



Anti-Cheating Commission

ACC REPORT TO THE FIDE CONGRESS
September 2016 - October 2017

This report summarizes ACC activities between the Fide Congress in Baku 2016 and the current Fide Congress in Antalya. In a nutshell, it could be said that the situation has much improved since the recent nomination of the Commission, but the lack of financial and political support has been laming and hindering the effectiveness of the Commission and the development of a better anti-cheating framework.

We shall now briefly touch on the major aspects of ACC's work

1. Proposals for Anti-Cheating Measures to be adopted during the 43rd Chess Olympiad

In November 2016, the ACC drafted a very important paper, i.e. the **Proposals for Anti-Cheating Measures to be adopted during the 43rd Chess Olympiad** (Batumi 2018). The paper, which followed the implementation of AC rules that were not drafted nor supervised by ACC during the Baku Olympiad, was the result of intense discussion among Mssrs. Klaus Deventer, Laurent Freyd, Andy Howie, Konstantin Landa, Yuliya Levitan and Salomeja Zaksaitė under the coordination of Mr. Yuri Garrett – who at the time did not hold any official post in Fide as the members of ACC had not yet been nominated by PB. Their opinion however was considered to be the opinion of the ACC via the ACC Chairman Mr. Israel Gelfer, who trusted the work and opinion of these individuals.

The main suggestion in the paper regarded the setting up and composition of an Olympic Anti-Cheating Committee (OACC):

«The ACC feels that the OACC needs to be made up of at least 15 members (1/3 of which are to be women), and have a representation of at least 3 members of the ACC. It should be chaired by an ACC member, and should benefit from the presence of at least one very experienced IA. The reason for this is that ACC members have a much broader perspective on anti-cheating related matters and should have a prominent role in critical Fide events, but the perspective of an expert arbiter is also deemed to be important. While ACC leadership in the OACC is an added value in terms of understanding the philosophy and rationale/history behind all published regulations, and it is critical to enforcing the rules in the most appropriate way, the presence of an expert IA will benefit the overall anti-cheating effort in more than one way.

Ideally, the OACC should be led by a Chair (an ACC member) with the assistance of a Board of two persons (one ACC member and one IA). Final decision should be on the Chair.»

Other important points raised in the paper are:

- OACC/Security Meeting (where OACC explains what to search and Security explains how to use devices)
- OACC/Arbiters meeting.
- Venue to be not accessible without performing a security check
- Improvements on security checks before entering the venue: No watches, pens, devices. Extend phone ban to all (including Arbiters and VIPs). Do not leave persons unattended after identifying a device.

- *After collecting a stored device, persons should exit the playing venue.*
- *Mandatory check points at toilets.*
- *Mandatory random inspections after game.*
- *Random inspections during game possible but regulated.*
- *'Green Pass' to avoid searches during play when in time trouble.*
- *Arbiters to record suspicious behaviour and share with OACC*
- *Players and Captains to wear badges at all times – never allowed to talk to each other during play unless permitted by regulations.*
- *Separated manned smoking areas for players and captains.*
- *Inspection of toilets and other areas before and during play.*
- *Improve cooperation between Arbiters and OACC*
- *Ken Regan monitoring of games.*
- *Delay of games*
- *Adequate number of clocks in the venue*
- *Final regulations to be published 60 days before the start of the Olympiad.*

The document was passed on to WCOC and developments are expected in the next few months.

2. The appointment of ACC

In March 2017 Fide PB finally nominated the members of the ACC and confirmed its Secretary for the extant part of the term, thus ending a period of stagnation that had been fostered by a series of personal accusations that were ultimately proven to be unsubstantiated.

As a result, the ACC timidly started to resume its work, even in the light of a continuing negative trend dating back to the final months of 2015 (and the onset of the accusations), when cuts in the budget caused the Commission to slow down its activities.

Currently ACC operates under many constraints, but the Commission is addressing all new complaints and, more in general, it is fulfilling any input requests from Fide officials. It also monitors, via Prof. Regan, virtually all major Fide and private tournaments.

