



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-001 - Approve Services Committee Budget for 2021**

Proposed by Austin Lockwood, ICCF Services Director

**Abstract**

The ICCF Services Committee request that Congress approves a budget of €20,000 EUR for webserver development during 2021.

**Proposal**

Further details of the planned server development work, including the Phase 18 schedule, and cost estimates of all relevant Congress proposals, will be included in the Services Director's report to Congress, this report will be available from at least one week before online voting closes, to allow delegates to take cost into consideration when voting on this and other proposals.

**Rationale**

It is not possible to estimate the potential cost of implementing Congress proposals before the deadline for proposals, so this budget request does not include a detailed analysis of costs; this information will be included in the Services Director's report to Congress which will be available at least one week before online voting closes, this will give delegates who are unable to attend Congress in person the information required to make an informed decision and vote online.

**Assessment**

The Services Director's report to Congress 2021 will include a progress update and evaluation of all work approved at Congress 2020.

**Effort**

Financial implications are as described by the proposal; this will include all development costs for 2021, including the technical implementation of any new Congress proposals.

**Considerations**

The cost of work required for the technical implementation of new Congress proposals is difficult to estimate before Congress; however, there is already a significant backlog of planned work. If this budget is approved, priority will be given to new work resulting from successful Congress proposals, with remaining development time spent on addressing the backlog.

**Documentation**

The information contained in the ICCF Financial Plan will be updated by the Finance Director.

**Comments**

Nobody has commented on this proposal yet.

**Your comment**



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

## 2020-002 Optional Preferential Voting (OPV) for Election of Officials

Proposed by Garvin Gray, National Delegate - Australia

### Abstract

Traditionally only member federation delegates who were able to attend Congress, or who were prepared to entrust a proxy with their vote, were able to vote in ICCF elections.

The increasing level of involvement and enfranchisement of member federation delegates who are not able to attend Congress in person in recent years has made the practicalities of the traditional multi-round EB and Auditor elections difficult to manage within the timescale of a Congress.

Because of the multi-round process, the World Tournament Director election in Vilnius involved the solicitation of email votes on a very tight two-day timescale, which was time consuming to organise, extremely disruptive to the third day of Congress, difficult to manage, and risked disenfranchising member federation delegates who were unable to respond in the given time window.

### Proposal

Elections for EB members and Auditor will use the Optional Preferential Voting (OPV) System for future elections.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Optional\\_preferential\\_voting](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Optional_preferential_voting)

A form will be given to each delegate, listing each candidate. Delegates will then be asked to rank the candidates in preferred order (1,2,3 etc), but delegates are free to vote for only the candidates they want to. If a delegate does not want to vote for a candidate, then they can leave that box blank.

The form will be available by email before Congress during the usual voting window. Delegates, delegates designees, and proxies whose federations have not voted by email will be able to vote in person on the first day of Congress.

Only one round of voting will take place.

If a candidate has more than 50% of the first-choice votes, he or she will be declared as elected. If no candidate reached 50% of the first-choice votes, the candidate with the fewest first-choice votes will be eliminated and those votes transferred to the second-choice candidate on each ballot. This process will continue until one candidate has more than 50% of the votes.

### A further explanation of Optional Preferential Voting:

The main elements of the operation of optional preferential voting are as follows:

1. Delegates are required to place the number "1" against the candidate of their choice, known as their first preference.
2. Delegates are then required to place the numbers "2", "3", etc., against the other candidates listed on the ballot paper in order of preference. Being Optional Preferential voting, each delegate only has to place a 1, 2 etc for the candidates they want to vote for. Delegates are not required to vote for candidates they do not want to allocate a vote to.
3. The counting of first preference votes, also known as the primary vote, takes place first. If no candidate secures an absolute majority— over 50% – of primary votes, then the candidate with the least number of votes is "eliminated" from the count.
4. The ballot papers of the eliminated candidate are examined and re-allocated amongst the remaining candidates according to the number "2", or second preference votes.
5. If no candidate has yet secured an absolute majority of the vote, then the next candidate with the least number of primary votes is eliminated.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

6. This preference allocation continues until there is a candidate with an absolute majority. Where a second preference is expressed for a candidate who has already been eliminated, the voter's third or subsequent preferences are used.

**Rationale**

This process ensures that the successful candidate is elected with at least a 50% majority, is more efficient and less disruptive than the current multi-round procedure, and ensures the enfranchisement of all member federations who wish their voices to be heard.

**Assessment**

The procedure will be assessed for manageability at the next election Congress (2023) or at mid-term elections should there be one in the interim.

**Effort**

Preparation of voting materials and managing the work of the scrutineers is likely to be easier than the current system.

**Considerations**

As this proposal will require an amendment to the ICCF Voting Regulations, a two thirds majority will be necessary for approval.

**Documentation**

The ICCF Voting Regulations will be updated to include this procedure.

**Comments**

**14/04/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Garvin,

Although I think I understand this proposal, I wish to examine it with you a bit further to be sure. I believe you have answers to my questions that follow, but am not sure of them myself.

Let's say there are 4 candidates for an EB position. And let's say that after the voting, none has 50+% of the "#1" votes. So, if I follow correctly, the candidate with the least number of #1 votes is eliminated from contention.

(a) What happens if there are 2, or even 3 people with the same "lowest" number of #1 votes?

Then, the eliminated candidate(s)' votes are reassigned to one of the remaining candidates based on the candidate listed as #2 for the eliminated candidate(s) votes.

(b) If more than one candidate was initially eliminated based on a tie for the lowest number of #1 votes, then the #2 votes could belong to the other eliminated candidate. What then?

When votes are reassigned to remaining candidates, they are to be reassigned as #2 votes. And then, if I understand correctly, all #2 votes are counted (given that the #1 votes did not produce a >50% winner), with all #1 votes ignored from this point forward.

(c) Is that correct?

(d) And if the #2 votes do not produce a >50% winner, the process repeats by eliminating the lowest #2 vote recipient, divying up that candidate's votes as #3, and counting again, right?

Thanks,

Dennis

**16/04/2020 Garvin Gray**

I had to double check voting procedures for OPV before answering.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A couple of items I missed in the proposal:

In OPV, or Full Preferential Voting, Candidates are drawn by ballot for their position on the ballot paper. This is done to reduce the effect of donkey voting.

To answer Dennis's questions:

In the first round of voting, if two or more candidates are tied for last place on '1' votes, then who is eliminated is decided by drawing of lots. Only one person is eliminated at this stage.

So I believe that answers (b)

- c) You are correct
- d) You are correct

After all the '1's have been counted, one candidate has been eliminated. Then if after re-distributing all the '2' preferences, two candidates are tied for last place, the candidate that is eliminated is the person who in the first count, had the least '1' votes.

Should again, there have been three candidates tied for the lowest 1 count in the first vote, and then again after allocating the '2' preferences, those two candidates who were tied in the first round are tied again, who is eliminated is drawn by ballot.

I believe this covers everything in case of ties.

If at any stage, one candidate achieves more than 50 percent, the election is over and winner declared

**Your comment**



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-003 Approve the 2019 Minutes**

Proposed by Michael Millstone, General Secretary

**Abstract**

Approve the 2019 Minutes

**Proposal**

Approve the 2019 Minutes

**Rationale**

Precedence?

**Assessment**

Minutes will be circulated to all officials and delegates. Comments will be incorporated and minutes uploaded to the ICCF website for posterity.

**Effort**

No financial cost.

**Considerations**

None

**Documentation**

None

**Comments**

Nobody has commented

--



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-004 Approve Financial Reports**

Proposed by Michael Millstone, General Secretary

**Abstract**

Financial statements (Income Statement, Balance Sheet, and Statement of Cash Flows) will be presented for the year ending 12.31.2019. Last, the auditor report will be shared to allow delegates the opportunity to view and approve the future course of ICCF activities.

**Proposal**

No changes anticipated.

**Rationale**

N/A

**Assessment**

No assessment needed - documents will be archived on the webserver.

**Effort**

None - this products produced are part of the volunteer positions of Finance Director and ICCF Auditor.

