot exclude that on the one or another position a small change may occur. This is not intentional and we should discuss whether such a change is acceptable.

Until now the new wording is a result of long discussions with Roberto Ricca who was a very worthful and competent partner in this work. Without his contributions this work would not be as it is now.

I expect some intense discussion and hope that Roberto Ricca will continue to help defending this paper.

A. Introductory Remarks and Definitions

A.1 Rating

No change of the wording.

A.2 Order

New order of titles

A.3 Score Brackets

No change of the wording

A.4 Floats

No change of the wording

A.5 Byes

No change of the wording

A.6 Subgroups, Definition of P0, M0

At the start of the pairing of a score bracket there is nothing new here. Instead of P the parameter P0 is defined here because the parameter P is defined differently later.
M represents the number of floaters to the given score bracket.

A.7 Colour differences and colour preferences

There is nothing new in A.7.a to A.7e. A.7f introduces the player who start late in the tournament and have not played any game. Therefore the new wording is more precise.

A.8 Definition of X1

The definition is more precise than before and integrates all players in the formula.
Instead of X the parameter X1 is defined here because the parameter X is defined differently later.

A.9 Transpositions and exchanges

No change

A.10 Definition: Top scorers, Backtracking

This are just a definitions to use simple words in the whole paper

A.11 Quality of Pairings, Definition of X and P

This is not a rule but just a description of the principle method used in these rules.

B. Pairing Criteria

No change . B2 has got a new wording, but no change of the content.

C. Pairing Procedures

No change

C.1 Incompatible player

No change. (the condition B2 is described more precisely)

C.2 Determine P0, P1, M0, M1, X1

No change: P0, New: X1 will be set in C.3 dependent from P
P0 and M0 are constants according to the current score bracket. P1 and M1 are variables which may be changed

C.3 Set requirements P, B2, A7d, X, B5/B6

This is newly worded. Here the requirements are set for the iterative procedure.

C.3.a **In a homogeneous score bracket set P = P1**
In a heterogeneous score bracket set P = M1
C.3.b **(top scorers) resetl B2**
C.3.c **(odd rounds) reset A7.d**
C.3.d **Set X=X1**
C.3.e **(bracket produces downfloaters), reset B5 for downfloaters**
C.3.f **(bracket produces downfloaters), reset B6 for downfloaters**
C.3.g **(heterogeneous groups) resetl B5 for upfloaters**
C.3.h **(heterogeneous groups) reset B6 for upfloaters**

C.4 Establish sub-groups

Put the highest P players in S1, all other players in S2
This is new: The old rules put the half of the players in S1 for the total pairing of the score bracket.
The proposed new rule put P players in S1. P is starting with P=P1 (like in the old rules) but P will be reduced if less pairs can be made.

C.5 Order the players in S1 and S2

No change

C.6 Try to find the pairing

This is new and more precise than the old rules.
Pair the highest player of S1 against the highest one of S2, the second highest of S1 against the second highest one of S2, etc.
If now P pairings are obtained in compliance with the current requirements the pairing of this score bracket is considered complete.

In case of a homogeneous or remainder score bracket: remaining players are moved down to the next score bracket. With this score bracket restart at C1
In case of a heterogeneous score bracket: only players moved down were paired so far.
Mark the current transposition and save all the current requirements (it may be useful later).
Redefine P = P1 – M1

Continue at C4 with the remainder group.

C.7 Transposition

No change

C.8 Exchange

No change

C.9 Go back to the heterogeneous score bracket (only remainder)

The new wording is more precise than the old one.

C.10 Lowering the requirements in homogeneous and heterogeneous score brackets

This is new and more precise than the old rules

C.10.a (heterogeneous bracket) Drop B6 for upfloaters and restart from C.4
C.10.b (heterogeneous bracket) Drop B5 for upfloaters and restart from C.3.h
C.10.c (bracket produces downfloaters) Drop B6 for downfloaters and restart from C.3.g
C.10.d (bracket produces downfloaters) Drop B5 for downfloaters and restart from C.3.f
C.10.e If X < P1, increase X and restart from C.3.e
C.10.f (odd numbered rounds), drop A7.d and restart from C.3.d
C.10.g (top scorers), drop B2 and restart from C.3.c

Any criterion may be dropped only for the minimum number of pairs in the score bracket.

C.11 deleted

(see 10. e)

C.12 Change previous Score bracket

Addition: Backtracking is not recursive.

C.13 Lowest Score Bracket

No change of the wording. But as backtracking is not recursive, this may have consequences.

C.14 Decrease P1, X1, M1

This is new and more precise than the old rules

For homogeneous score brackets:

As long as P1 is greater than zero, decrease P1 by 1.
If P1 equals zero the entire score bracket is moved down to the next one.
Start with this score bracket at C1
Otherwise, as long as X1 is greater than zero, decrease X1 by 1 and restart from C3.a

For heterogeneous score brackets:

If the pairing procedure has got to the remainder at least once, reduce P1 and X1 as in the homogeneous score brackets and restart from C.3.a
Otherwise reduce M1 by 1 and restart from C.3.b

D. Transposition and exchange procedures

D1. Transpositions

The description of the transpositions is just a more precise description of the current rule. There is no change in the algorithm.

D2: Exchange of players (homogeneous or remainder score bracket only)

The description of the exchanges should be just a more precise description of the current rule which in the first sentence of D.2 gives a very short advice.
The example in the old description does not mention repetitions of solutions at some points.
Any repetition has no influence on the final solution because each solution which is repeated gives no new solution and can be ignored.
As the new description does not omit these repetitions the solutions of the new description are identical with to solutions of the old description.
The new description enables each arbiter to proceed exactly the same way.

E. Colour Allocation Rules

No change

F. Final Remarks

No change

Forstern, 2011-09-30

Christian Krause