3. Closed cases

In April 2017, the Ethics Commission concluded the examination of three cases that had been prosecuted by ACC:

- Mr. Ivan Tetimov was sanctioned with a *2-year ban* for violating the CoE;
 - Mr. Arcangelo Ricciardi was sanctioned with a *2-year ban* for violating the CoE;
 - Mrs Zhukova was sanctioned with a *3-month ban* (suspended for one year under proviso that no reckless accusations are made in the period) for «*making unjustified accusations of cheating against WGM Mihaela Sandu, thereby injuring and discrediting her reputation as an honest chess player*»;
- Mrss. Alissa Galliamova, Ianita Stetsko, Anastasia Bodnaruk, Dina Belenkaya, Jovana Vojinovic, Svetlana Matveeva, Marina Guseva, Anna Tskhadadze, Tatiana Ivanova were sanctioned with a *reprimand* (severe expression of disapproval and warning of consequences if conduct is repeated) for the same reason;
- Mrss Natassia Ziaziulkina, Anastasia Savina, Evgenija Ovod, Melia Salome and Ekaterina Kovalevskaya were sanctioned with a *warning* (caution to avoid a repeat of the same conduct) for the same reason.

The ACC wishes to thank Ethics for its hard work, especially in the case regarding the Chavki 2015 incident, which required the exercise of extreme moderation and a ground-breaking ruling on the subject of witch-hunting that set an important precedent for future cases.

4. Ongoing cases

In the period under observation, the ACC received only a limited number of inputs, the amount of unofficial reports greatly outnumbering official complaints. While some of these were subsequently addressed by the relevant national federations, other progressed to the point of forming an IC, notably a case occurred at a tournament in Saint Petersburg. The relevant IC is made up of Mrs. Salomeja Zaksaitė (Chair), Konstantin Landa and Yuliya Levitan. The ACC also received an official complaint from Italy which appears to be unsubstantiated. The ACC is currently in the process of understanding the right way forward, as the case was handled in an almost exemplary way by the arbiters and thus poses a number of interesting challenges as to the correct procedure to follow.

Finally, the ACC *de facto* decided not to prosecute a number of previous cases that it could not address during the long phase of uncertainty before and after the Baku Olympiad, as this would have proven too much of a burden for the current resources of the Commission. However, all reports have been noted and they will be considered for future reference.

5. Cooperation with National Federations

The ACC was informed by a National Federation of a case of suspect cheating which they were dealing with. The National officer liaised with ACC Secretary Yuri Garrett and Prof. Ken Regan with a view to establishing the best course of action, while asking for privacy in the interest of the suspected player. ACC feels this is a great example of interaction that is instrumental to identifying best practices and policy making for the future.

The Greek Federation decided to undertake the prosecution of some cases previously reported to ACC. It was decided that ACC would not further investigate such cases.

The ACC was also informed by the National Chess Prosecutor of Italy of an investigation regarding a very serious case of match-fixing, which came to the fore following an open letter by the vast majority of the country's top players. The case is currently under trial by the Italian Authorities. Again, the ACC feels this is a good example of cooperation, as being informed of such instances of cheating can prove helpful in setting best practices.

6. Public accusations of cheating

Public accusations of cheating are unfortunately increasing. ACC feels discussions should be made to understand how to deal with this phenomenon, as it is bound to impact very seriously on the life of a chess player - and in some cases even on the development of a young individual. Striking a balance between witch-hunting and legitimate suspicion remains one of the key issues to solve for Fide and ACC.

7. Autonomous findings by the ACC

Fide Statutes provide ACC with autonomous investigation powers and the capacity to open a case by itself. However, no clear procedure has been developed yet and the Commission is uncertain as to how proceed when it collects circumstantial evidence that can lead to the setting up of an Investigatory Chamber. This matter requires some thinking and should be addressed by ACC in the near future, so that the procedure is reflected in its internal regulations.