**Considerations**

If not approved, the EB will reconvene to address concerns and (b) produce changed financial documents, which will be subject to distribution, review, and e-mail voting.

**Documentation**

Income Statement, Balance Sheet, Statement of Cash Flows.

**Comments**

**19/05/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Michael,

This proposal, possibly written prior to the cancellation of an in-person Congress, states the "financial 5-year plan will be reviewed at Congress" and comments about the auditor's report suggesting the same process. That plan no longer seems in keeping with today's reality, given the cancellation of an in-person Congress and the deadline for proposal voting being prior to the original Congress date and deadline for officials' reports. For the record, I do not see a change in the current proposal as absolutely imperative, in that the procedure under "considerations" does allow for later voting by Congress if the proposal is not approved. However, it seems to be a rather strange proposal within today's context - asking delegates to vote about financial statements that may not yet be available for viewing, or easily found even if they are.

I suggest that this proposal be amended to include a link to all relevant "finance statements" and the auditor's report. In that way, delegates can see what they are being asked to approve during the already-scheduled proposal voting period.

**19/05/2020 Michael Millstone**

Dennis,

I could not agree more. If delegates and officials go to:

"About ICCF"

"Congress 2020" documents"

This folder is continuously updated as ICCF officials' reports are submitted. The Financial Director reports, and well as the ICCF Auditor opinion letter should be there shortly.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

Your comment



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

### **2020-005 Players' Record Keeping Requirement**

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules Commissioner

#### **Abstract**

ICCF Rule 2.11 requires that players keep a record of all moves and times of transmission in server games until a game is completed, even though the server has such a record. There seems little current reason and no suggested enforcement for this rule. Proposed is that this rule is eliminated.

#### **Proposal**

In ICCF Rule 2.11. , entitled "Records and Reports" is the following:

1. SERVER: All transmissions concerning the game and a record of the moves and dates are kept by the ICCF Webserver system and these are available to the TD, as required. As a further safeguard, a player is required to maintain a record of the moves and playing time used by both players until the game has been completed, e.g., a copy of latest system notification (as described in §2.3.), and he/she must send information to the TD, as requested....

Proposed is that the highlighted portion, concerning what players are required to do, be deleted.

#### **Rationale**

TDs can obtain copies of all of this information in server games directly from the server. The likelihood that the server will lose this information while a game is ongoing is tiny. and we would be very hard-pressed to rely on player information in that case anyway. In other words, there is no point to this rule anymore. There also is no enforcement to this rule. Therefore this rule should be deleted.

#### **Assessment**

None. Players who wish to keep their own records can still do so, while players who choose not to will no longer be in violation of the rules.

#### **Effort**

No financial cost. The ICCF Rule 2.11 will need to be updated through the proposed deletion.

#### **Considerations**

The Rules Commission was nearly unanimous in supporting this proposal.

#### **Documentation**

Rule 2.11 will need to be updated.

#### **Comments**

##### **07/05/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Agreed. Also I think the server has a backup procedure as well.

##### **07/07/2020 Garvin Gray**

As most people are playing on the server, I would be very surprised if more than a handful of players outside of the Rules Commission were even aware of this regulation.

With the server showing the game notation and also transmission times, there seems to be no meaningful reason to keep this rule.

##### **07/07/2020 Mariusz Wojnar**

Dear Dennis

Just because a server failure seems unlikely doesn't mean it can't happen. It seems irrelevant to you and





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

the documentation from the player is unreliable.

Please read ICCF rule and your rationale more carefully and you find that it is just the opposite.

To maintain a record of the moves and playing time used by both players until the game has been completed is about a safeguard, it doesn't matter if it's a postal or server game. The reliability of the documentation of the game played on the server is almost 100% because the moves made come to the email addresses of both players from the ICCF server. In the event of a server failure, the game can be restored from the documentation provided by both players. Player has letters (postcards) as evidence in a postal game, and electronic letters when playing on a server. Of course, the player's choice is to give up this safeguard at his own risk that the documentation presented to TD by the opponent will be taken into account.

That is why this rule must remain.

#### 2.11. Records and Reports

1. SERVER: All transmissions concerning the game and a record of the moves and dates are kept by the ICCF Webserver system and these are available to the TD, as required. As a FURTHER SAFEGARD, a player is required to maintain a record of the moves and playing time used by both players until the game has been completed, e.g., a copy of latest system notification (as described in §2.3.), and he/she must send information to the TD, as requested.

POSTAL: All transmissions from the opponent concerning the game and a record of the moves and dates shall be kept until 2 weeks plus transmission time after the end of the tournament and sent (TEAM: to the team captain and/or through him/her) to the TD upon request. Unless the TD specifically states that original documents must be sent, it is recommended that copies are made and sent. [Reference: Playing Rule Guidelines]

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-006 Players' Requirement to Update Personal Address**

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules Commissioner

**Abstract**

ICCF Rule 2.11 requires that players update their personal (postal) addresses. This seems in violation of European law. Proposed is that this requirement be deleted from the ICCF Rules.

**Proposal**

ICCF Rule 2.11 says the following:

"2. SERVER: Changes of permanent address and email address shall be made by the player under his/her personal settings maintained in the system. It is not necessary to notify the tournament director separately of a change in email address. It is sufficient to make the necessary changes on the Webserver under one's personal settings. For any contact with the TD, the email option of the Webserver is to be used. TEAM: These addresses only shall be available for use by disclosed to the Tournament Office, team captain and TD."

Proposed is that the highlighted phrases be deleted, with the phrase in red font be added instead.

**Rationale**

The ICCF Rules need to be in compliance with European law. The ICCF should not be requiring players to give personal identifying information to the ICCF simply for storage purposes. Additionally, players need to be informed about who will have access to information that is properly stored (such as an email address).

**Assessment**

None. This change would simply bring the ICCF Rules into greater compliance with European law.

**Effort**

No financial cost as the server has already been updated accordingly.

Rule 2.11 will need to be updated as proposed.

**Considerations**

The Rules Commission was unanimous in its support of this proposal.

**Documentation**

ICCF Rule 2.11 will need to be updated as proposed.

**Comments**

**07/05/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Also agreed and I believe we need to stop asking for player's email addresses when they register to events

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean players will no longer be required to update their permanent addresses..

A vote of NO will mean players will still be required to update their permanent addresses, probably contrary to European law.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-007 Counting FIDE GMs**

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules Commissioner

**Abstract**

If the proposal entitled "Eliminate the requirement for '5 GM' opponents for GM title" is not approved, then this proposal will need to be addressed. If that proposal is approved, this proposal becomes moot and should not be voted upon

Proposed is that each player with a FIDE GM title (and no ICCF GM title) will count as one of the required "5 GMs" opponents towards a player's earning the GM title.

**Proposal**

This proposal relates to ICCF Rule 1.5.2.(2)

"2. The title "Correspondence Chess Grandmaster" is not limited in time and is awarded to: (a)...(b)... (c) those players who gain at least two grandmaster norms in international title tournaments with a total of at least 24 games. This number of games may be reduced if the player overscores sufficiently to achieve the standard Norm requirements over 24 games. At least five of the 24 games must be against players who already hold the Correspondence Chess Grandmaster title prior to the end of the initial rating period or who have fixed ratings of at least 2600. However, of this five-game quota, a maximum of two may be replaced by two games each against players who hold the SIM title prior to the end of the initial rating period. "

Proposed is that each opponent with a FIDE GM title will count as one of the required GMs towards earning the GM title, as described in the above highlighted portion of Rule 1.5.2.(2)

**Rationale**

Counting FIDE GMs for this purpose has reportedly been done historically, despite the fact the rule states the opponents need to hold the title of "Correspondence Chess Grandmaster". We should therefore put this exception into the Rule.

A contrary perspective is that FIDE GM titles are not comparable to ICCF GM titles, just as FIDE ratings are not comparable to ICCF ratings. However, we currently allow the use of FIDE ratings frequently to serve as provisional ratings in ICCF events. A consistent rule therefore would also count FIDE GM titles as sufficient to substitute for ICCF GM titles in a player's quest for the GM title.

**Assessment**

The Qualifications Commissioner could keep track of the frequency by which players earn the GM title specifically by satisfying the "5 GM" requirement by counting one or more FIDE GM titled opponents.

**Effort**

Nothing financial. ICCF Rule 1.5.2.(2) would need to be updated.

**Considerations**

The Rules Commission was supportive to this proposal.

The Qualifications Commissioner expressed a mixed perspective about this proposal: preferring that no FIDE ratings or titles were used within the ICCF, but also expressing the perspective that if FIDE ratings are accepted, then FIDE titles should be too.

**Documentation**

ICCF Rule 1.5.2.(2) would need to be updated.

**Comments**



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**17/04/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

As indicated in the abstract above, this proposal will become moot if proposal 2020-008 is voted upon before this one and is approved. The proposal herein only matters if the requirement for "5 GM" opponents for the GM title remains in effect.

**17/04/2020 Josef Mrkvička**

Dear Dennis,

typing error, this proposal relates to the Rule 1. 5. 2. (2), not 1. 5. 1. (2).

Josef

**17/04/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Josef,

You are correct. Thank you for catching my error. The ICCF Rule 1.5.2.(2) is the one to be affected by this proposal.

Dennis

**10/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

This proposal was submitted prior to our knowing that there would only be an online voting process this year. Therefore, I wish now to clarify one odd phrase in the above Abstract and my initial 17 April comment. Online voting requires that all voting essentially gets counted without consideration of the voting result from another proposal. Delegates therefore need to vote their perspective on this proposal no matter their vote concerning 2020-008. My comment here is to clarify that it is distinctly possible that the outcome from 008 will make this proposal moot, but delegates still need to vote concerning both proposals, in case 008 does not get approved.

**26/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

After having consulted with QC Uwe Staroske, I can say we have agreed that the following would be true:

- if 2020-008 does not get Congress approval, and
  - this proposal, 2020-007 does get approval, then
  - the counting of FIDE GMs towards the required 5-GM opponent requirement for an ICCF GM title can occur once any GM norm is earned any time after the Congress approval of 2020-007 is announced.
- Our rationale is that 2020-007 serves as a rule clarification about an ambiguous issue, and does not represent a complete change in the rules. Precedent is that rule clarifications go into effect immediately.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean the "5 GM" requirement for earning the GM title can include FIDE GM opponents..  
A vote of NO will mean the "5 GM" requirement for earning the GM title cannot include any FIDE title in that count..

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

## 2020-008 Eliminate Requirement of "5 GM" Opponents for GM Title

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules and Ratings -and Qualifications Commissioner

### Abstract

Currently, to earn a GM title, a player not only needs to have at least 2 GM norms across 24 games, but also must have played 5 GMs (or listed exceptions considered comparable). Proposed is that the latter portion of that set of requirements, about the number of GMs played, be deleted from the requirements for a GM title.

### Proposal

ICCF Rule 1.5.1.(2) says the following:

"2. The title "Correspondence Chess Grandmaster" is not limited in time and is awarded to: (a)....(b).... (c) those players who gain at least two grandmaster norms in international title tournaments with a total of at least 24 games. This number of games may be reduced if the player overscores sufficiently to achieve the standard Norm requirements over 24 games. **At least five of the 24 games must be against players who already hold the Correspondence Chess Grandmaster title prior to the end of the initial rating period or who have fixed ratings of at least 2600. However, of this five-game quota, a maximum of two may be replaced by two games each against players who hold the SIM title prior to the end of the initial rating period.**

Proposed is that the **highlighted sentences be deleted**, and thereby eliminate this requirement in considering the granting of GM titles in the future. This proposal, if approved, would be applied in assessing newly earned GM norms from the time of this proposal's approval by Congress forward.

### Rationale

The requirement of having played at least 5 GMs (or listed comparable opponents) does nothing to indicate the player has played a tougher set of opponents to earn each GM norm. A GM rated 2400 is clearly an easier opponent than an IM rated 2550. Once norm thresholds are computed based on opponents' rating, a GM norm already indicates when the person has played at the level of a GM. The number of GM opponents adds nothing to this statement, and only artificially imposed difficulty in obtaining a GM title.

The GM title has already become far harder to earn than it used to be, due to the rating suppression caused by the increase in draws. The added requirement of having played a certain number of GMs makes the earning of the title harder still, but with no demonstration of improved skill.

A search of the ICCF data indicates that 21 players obtained at least 2 GM norms across 24 games but failed to get the GM title because of the requirement of "5 GM" opponents. (Only 5 of those players are currently active.) In other words, the requirement is typically met by obtaining the required GM norms across 24 games, holding back the title from a small number of people who performed just as well as those getting the title. It does not seem fair to continue this requirement to punish a small number of people in the future.

### Assessment

The Rules and Ratings -and Qualifications Commissioner can keep track of how many GM titles are awarded in the future where the player has either also met the existing requirement of "5 GM" opponents or not. The number of GM titles granted can be compared to the rate of GM titles earned previous to the change in rule. These data can be used to determine if the GM title became significantly easier to earn once the "5 GM" requirement was deleted.

### Effort

None. The Rules and Ratings -and Qualifications Commissioner uses whatever the current rules are to determine when a player earns a GM title.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**Considerations**

The Rules and Ratings -and Qualifications Commissioner was supportive to this proposal.

**Documentation**

ICCF Rule 1.5.1.(2) would need to be updated in keeping with this proposal.

**Comments**

**19/04/2020 Uwe Staroske**

As already mentioned the QC supports this proposal - it is a joint idea from the Ratings and the Qualifications Commissioner.

There is no need any more for the 5 GMs requirement; it stems from times, in which GM norms were maybe a bit easier than today and used to be some kind of "quality control".

All the best

Uwe

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean a GM title can be earned no matter how many opponents were GMs (or the listed comparable set of players)..

A vote of NO will mean the requirement for at least 5 GMs (or listed comparable) opponents will remain to earn the GM title..

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-009 Making the Triple Block Time Control System an Official Option**

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules Commissioner

**Abstract**

Congress approved a trial period for the triple block time control system in 2016, meaning it has been running on a trial basis for nearly 4 years. Proposed is that the triple block system and its current rules be incorporated into the ICCF Rules as an official option available to tournament organizers, besides existing time control systems.

**Proposal**

The triple block time control system shall become an option regularly available to TOs for all server events, with the system's current rules becoming the official set of rules for the system. These rules will be incorporated into the single ICCF Rules document as appropriate.

**Rationale**

There are many reasons for this proposal:

- (1) Congress 2015 saw many proposals trying to address shortcomings in the traditional time control system. A work group was formed to devise a single answer to those many issues, the result being the development of the triple block time control system.
- (2) Congress approved a trial period, presumably to last at least 3 years, during which the triple block system was to be tried, with discovered issues to be addressed during that trial period.
- (3) Two main changes to the initial rules were made during the trial period:
  - (a) a team captain became able to move a player's time from the player's bank to the player's clock if (and only if) a substitution of that player was being made. This was to help ensure a player's clock did not go ETL while a substitution was in process.
  - (b) the optional "guaranteed time" (GT) feature was added. The GT feature means that all players in the event would be guaranteed a minimum of 3 days reflection time for every move after 50 (when the increment would no longer exist), presuming the game had not already ended in any of usual ways. This was to address the concern that players would play out games that were otherwise clearly lost or drawn just trying to get the opponent to lose on time. This feature is available at the option of the TO, and thought appropriate to apply any time the TO does not need there to be a fixed end date.
- (4) Individual feedback about the system was solicited from very highly rated players from two events using the triple block system: an invitational of category 12, and the top 4 boards from the Slovenia - USA friendly match (all latter players being GMs). These players were asked for their feedback because of the original criticism of the triple block system that only low rated players would like the system (because they move so quickly anyway that the time control system used with them was essentially irrelevant), and that high rated players would not.