8. Standard setting and policy making

The Anti-Cheating Guidelines appear to be outdated due to incorporation of some of its provisions in the Laws of Chess and to problems associated with its implementation – for example the reporting procedure (which need to be improved) and witch-hunting cases (where a better balance needs to be struck). A thorough revision both of the role of the Guidelines and their content is badly needed.

Unfortunately, however, the standard setting action has been halted due to financial constraints and the intended work with other Commissions in order to harmonize regulations continues to remain on paper. The ACC feels that it needs more financial and political support from Fide in order to resume its standard setting and policy making action.

Among other things, the ACC wishes to point out the urgent need for developing a new set of Regulations that deal with the ACC reporting/prosecuting procedure and Regulations/Guidelines for clearing the role and obligations of Organizers in the fight against cheating. In almost all cases the ACC investigated, the role and behaviour of the Organizer was crucial in determining whether good or bad practices were followed. Where good practices were adopted the outcome was satisfactory, in that the best possible result was achieved; where bad practices were followed the outcome was unsatisfactory, i.e. it had a greater negative impact on the chess community than it ought to have. This clearly calls for action and standard setting in this area, and for defining sanctions for organizers that do not comply (such as not rating the tournament – to be discussed with QC).

9. The functioning of ACC

The current level of funding of the Commission is so low that it is heavily hindering its functioning. Commissioners have not been meeting since early 2015 and, while the Commission has in one way or another guaranteed all contingent operation, it has proven impossible to share ideas and move forward on almost all other matters – some of which are crucial to the fight against cheaters and cheating.

Among other things, the much needed and requested on-line tool for filing and archiving cases (the “on-line repository”) was never implemented and it is almost impossible to keep track of the amount of work that needs to be addressed or that has been addressed. The same applies to the so-called “on-line screening tool”, which is clearly needed to help organizers and arbiters throughout the world to counter cheating attempts as also to limit the burden that is currently imposed on Prof. Regan, which is a clear bottleneck in AC operations.

If ACC is not supported adequately, it will not be able to work effectively since it does not have a chance to meet internally (not even in subcommittees) or to stage much-needed meetings with other Commission officers for harmonization, etc..

Summarizing, the ACC is in urgent need of financial support for:

- scheduling meetings (both plenary and of subcommittees) to resume the standard setting work;
- develop the on-line repository (tool for filing and archiving claims)
- develop the on-line screening tool.

This report therefore ends with a very respectful but loud cry for financial support.



Proposals for Anti-Cheating Measures to be adopted during the 43rd Chess Olympiad (Batumi 2018)

Introduction

On 27 October 2016, the ACC was asked to come up by November 5th with a proposal for an anti-cheating framework to be implemented at the 43rd Chess Olympiad in Batumi, Georgia.

While the ACC wishes to stress that the allotted time was wholly inadequate to this huge task, it nevertheless worked at a fast and steady pace to draft an initial proposal that could meet the request.

Before getting into the specifics, there are several important caveats to be borne in mind:

- This document is the result of intense discussion among Messrs. Klaus Deventer, Laurent Freyd, Andy Howie, Konstantin Landa, Yuliya Levitan and Salomeja Zaksaitė under the coordination of Mr. Yuri Garrett. While they are collectively referred to as ‘the ACC’, none presently hold an official post in the ACC, as the appointments for the newly set-up Commission have not been finalized.
- The document is intended as an initial basis for discussion; while broad consensus has been reached on most items of discussion, there is a widespread feeling that these matters require additional consideration that was impossible due to time constraints.
- While a general framework can be set in 2016 for an anti-cheating effort at the Olympiad to be staged in 2018, the nature of the fight against cheating is such that the general scenario changes dramatically at a very fast pace. For this reason, specific anti-cheating measures for any major Fide competition should be finalized and published two months before the event – with possibility to introduce last-minute changes to accommodate any changes in the requirements. These regulations should also specify the special powers of the OACC, if any.

All the proposals that follow are based on the individual experience of the signatories, the Final Report on the Baku Olympiad by IA Klaus Deventer, and an e-mail round of discussion. The paper has been submitted to ACC Chair Israel Gelfer for acknowledgment. The ACC wishes to apologize for the lack of cohesiveness of this paper, but there simply was not enough time to do better than this.