Feedback was received from about 10 such people, the comments covering the complete range: from strongly supportive to rather neutral to strongly negative. The strongly supportive cited features such as the flexibility in how reflection time can be used and the ability of TOs to organize events with durations reflecting the expected participants. The addition of guaranteed time (GT) was thought to address the only issue raised (by two people). The neutral feedback essentially said there did not seem to be any issues (except already addressed by GT), but also seeing the system as essentially no different for the players from the traditional system. The strongly negative (of which there was only one) criticized the excessive amount of time available to players at the beginning of a game. That person, and one other also criticized the traditional system as well, saying both should involve far shorter time periods early in a game, with no carryover of such time after the initial period of the game (such as after move 10).





### Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

In total, this feedback was not viewed as offering any significant criticism that was particular to the triple block system, with some supportive comments. (As stated, the criticisms were also applicable to the traditional system.) No specific problem in using the system, or understanding it was ever mentioned.

(5) The triple block work group members followed up on all reported concerns to the triple block system that became known to us (SIM Gino Figlio, SIM Michael Millstone, IM Austin Lockwood, and Chair Dennis Doren) as the issues were reported. The most significant one was a question (as opposed to a report) about the relative frequency of ETLs in the triple block system versus in the traditional time control system. Ultimately, the work group looked at the server's data in that regard, and conducted a formal set of statistical analyses to study the issue. The result was that the triple block system was statistically associated with the same frequency (rate) of ETLs as the traditional system.

Based on the work group's assessments, there seems little reason to continue the triple block system's trial period. There may be minor changes made to the system in future years, but those are expected only to show the triple block system is like the traditional system - where minor changes can be proposed each year at Congress, but the structural parameters stay the same from year to year.

(6) The system offers features that the traditional system does not, avoids some issues of the traditional system, and offers the option of a fixed end date for TOs who wish it.

(7) The work group is prepared to offer recommendations as the duration of specific types of events, to give TOs guidance in this regard. These recommendations would be added where TOs will be able to find them.

**(8) This proposal is just to add the triple block system as an additional option for TOs, both with and without GT, as compared to the traditional time control system. This proposal is NOT to replace or delete any existing time control system.**

#### **Assessment**

The work group can be maintained as an informal body to which players, TOs, TDs, and other officials can bring their concerns, questions, and/or ideas for improvements. Reference to this work group, and contact information, can be offered in the ICCF Rules or on the ICCF home page, as the Executive Board determines. Follow-up to those issues and ideas can be reported to Congress by the Chair of the work group.

#### **Effort**

The system is already online and fully functioning using its existing rules. Hence, there is no new financial cost implied by this proposal except, perchance, a small amount to add recommendations for event durations as TOs organize events on the server.

The Rules Commissioner will need to spend a good deal of time incorporating the triple block rules into the existing ICCF Rule document. Since he is also the Chair of the triple block work group and the writer of this proposal, he is very well aware of the work he is giving himself.

#### **Considerations**

The work group that developed the triple block system is unanimously in favor of this proposal.

#### **Documentation**

There are no statutory changes to be made based on this proposal. There are many additional entries to be made in the ICCF Rules. This will mostly be in the Tournament Organizer section (section 4), but also in the Tournament Director section (section 3) and the Player section (section 2).

#### **Comments**

**03/05/2020 Garvin Gray**

I am in favor of this proposal, as long as Guaranteed Time is the default.





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**07/05/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

I think we need to be careful with GT and make it only optional. TO's decide what to choose

**28/05/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

The intention of this proposal is for GT to be offered to TOs at every opportunity in using the triple block system, but the use of GT is not required of any TO at any time.

**29/05/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Great!

**01/06/2020 Garvin Gray**

Thank you for the replies. As per my original comment, just like a lot of other settings, some are set as the default, but organizers retain the ability to not follow the default setting.

In my original comment, I said that I thought GT should be the default. This is different than making GT mandatory for all Triple block events. Organizers would still retain the ability to not have GT if they wish.

**01/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

I can agree to the idea of GT being the default setting on the server's event organizational screens. And as stated, all TOs would have the option of turning off that default setting, and hence negating there being GT in their events.

**02/07/2020 Michael Roy Freeman**

I can also agree to the idea of GT being the default setting on the server's event organizational screens.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean the triple block system will become an official option for TOs in organizing server events, using current the current rules and parameters.

A vote of NO will mean the triple block system will remain in its trial period, meaning the rules and parameters can still be changed by the work group at any time.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

## 2020-010 Clarifying a Requirement for a Title Tournament

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules Commissioner

### Abstract

ICCF Rule Appendix 2, entry 1e, states that for an event to be title norm eligible, the following condition must apply: "not more than two thirds of the participating players shall be members\* of...the same ICCF affiliated federation".... [\* "members" does not necessarily mean the flags under which players play...]. Proposed is to add the following sentence to clarify what was intended concerning the word "members".

### Proposal

In ICCF Rules Appendix 2, entry 1e, the following sentence will be added: An event that is restricted to players from one specific federation or club shall be considered an internal event and therefore cannot qualify as a title tournament no matter how many flags are represented by those potential participants." If this proposal is approved, any already ongoing events will be allowed to continue as they were advertised at their official start date (concerning norm eligibility). However, no event yet to reach its official start date on the day Congress approves this proposal will be allowed to result in the earning of a title norm if the set of participants fails to meet the updated 2/3's rule. In other words, this proposal will go into effect immediately upon its approval, but not retroactively effect events that are passed their start dates.

### Rationale

Member Federations (MFs) and their affiliated clubs can have members who play under flags different from that of the MF, as membership in MFs and clubs are determined by the MFs and not the ICCF. It is already stated in the existing Rule that "'members' does not necessarily mean the flags under which players play". By definition, if all participants of an event are members of the same MF or club, this event is internal to that MF or club, no matter how many flags are represented by the participants. Titles (and therefore their norms) are sponsored solely by the ICCF, not by MFs and/or their affiliated clubs. Events that are internal to a single MF (or affiliated club) were not meant to be norm-eligible. There has been some lack of clarity in interpreting the existing rule concerning the need for "not more than two thirds of the participating players" to be from the same MF". One interpretation has been that clubs meet this condition by counting players' different flags despite the fact that all of the participants were required to be members of the same club, and hence (by definition) affiliated with a single MF. This proposal will clarify the intention of the "no more than two-thirds" rule for norm-eligibility of events. This proposal will not stop any event from being run in the future. This proposal can only affect whether or not an event can offer title norms.

### Assessment

None, as this serves only to clarify an existing rule.

### Effort

The only change will be an added sentence to ICCF Rule Appendix 2, entry 1e, as stated above.

### Considerations

The Rules Commission was unanimously in support of this proposal.

The Executive Board expressed that the existing rule allowed a "loophole" that needed to be closed, as described above as the need for clarification.

### Documentation

ICCF Rule Appendix 2, entry 1e would need to be updated.

### Comments

#### 07/07/2020 Mariusz Wojnar

Some players are registered to several federations or clubs.

Who will check the player's club membership or federation membership?



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean the "no more than 2/3" rule pertaining to title tournaments would specifically exclude all events internal to MFs and/or clubs.

A vote of NO will mean the rule would continue not clearly excluding some MF/club internal events from also being title norm eligible events.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments

**2020-011 Congress Allowances for ICCF Auditor**

Proposed by Jan M. Vosselman, Finance Director

**Abstract**

Add ICCF Auditor to receive congress allowances.

**Proposal**

Add ICCF Auditor to other designated officials eligible to receive payments of congress allowances.

**Rationale**

Recommend the ICCF Auditor attend congress to present the auditor report, respond to questions from delegates, act as scrutineer, if applicable, and obtain knowledge of (financial) discussions.

**Assessment**

N/A

**Effort**

Depending on congress location yearly costs between 1.000 and 1.500 Euro.

**Considerations**

It is common business practice that the auditor attends AGM's.

**Documentation**

ICCF Financial Regulations (6. Appendix A - Allowances for Officials) will need to be updated to include the auditor.