PROPOSALS

The Olympic Anti-Cheating Committee (OACC).

The ACC feels that the Baku experience of setting up a special committee for anti-cheating purposes goes in the right direction. However, rules for the OACC need to be clearer. The ACC feels that the OACC needs to be made up of at least 15 members (1/3 of which are to be women), and have a representation of at least 3 members of the ACC. It should be chaired by an ACC member, and should benefit from the presence of at least one very experienced IA. The reason for this is that ACC members have a much broader perspective on anti-cheating related matters and should have a prominent role in critical Fide events, but the Perspective on an expert arbiter is also deemed to be important. While ACC leadership in the OACC is an added value in terms of understanding the philosophy and rationale/history behind all published regulations, and it is critical to enforcing the rules in the most appropriate way, the presence of an expert IA will benefit the overall anti-cheating effort in more than one way.

Ideally, the OACC should be led by a Chair (an ACC member) with the assistance of a Board of two persons (one ACC member and one IA). Final decision should be on the Chair.

While it is not critical that every member on the Committee is an arbiter or ACC member, every person on the Committee should be a technical expert in anti-cheating related matters. While rotation was implemented in Baku, the ACC does not feel this is desirable nor does it oppose it. However, rotation should be limited to 1/3 of the OACC, so as to ensure continuity.

A meeting between the OACC and the Arbiters should be mandatory before the start of the Olympiad.

Timing of Publication of Anti-cheating measures.

Anti-Cheating measures for any major Fide event should be proposed by the ACC (upon hearing suggestions from all relevant Fide Committees) and approved by WCOC. They should be published at least 60 days before each event and circulated to the Committee in charge of implementation (at the Olympiads, OACC).

Security upon entering the playing area.

Baku was a major breakthrough in this area, and a very welcome development. The ACC feels that banning pens, watches and electronic devices from the playing hall is the way forward in major events. However:

- There were major leaks in the procedure. When a device was identified, the person was not accompanied to the lockers. A person should never be left alone with its

devices in the playing hall. Also, a new check has to be performed upon leaving the lockers.

- Players and captains could collect their devices after finishing their games, but were not forced to leave the playing venue. Upon collecting their devices from the lockers, all persons should be forced to leave the premises.
- There were far too many persons allowed to carry their mobiles in, in one way or the other. No person should be allowed with a mobile phone in the playing area.
- Every match arbiter should have replacement pens for the players. Pens should be of acceptable quality. Players should be required to hand their pens back over to the arbiter (pens could be numbered to this effect) and appropriate sanction should be established.
- Security personnel did not speak English, which was a problem on some occasions. While the ACC understands that this is not easy, an improvement should be sought here.

It could be useful that OACC attend a briefing meeting with security personnel, so as to explain what they should be looking for.

Since players have no watches, there should be an abundance of clocks in the playing area. The number of clocks in Baku was insufficient.

Inspections during play

This has proven to be an overly sensitive topic in Baku. While some of the concerns by Mr. Short need careful assessment, the ACC still feels that the possibility of randomly inspecting a player during play should be in the regulations, as this is the **THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY** to catch any person who is suspected of cheating. Of course, this has to be done *cum grano salis*, and the random check strategy should be carefully evaluated by the OACC Board and Chair. Here are a few

- No random checks should be performed during the last hour of play.
- No player in time trouble should ever be randomly checked. Arbiters could distribute 'green pass' to players whenever the player is in time trouble (say, less than 2 minutes per move). When asked to be searched, the player can show the green pass and be exempted. If a player does not have a green pass, he can still claim time trouble and the OACC will then be entitled to check with the match arbiter whether this is the case, with appropriate sanctions to be established in case of misrepresentation.
- Mandatory check points should be established at each toilet. This does not mean that everyone entering will be searched, but the players will know that upon entering or leaving the toilet there is a high chance that they will be searched. These check-points should be manned at all times, and scans (which do not need to be thorough) should in no case be longer than 10 seconds.

Inspections after play

This was an effective measure and we do advocate it be confirmed. However, criteria for selection need to be improved, as focus on top boards is not necessarily the best way to proceed.

Smoking areas

Smoking areas should be manned at all times. Players and captains should have separated smoking areas. Talking should not be allowed in smoking areas.

Players

Players who remain in the playing venue after the end of their game should never be allowed to talk to another player who is still playing. Breach of this provision should lead to sanctions for both players and the team.

Players (both playing on the day or not) should wear an identifying badge at all times during the round, so that Arbiters and OACC members can perform checks on them, and failure to do so should lead to a warning and other sanctions.

Captains

Captains should not be allowed to leave the secured area while their match is on. They are not to talk to their players at any time, except when permitted by regulations.

Captains should wear an identifying badge at all times during the round, so that Arbiters and OACC members can perform checks on them, and failure to do so should lead to a warning and other sanctions.

Playing venue

The playing venue must be a closed area and no access to it should be possible without being searched.

Inspections of toilets / other areas

Toilets should be checked by the OACC before the start of the round and at regular intervals during play (say, immediately after cleaning).

Going to toilets

The ACC feels that the requirement to inform an arbiter, introduced at Baku, is not desirable and should definitely be removed. However, an arbiter should keep a (written) record of a player's suspicious behaviour (such as a player going too often to the toilet or other suspicious circumstances including frequently leaving the playing area).

Non-linear scanners and other anti-cheating equipment

The OACC should be briefed before the start of the Olympiad by an expert in operating these devices, so that they can be effectively used. In Baku this was not done and the search with scanners proved to be 'amateurish'.

Monitoring games for prevention purposes

All games are to be scanned by Prof. Regan's tool, which is a valuable tool for prevention. All costs associated with this need to be taken care of.

Delay of games

In the ACC's opinion, this is still a desired measure. While it is not a guarantee that no cheating will occur, it makes things somewhat harder for any cheater wishing to receive external information.

Delay report / Cooperation between the OACC and Arbiters

This is an area where major improvements are possible.

The OACC should prepare a brief daily report to be shared with Section Arbiters and the Chief arbiter.

Match arbiters should report to Section arbiters – and these to Chief Arbiters and/or the OACC – any suspicious activities they might notice. OACC is to be informed (either by Section Arbiters or the Chief Arbiter) of any reported matter. Direct reporting from a Match Arbiter to OACC should be possible, as a matter of urgency/convenience, but not encouraged. It is important that this information reach the vertex of the Chain of Command (of both Arbiters and OACC), so that the relevant safety measures be adopted and passed down to both teams.

At the end of the round, the OACC should be notified in writing of any suspicious activity detected during play. Meetings between the Chief Arbiter and the OACC Chair for fact sharing should be encouraged.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **OACC of at least 15 members:** Chair from ACC, Board made up of one ACC member and one IA. At least one third should be women.
- **OACC/Security Meeting** (where OACC explains what to search and Security explains how to use devices)
- **OACC/Arbiters meeting.**
- **Venue to be not accessible without performing a security check**
- **Improvements on security checks before entering the venue:** No watches, pens, devices. Extend phone ban to all (including Arbiters and VIPs). Do not leave persons unattended after identifying a device.
- **After collecting a stored device, persons should exit the playing venue.**
- **Mandatory check points at toilets.**
- **Mandatory random inspections after game.**
- **Random inspections during game** possible but regulated.
- **'Green Pass'** to avoid searches during play when in time trouble.
- **Arbiters to record suspicious behaviour** and share with OACC
- **Players and Captains to wear badges at all times** – never allowed to talk to each other during play unless permitted by regulations.
- **Separated manned smoking areas for players and captains.**
- **Inspection of toilets and other areas before and during play.**
- **Improve cooperation between Arbiters and OACC**
- **Ken Regan monitoring of games.**
- **Delay of games**
- **Adequate number of clocks in the venue**
- **Final regulations to be published 60 days before the start of the Olympiad.**



Anti-Cheating Commission

ACC Business Case for FIDE Treasurer

In the period leading to Batumi General Assembly 2018, the Anti-Cheating Commission mainly has 2 HIGH PRIORITY areas to progress: to improve our operations on the one hand and to provide expected inputs to other Commissions or FIDE in general on the other hand. These areas are: tools and regulations.