**Comments**

**21/05/2020 Josef Mrkvička**

Auditor ICCF is no ICCF Official comparable with EB or MC members, but a contractor of services, in a position comparable with Martin Benedik, programmer of the ICCF server, with a company providing the webhosting, with a supplier of medals, and similarly the relation between ICCF and Auditor should be regulated on the contractual base.

When I was ICCF Auditor I carried out all above activities on a voluntary basis, I tried to persuade ICCF President, that it was not OK that the Auditor carried out his services without any financial appreciation.

However, I don't believe that a congress allowance is a correct way of a reward.

See the ICCF Organizational Chart, where no Auditor appears as a part of ICCF.

**Voting Summary**



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A vote of YES will mean the ICCF Auditor, if attending, will receive congress allowances as of 2021..  
A vote of NO will mean the ICCF auditor, if attending, must pay his/her own Congress arrangements..  
A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-012 Limiting the 10-Move Draw Rule**

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules Commissioner

**Abstract**

The current draw rule is that a player can make a follow-up draw offer no sooner than 10 moves after any earlier offer. Proposed is to terminate the 10-move count for a player at the time the opponent subsequently makes a draw offer.

**Proposal**

To continue to implement the 10-move draw rule [ICCF Rules 2.9(2)] in server games, but with one change: if the opponent offers a draw during a player's 10-move count (that is, within 10 days subsequent to the player's having made a draw offer), then the player's 10-move count is terminated at that time.

**Rationale**

A rare circumstance was experienced that showed a possible shortcoming to the 10-move draw rule. In essence:

- (1) player A offered a draw that was declined by player B.
- (2) player B offered a draw a few moves later, this offer being declined by player A.
- (3) within a few moves, player A decided again to offer a draw but could not. Likewise, player B could not. Both needed to wait until their 10 required moves had been made, this despite the fact they came to inform each other that they were both ready to agree to a draw.

The Rules Commission discussed this situation. A majority thought it best if this proposal were brought to Congress as a possible way of avoiding repetition of what occurred. The proposed solution is a minor change in the rule, would not cost much in its implementation, and would only affect the rare circumstance described.

However, nearly half of the Rules Commission believed the situation was of the players' own creation, was so rare as not to reflect a flaw in the rules, and believed that the ICCF should not spend its time and money saving players from problems they create on their own.

As a result of the principle within the Rules Commission that proposals supported by the majority are brought to Congress, this proposal is offered without a strong recommendation either way.

**Assessment**

The relevant situation is thought so rare, and hence the application of the new rule would be so rare as not to warrant any scheduled follow-up.

**Effort**

There would be the cost of implementing a new rule in the server. However, since the server already is programmed to make the 10-move count following a declined draw offer, building in a new reason to terminate that count would likely cost little.

**Considerations**

The simple majority of the Rules Commission supports this proposal.

**Documentation**

Rule 2.9(2) would need to be updated.

**Comments**

Nobody has commented on this proposal yet.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean the 10-move count following a declined draw offer would terminate any time the opponent offered a draw.

A vote of NO will mean the 10-move draw rule would remain as it is..



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-013 Lowering Entry Fees**

Proposed by Jan M. Vosselman, Finance Director

**Abstract**

Lowering entry fees.

**Proposal**

World Championship Preliminaries & Semi-finals: change from 25.00 to 20.00 Euros per entry; DE: change from 39.00 to 31.20.

World Individual events (7 player sections): change from 3.50 to 3.00 Euros per entry; DE: change from 5.46 to 4.68.

World Individual events (11 player sections): change from 6.00 to 5 Euros per entry; DE: change from 9.36 to 7.80.

World Cup events: change from 9.00 to 8.00 Euros per entry; DE: change from 14.04 to 12.48.

Master Norm events: change from 20.00 to 18.00 Euros per entry; DE: change from 31.20 to 28.08.

CCE Norm events: change from 15.00 to 12.00 Euros per entry; DE: change from 23.40 to 18.72.

Champions League team events: change from 30.00 to 20.00 Euros per entry; DE: from 46.80 to 31.20.

Note: The first (change from 210 to 300) games are free for member federations only.

**Rationale**

To pass on the favourable result 2019 and expected very favourable result 2020, due to cancelling Congress (Covid-19) for the benefit of the players. The liquidity and solvency ratio are sufficient to afford this lowering at least for many years.

**Assessment**

Yearly evaluation in FD Reports.

**Effort**

The income will decrease by 4.500 Euro, but could be affected less when volumes increase.

**Considerations**

N/A

**Documentation**

ICCF Financial Regulations (8. Appendix C - Tournaments Fees and 9. Appendix D - Direct Entry Fees & Rebates to Member Federations) will need to be updated.

**Comments**

**07/05/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Excellent!

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean the lowering of entry fees will be invoiced for mentioned tournaments started 1st January 2021 and onwards..

A vote of NO will mean entry fees will remain static according to Financial Regulations 01/01/2020..

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-014 2020 and Onwards - CCE and CCM Medals**

Proposed by Phillip J. Beckett, National Delegate for England

**Abstract**

Those players who obtain CCM and CCE titles currently receive a bronze coloured medal to mark their achievement. This proposal is to distinguish between the medals for the CCM and CCE.

**Proposal**

The proposal is to award a silver coloured medal for the CCM title and to award a bronze coloured medal for the CCE title.

ICCF rule 1.5.4 covers 'Awarding of titles' and makes reference to "medals for the CCE and CCM titles". However, no reference is made to any specific colour of medal for a particular title and therefore no rule change is deemed necessary

**Rationale**

Since the introduction of medals for these titles they have been of the same colour. England considers that the medals should be different for different titles.

**Assessment**

The presentation of the new medals would take place at Congress 2021 as congress 2020 has been replaced by online consideration of proposals.

**Effort**

The current cost of replacing the medals (from the Finance Director) is 1500 euros.

There would be a minimal amount of time involved as it would merely be a slight rearrangement of the number of different coloured medals.

1. All MF delegates would be required to state current stock of CCM medals.
2. An order of Silver medals with CCE boxes (to replace current boxes for CCM).
3. Distribute these at Congress 2021 (absent delegate should arrange for another delegate/official collect and distribute).
4. MF Delegates will change round medals and boxes so all CCM have silver medals and CCE have bronze medals.

Although the cost of replacement is 1,500 Euros, this will result in delegates having an extra stock which will mean a reduction in the overall bill at the next scheduled distribution.

**Considerations**

As this proposal is not a new rule, this proposal, if approved, may be implemented immediately for titles achieved after congress 2020.

**Documentation**

ICCF rule 1.5.4 covers 'Awarding of titles' and makes reference to "medals for the CCE and CCM titles". However, no reference is made to any specific colour of medal for a particular title and therefore no rule change is deemed necessary

**Comments**

**09/05/2020 Uwe Staroske**

Dear Phill,

this is a practical and down-to-earth approach!

If I understand you correctly, you wish the delegates to bring their medals back and you want to change them against the medals you suggest in your proposal?

Last year delegates were asked to make an estimation for the next 3 years, some of these are for sure already distributed to the players.

Therefore delegates have to contact their players, ask them to send them back to the delegates and the



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

delegates bring them back to the Congress 2021 (provided this takes place face to face) ? Then the delegates receive new medals from ICCF, take them home and distribute the new medals to the "New" CCE /CCM holders of 2019/2020?

Please allow me to ask - whom do you wish to do the work on behalf of ICCF?

Furthermore allow me to add a minor fact - the CCM medals that were distributed are silver :=)

I do not understand, why you do not specify the colour and thickness of the paper of the certificates, for those, who were personally present.

In German we would say: Wir wollen mehr Bürokratie wagen.

Maybe you intend to re-read your proposal and wish to take the proper action.

This is the only and last comment I am going to submit on your words.

All the best,

Uwe

**12/05/2020 Phillip J. Beckett**

The intention is to minimize the work, and cut the cost to a minimum.

The new medals would only be for newly awarded titles.

Each federation would need to notify how many incorrectly colored medals they have in stock, replacements would be ordered with bronze medals but stands named CCM. These replacements would then be handed over to federations. Each federation would be responsible for the switch over of medals and stands.

**13/05/2020 Garvin Gray**

I have a few bronze CCM and CCE medals at this point in time, but no silvers.

If we are talking about reasonable colors for the medals moving forward, then I think this is a reasonable and sensible color arrangement:

- 1) GM medal - Gold
- 2) SIM and IM - Silver
- 3) CCM and CCE - Bronze

As for whether there will be a Congress in 2021, according to Section 4, Article 29: Article 29 of the ICCF Statutes.

The Congress shall meet at least every other year. The arrangements of a Congress shall be decided by the preceding Congress or, in the absence of such a decision, by the President.

Therefore, with it being 99.9% certain that there will not be a Congress in 2020, there must an in person Congress in 2021.

**19/05/2020 Michael Millstone**

Hello Garvin,

Clarification to your last sentence that there must be an in-person Congress in 2021. ICCF Statute, Article 30, "The President of ICCF is empowered to cancel or rearrange a meeting of Congress, should exceptional circumstances arise".

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean a silver-colored medal will be awarded for the CCM title and a bronze-colored medal for the CCE title..

A vote of NO will mean both titleholders will currently receive a bronze-colored medal..



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-016 Add a Second Payment Processor to the Server Entry Process**

Proposed by Austin Lockwood, ICCF Services Director

**Abstract**

The response to Proposal **2017-009** (Credit Card Module or Alternative Payment System) in Albena was to establish an account with the payment processor "Stripe" and to set up a separate **website** in order to process purchases made using Stripe.

The use of a separate website was always intended to be a temporary measure to be used whilst Stripe was evaluated. Furthermore there are a number of operational and GDPR issues associated with this website. If ICCF are to continue using Stripe as a payment processor, then it is now time to fully integrate the processor into the main ICCF website and server.

This is intended as a neutral proposal; the Services Committee make no recommendations about whether this work should proceed, however the intention is to discontinue the "store" website whatever the outcome of the proposal.

We will present delegates with information about:

- The cost of implementing a Stripe payment processor on the webserver,
- The level of usage of the current store website,
- The outcome of a recent survey of players.

Delegates can then decide whether to:

1. Accept this proposal and implement Stripe on the server, or
2. to continue with PayPal as the only available payment processor for direct entries.

**Proposal**

To fully integrate the Stripe payment processing system in the server, so that players entering events through Direct Entry will have a choice between paying by PayPal and paying by Stripe directly from iccf.com.

**Rationale**

Although direct credit card payments are possible using PayPal, PayPal is not universally available in all countries; in particular players from Turkey are not able to make payments using PayPal. This means that Direct payments via the server are not currently available to Turkish Players.

Proposal **2017-009** established the right of all players to make direct credit card payments; this was implemented using an external website, however this arrangement is unsatisfactory as the external website has not been fully evaluated for GDPR and other regulatory compliance and we are not in a position to continue to maintain this site.

We must now, therefore, decide whether to invest in the necessary work on the server to accept payments other than through PayPal, or to discontinue support for Stripe entirely.

**Assessment**

The number of Direct Entries through Stripe will be reported to Congress in 2021.

**Effort**

The cost of fully integrating Stripe into the website is estimated at approximately €4,000 Euros; this will represent a sizable portion of the **2021 development budget**.

**Considerations**

**Current Use of Stripe**

Since 1st January 2019 there have been thirty Direct Entries made through the Stripe website (approximately two entries per month), including just one from a player who's country is not able to use PayPal.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

The Stripe website has not been universally advertised or promoted, so the overall numbers are not a fair comparison. It has, however been strongly recommended to federations from countries where PayPal is not available and it is disappointing that these players have not made use of the facility.

**Survey of Players**

A survey of players' experiences and satisfaction with using the ICCF entry system was conducted in early 2020. In order to avoid leading questions, no questions were asked directly about players' experiences with PayPal.

788 players responded to the questionnaire, of those, 502 (63.7%) reported that they had successfully entered tournaments using Direct Entry or their member federation, however 134 (17%) reported that they were unable to enter ICCF tournaments.

Some of the reasons given were unrelated to the tournament entry system (for example the player was not qualified, or that they preferred free tournaments), however four players mentioned difficulty using PayPal, including one from a country where PayPal is not available.

694 (88.1%) players reported that they were satisfied with the current arrangements for entering tournaments using the current entry process, 94 (11.9%) reported that they were dissatisfied.

Again, many of the reasons for dissatisfaction were unrelated to the entry process, however in the comments fifteen players (16% of those dissatisfied, or just under 2% of all players) reported that having PayPal as the only option for payment was the source of their dissatisfaction.

**Documentation**

It will not be necessary to update the Financial Regulations or other official documents as no specific reference is made to the payment processor used by ICCF.

**Comments**

**07/05/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

I think integration is the only logical consequence. Zone 2 and now the WZ have offered credit cards via Stripe for a few years, in an integrated way. When presented this way, players use a credit card in 44% of the transactions. I support this implementation

**10/05/2020 Garvin Gray**

I support this proposal as well. Two methods of payments is better for all, as it gives choice to the entrant and also in this case, helps to get around the difficulties associated with PayPal in some countries.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean the "store" website will be closed; players will be able to pay for direct entries directly on the server using their credit cards and the "Stripe" service in addition to PayPal..

A vote of NO will mean the "store" website will be closed; players will be able to pay for direct entries with PayPal being the only option..

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

### 2020-017 Validity of “Half Qualifications” for WCCC

Proposed by Gian-Maria Tani, Title Tournament Commissioner

#### Abstract

ICCF Rule 1.2.1 (7) states that “Qualifications based on results in tournaments are valid for 3 years from the end of the tournament in which the qualification was obtained.”

Nothing is stated about “half qualifications” (currently only possible for WCCC Preliminaries): at the moment, they have no expiration limit.

#### Proposal

I propose that a “first half qualification” is considered valid for 3 years from the end of its tournament. If in this period the player gets a “second half qualification”, his “full qualification” will be valid, as now, for 3 years after the end of the second tournament; on the contrary, the first half qualification will expire.

Rule 1.2.1 (7) should be changed in the following way:

“... Qualifications based on results in tournaments are valid for 3 years from the end of the tournament in which the qualification was obtained. A half qualification is valid for 3 years from the end of the tournament in which it was obtained; if a second half qualification is obtained in this period, the full qualification will be valid for 3 years from the end of the tournament in which the second half qualification was obtained...”

It should be inserted a “temporary note” to Rule 1.2.1 (7): “All “half qualifications” obtained in tournaments ended before 31/12/2020 are valid until 31/12/2023.”

#### Rationale

The nowadays situation leads to an incongruence with the general rule (there were cases in which a “first half qualification” was used more than 10 years after the end of the tournament in which it was obtained!). Additionally, the qualification list for WCCC Preliminaries is now unnecessarily burdened by “half qualifications” of players who stopped playing many years ago.

There will be no complaints from the players because the validity of all the “half qualifications” already obtained will be extended to 31/12/2023.

#### Assessment

No assessment should be necessary.

#### Effort

The qualification list for the WCCC Preliminaries (that is not an official document, but a work document of the TTC) will be updated by the TTC to reflect these changes.

There is no financial cost from this proposal.

#### Considerations

N/A

#### Documentation

The only change to the Rules will be an added sentence and a temporary note to ICCF rule 1.2.1 (7), as indicated above in “Proposal”.

#### Comments

Nobody has commented on this proposal yet.

#### Voting Summary

A vote of YES will mean that a first “half qualification” will expire 3 years after the end of the tournament in which it was obtained if a second half qualification wouldn’t be obtained..

A vote of NO will mean that a first “half qualification” will continue to be indefinitely valid..



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

### **2020-018 Assumed Ratings**

Proposed by Uwe Staroske, Qualifications and Ratings Commissioner

#### **Abstract**

Change the current rule of assumed ratings to a new regulation.

#### **Proposal**

Currently for rating purposes the table mentioned in the ICCF Rules, Appendix 1, item 11 is applied to define assumed ratings for players without a published rating.