Tools

Two tools are key in the operations of ACC:

- An **online screening tool**, whose engine currently exist at Buffalo University, lacking a proper user interface for the FIDE “users” and at risk due to this current implementation.
- An **online repository**, which basically doesn’t exist yet, and is needed for ACC to operate and archive cases and works, as well as provide a communication tool about Anti-Cheating

The Online Screening Tool

This tool is described in the Anti-Cheating guideline as a key element of the ACC process, to be provided by FIDE, to fight against cheating, through analysis of games in PGN format. The core of the system is an “engine” developed by Prof. Ken Regan, hosted at the Buffalo University. This “prototype” is already extensively used by top level arbiters in collaboration with Prof. Regan, however this presents a few risks and barriers. As a matter of fact, currently :

- No user interface is available, i.e. all actions need to be performed exclusively by Prof. Regan himself and we depend 100% on his availability
- The system operates on servers at the university, whose capacity is limited and limits the processing speed

A technical analysis was provided to FIDE in 2015, in order to understand the technical needs and estimate the budget. The analysis should be refreshed, as by now the technical and market conditions may have changed, however we can estimate the cost at 20.000 € initial investment, then 5000 € per year.

Benefits are multiple:

- The current tool is wholl abstract to the public: making it a “visible” system will highly contribute to communicate anti-cheating measures taken by FIDE and support new processes currently being designed to support arbiters in FIDE events.
- By having a FIDE web-based tool we drastically reduce the risk attached to the dependency on the sole person of Porf. Regan.

The Online Repository

This tool is the answer to a current main issue that exist within ACC operations: as such a common space does not exist, proper collaboration and follow-up of ACC activities are severely hindered, by the exclusive use of email. While email is absolutely fine to share messages, it is inappropriate for working on documents on a collaborative way, or even worse, archiving cases in a secured and shared manner. ACC needs an online repository, basically a website (<http://acc.fide.com?>), with a back-end part only accessible to accredited users, for storing cases, ongoing work on regulations and archives; and a front-end part, to share news, education, grant the possibility to post complaints instead of the current paper form.

Benefits:

- Improved support of internal processes, which also implies higher reliability in handling interactions with other commissions (e.g. better follow up of projects) or with complainants (no case hidden in hundreds of emails)
- Improved communication with the public and greater visibility of Fide's action in contrasting cheating.

ACC needs support from FIDE, either by assigning the proper budget (given the low complexity of the request, this is estimated in-between 5 and 10K euro for the setup and close to zero for maintenance) or by committing internal resources to develop this system.

Regulations

The need for updating the 2014 Guidelines and turning them into both integrated and separated Regulations is high - and it is a constant request coming from many Commissions: ETH, CON, QC, ARB and RC among others.

ACC however has not been able to meet since 2015 and the standard setting process is basically stalled. Please remember that, contrary to other areas, this is a new field of operation and much of the new drafting requires extensive brainstorming and consultation – both within the Commission and with other Commission Officers.

In order to develop the new Anti-Cheating Framework in time for the Batumi Congress (General AC Regulations, Olympic AC Regulations and Implementation Guidelines), it is imperative that the Commission be able to meet at least once in plenary session and on two subsequent occasions in subcommittees before the end of June 2018. This needs to be appropriately funded by Fide providing for the following meetings before Batumi:

- one 3-4 day plenary meeting for 9 persons in March,
- 2 meetings for 5-6 persons in April and May.

We understand this is a heavy burden on Fide's current financial restraints, but the benefits in terms of results are huge, and while most of the work will be done remotely, these three meetings appear to be the absolute minimum for guaranteeing proper standard setting.

ACC ROADMAP TO BATUMI