The proposal aims at changing this as follows:

If at least 75% of players of an event are rated, then the average rating of the rated players shall be applied to the players with an unpublished rating.

If less than 75 % of players of an event are rated, the assumed rating shall be 1.800 without any exception.

As it is current practice, Fide ratings should be treated as unfixed ratings:

If a player new to ICCF has indicated his/her Fide rating, this rating shall be his/her start rating (and consequently qualifies this player for the appropriate tournaments, and the rating which is calculated for his opponents).

#### **Rationale**

The current rules is a source of confusion among players and tournament organizers, furthermore there are new types of tournaments not mentioned in the appendix (e. g. there are four stages in zonal championships).

The new regulation is a general rules applicable to all kinds of tournaments. The average of the rated players appears to be a "fair" solution – this is the rating that players are expecting.

This rule is going to make the rules easier to handle.

The current situation (different rating for players without a published rating for titles and for ratings purposes) is removed.

#### **Assessment**

Currently the Ratings Commissioner checks preliminary ratings of new tournaments. This would save a lot of time and effort. Ambiguities in the application of rules are removed.

#### **Effort**

Rules and server update necessary.

#### **Considerations**

N/A

#### **Documentation**

ICCF Rules, Appendix 1, item 11

#### **Comments**

##### **19/05/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Please clarify how a start rating would be determined in a team event, as the process of averaging across opponents seems mainly to apply to individual events. For example, what would determine the start rating in a multiple team event such as the Rochade, versus a single opponent event such as a friendly match?

##### **20/05/2020 Uwe Staroske**

I do not see a difference between a a team and an individual event. In a team event the opponents of your board decide about an assumed rating.

##### **28/05/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Thank you for the clarification. I therefore understand this clarification to mean that any unrated player placed into a friendly match will automatically be given the provisional rating of his/her one opponent,



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

whether that opponent be rated 1600 or 2600. Please correct me if I am wrong, but it would seem that, for instance, placing a brand new player against a 2600-rated opponent in a friendly match would mean that the 2600-rated opponent would then gain or loss rating points based on results with the presumption of a 2600 provisional rating. Under most circumstances, this would seem like an avenue for easy rating points by the rated player. Is this what is intended? If that is not how the rating system would work, please let me know. If I am correct, might there be a minimum number of opponents required before the automatic averaging of ratings is employed?

Dennis

**28/05/2020 Austin Lockwood**

The proposal specifies a minimum of 75% of players being rated, so this rule can only apply in events of four players or more. In the case of a friendly match, an unrated player will always have an assumed rating of 1,800.

**29/05/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Austin,

I appreciate the clarification, presuming the submitter, Uwe, agrees with it. I had not read the phrase "at least 75%" as necessarily implying there needs to be at least 4 opponents. (My read had been that if the single opponent in a friendly match is rated, then 100% of the opponents are rated.) With this new clarification, I support the proposal as it is. I just ask that Uwe officially agree with your clarification.

Dennis

**30/05/2020 Uwe Staroske**

Dear Dennis,

I agree with Austin, we discussed this in advance.

The proposal says 75 of the players of an event - if in a friendly match there is a player without a rating, the only 50 % have a rating.

All the best

Uwe

**31/05/2020 Austin Lockwood**

We may need to make a slight amendment for Silli proposals - maybe "75% of the player and his opponents".

**01/06/2020 Uwe Staroske**

Agreed - the amendment for the Silli system is useful and should be part of the proposal

**27/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

After consulting with Uwe and Austin, we have come to the agreement that the described process of averaging of ratings to determine an unrated player's provisional/assumed rating will specifically involve the average of that player's opponents. This can be the same as the average in an event, but in multi-group and Silli events, these average ratings may not be the same. This proposal would result in using the average of the player's actual opponents (if at least 75% of them are rated) no matter what the type of event.

Likewise, the 75% threshold of rated opponents for determining an unrated player's assumed rating would also be determined only at the start of each event, and would not be recomputed later even if one or more opponents withdraw or are substituted for any reason.

**29/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

I need to correct an error in something I just wrote. The 75% threshold of rated players pertains to the complete set of players in an event, not just to each player's set of opponents. In any case, once an event has been determined at its start to meet that requirement (for averaging opponents' ratings in computing



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

provisional ratings), that requirement will not be reassessed if one or more players withdraw or are substituted for any reason.

**06/07/2020 Russell Sherwood**

It should be noted that this proposal will introduce an anomaly in that a player will be able to have two different assumed ratings in different groups of a large event (e.g. World Cup) and opponents will therefore gain/loss different amounts from results against the same player at the same time.

**06/07/2020 Russell Sherwood**

For clarity to voters - what is the definition of Event being used here? In a large event such as the World Cup does this mean all entries to the World Cup event or the Individual section?

**07/07/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Since we are running out of time for further comments before voting begins, I will risk answering Russell's question despite the proposal not being mine. From a Rules' perspective, where consistency is of relevance, I believe that the meaning of "event" in determining the 75% rated requirement pertains only to the subsection in which a player is playing, and not the entire set of multiple sections that comprise a complete tournament. Using Russell's words, it is the individual section and not the entire World Cup event. My reasoning is two-fold, both related to consistency in the Rules:

(1) the determination of the average rating as described by this proposal is made only using the player's opponents and not everyone in the entire tournament, and

(2) we have the precedent for years that the category of an event (for norm purposes) is determined section by section and not just singularly across sections for an entire multiple section tournament.

In both cases, the "individual" section, as opposed to the entire multiple section tournament, serves as the definition of "event".

Without contrary input about the intention of this proposal from its writer, the above will serve as my understanding of the proposal's meaning.

**07/07/2020 Mariusz Wojnar**

As I remember during Services Committee meeting we agreed upon average of opponents (as it is defined in Appx.2 for title norms and to be consistent in all events).

Dennis, under item (2) you describe old rules. Currently title norms are calculated based on opponents and the average of the whole section is used for marketing purposes only!

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean that the list of assumed ratings will be substituted by a reasonable and useful regulation.

A vote of NO will mean that the list of assumed ratings will remain.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

### 2020-019 New Tournament Format

Proposed by Uwe Staroske, National Delegate

#### Abstract

This is a joint proposal by TO Mike Green and Uwe Staroske.

ICCF are always pleased to offer their customers new and attractive tournaments. The authors believe, that with their proposal they can offer such a tournament.

#### Proposal

This tournament combines elements of a Knock Out system and a Swiss system and adapts them to the needs of a round robin tournament as used in correspondence chess.

The tournament starts as a normal round robin with groups of 11 players, each group being of approximately the same average rating. If the total number of registrations is not a multiple of 11, then groups should be formed with a minimal deviation from 11 (i.e. 217 registered players would be 4 groups of 13 and 15 groups of 11) After this and all further rounds a ranking list will be created according to the following criteria:

1. The highest percent points
2. The highest percent wins
3. The highest percent wins with black
4. The lowest rating

All players with more than 50% points will qualify for the second round (this is the KO part of the tournament). The first 11 (or the nearest odd integer to 11) players on the list form group 1 for the second round, the next 11 (or the nearest odd integer to 11) group 2 and so forth (this is the Swiss part of the tournament). For the third round, the accumulated points achieved in the previous rounds will be used to calculate a player's place in the list (but the >50% in the current round is still a requirement for promotion). The tournament will be restricted to maximal 4 rounds. The winner of the tournament will be the player with the highest accumulated score (percent) over all 4 rounds.

#### Rationale

To offer attractive tournament to the players and to attract new players to ICCF.

#### Assessment

This tournament form is already running on the BdF's own server and has attracted a wide range of players from very strong to beginners. Because more than half of the possible points are necessary for promotion, it could also help against the flood of draws, which we are currently experiencing in correspondence chess. Apart from that, the probability of promotion is higher than when only one player promotes, so that more players will get more value, in terms of more games, for their entry fee. Other points that will make this tournament form attractive are 1.) Title norms will certainly be available in some (if not all) of the groups from round 2 onwards and 2.) The novelty of this tournament.

#### Effort

TO Michael Green, who has experience in the organisation of this type of tournament on the BdF server, is willing to take over the organisation on the ICCF server. The ICCF Marketing Department may like to try and organise a sponsor for this event, whose name could be integrated in the name of the tournament.

#### Considerations

N/A

#### Documentation

An entry fee of 10 €, in line with the entry free for the World Cup, seems reasonable. In order to complete the tournament within a manageable space of time, we suggest a triple block time control (i. e. 480 days). WTD Frank Geider and NTTC Jörg Kracht expresse their support to this proposal.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**Comments**

**23/05/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Uwe this sounds very interesting, would you be able to share any examples of current or past BdF events to look at the crosstables and how the ranking system works?

**28/05/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

For the record, I am not aware of any current rules that are contrary to this tournament format. It should be noted that the time control mentioned in the proposal is described as a suggestion (triple block with a 480 day duration) and should not be interpreted as required of the tournament organizer. Personally, I find such a time control to be a reasonable one for a 4-stage event.

**04/06/2020 Uwe Staroske**

Hi Gino,

the following link shows an example:

<https://iccfwebfiles.blob.core.windows.net/congress/2020/Example%2BRanking%2BList.xlsx>

It shows the ranking list of the players qualifying for round 2 all players with > 50% score.

All the best

Uwe

**06/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Hi Uwe,

The link does not seem to be working...

**09/06/2020 Gordon M. Anderson**

An interesting proposal and offer. I was looking forward to using the link, however, I agree with Gino it does not appear to work.

**09/06/2020 Austin Lockwood**

Try this... <http://iccfwebfiles.blob.core.windows.net/congress/2020/Example%252BRanking%252BList.xlsx>

**10/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Thanks! what does FWZ stand for?. It looks like it is a rating, perhaps performance rating?. Out of curiosity, would you please show the real ratings for the players? It is indeed a sort of knockout based on performance. Very interesting idea, I am thinking out loud here, what are the chances of two players facing each other more than once in a 4-stage event?

**25/06/2020 Uwe Staroske**

Hi Gino,

Thanks a lot for your questions.

The FWZ is, as you correctly assumed, the German CC rating. It is also based on Elo's probability formulae but applied differently. The FWZ value is in general about 250 points lower than the ICCF value. The displayed values in the list have been corrected to account for this difference. It is not possible to display the ICCF rating of all players because several of the players involved don't play on the ICCF sever and consequently have no ICCF rating.

All the best

Mike and Uwe

**25/06/2020 Uwe Staroske**

2. The chances of two players facing each other more than once in the tournament are quite high. This is unavoidable because on average 5 or 6 players from each group will promote to the next stage and players with the same score are grouped together. That is also why multiple registrations for the tournament are not possible (a player may end up having to play against himself).



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**26/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Thanks Uwe, still sounds like a very interesting event. Would the format allow for some higher rated players to register in the second round directly (and perhaps be given 1/2 unrated point for the first round games)? I am remembering late entries to an OTB Swiss event, this usually involve only one game though...

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean to introduce this innovative and appealing tournament format.

A vote of NO will mean that nothing will change. .

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-020 Special Provisions for the 70th ICCF Jubilee Events**

Proposed by Michael Millstone, Eric Ruch on behalf of the Executive Board

**Abstract**

Special qualification provisions to be achieved in the ICCF Jubilee events.

**Proposal**

EB requests the formal approval of the special provisions below.

The following special qualification provisions (required result above 50%) can be achieved in:

1. the 70th ICCF Jubilee World Champions event:
  - winner and runner-up (tie-break apply) will qualify for a World Championship final
1. the 70th ICCF Jubilee World Elite event:
  - section A: winner and runner-up (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship final;
  - section B: winner and runner-up (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship final;
  - section C: winner (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship final;
  - section C: players from places 2-5 (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship Candidates (upon payment of the entry fee).
1. the 70th ICCF Jubilee Chess 960 World Elite event:
  - the winner (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship final;
  - players from places 2-3 (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship Candidates (upon payment of the entry fee);
1. the 70th ICCF Jubilee World Cup final:
  - the winner (tie-break applies) will earn the SIM title;
  - the winner (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship final;
  - players from places 2-3 (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship Candidates (upon payment of the entry fee);
  - players from places 4-13 (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship semi-final (upon payment of the entry fee).
1. the 70th ICCF Jubilee Chess 960 World Cup final:
  - the winner (tie-break applies) will earn the SIM title;
  - the winner (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship final;
  - players from places 2-3 (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship Candidates (upon payment of the entry fee);
  - players from places 4-9 (tie-break applies) will qualify for a World Championship semi-final (upon payment of the entry fee).

**Rationale**

In the past, special provisions were applied to ICCF jubilee events, and they are, to some extent, customary. Their role is to give a unique setting to jubilee tournaments and to attract players.

In 2021, the ICCF celebrates its 70th anniversary.

The Executive Board (EB) to celebrate this anniversary, according to its tradition (from the 50th and 60th anniversary), will conduct several activities such as:

- Special Jubilee tournaments (world champions, elite players, ICCF officials, including events for postal players, elite 960 players) – start date 2021, duration about 2-4 years.
- Jubilee World Cups (regular and chess 960), separate events from the regular ICCF activities, carried out with the Silli system in 2 stages (preliminaries and final) over 4 years – start date 2021-02-15.

This plan was presented in detail, including special provisions, at the 2019 Congress in Vilnius and, formally approved by delegates, although no formal voting was carried out.





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**Assessment**

N/A

**Effort**

N/A

**Considerations**

- a. For the future, consideration could be given to incorporating such provisions into ICCF regulations.
- b. In case of a vote "NO," the Jubilee tournaments will be started without the special qualification provisions.

**Documentation**

There is no need to change the ICCF documentation or ICCF statutes.

**Comments**

**02/07/2020 Michael Roy Freeman**

I would be opposed to so many qualifications to a World Championship final event, especially from other forms of chess like 960. I believe it devalues the status of the WC Final. But... the Executive have made a call, and the rules published.

**02/07/2020 Garvin Gray**

I could not find any reference to a 2019 Proposal that gave these provisions.

At the 2018 Congress, the delegates voted against these type of extra provisions at every opportunity. All proposals, such as special qualifications from the Veterans World Cup winner to Candidates qualification for the Chess960 World Cup, were made clear that no special qualifications should exist.

Therefore, based on the information so far, I will be voting against this proposal.

**03/07/2020 Per Söderberg**

Our federation approves of points 1, 2 and 4 but is against 3 and 5.

As it is a full package deal, the only option, for us, is to vote NO, sorry to say.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean formal approval of special provisions for the ICCF Jubilee events accepted at the 2019 Congress in Vilnius. .

A vote of NO will mean rejection of special provisions regarding the ICCF jubilee celebrations, although adopted at the 2019 Congress in Vilnius..

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

## 2020-023 Clarifying Rules about Resetting Clocks after Extended Period of Down Server

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules Commissioner

### Abstract

A recent experience showed varied ways in which tournament directors implemented Rules 3.16.1. (b) and 3.16.2. related to the resetting of clocks when the ICCF server went down for more than 8 hours. Based on a request from the Chair of the ICCF Appeals Committee, the Committee that needed to deal with that variation, this proposal was brought forth to clarify that same existing rule. The purpose is to ensure that any future occasion when the server is down for an extended period will result in a consistent implementation of the existing rule.

### Proposal

Rule 3.16.1(b) states that a player's clock can be reset "if the ICCF server is down while a game is in a time critical phase - in other words, where a player's time expires during a time when the player had no opportunity to make a move." The same rule further states: "ICCF 'guarantees' there will be no more than three periods of server unavailability of an hour or more in a seven-day period, and there will be no periods of server unavailability of eight hours or more. " This latter phrase is to be interpreted as meaning the resetting of clocks due to the server being down only is to occur if the server is down beyond one of those time periods.

Rule 3.16.2. states that the amount of time to be reset to players' clocks under this same circumstance is "the time the server went down".

This proposal will formally clarify aspects of these two rules and relevant procedures to mean:

- (1) the resetting of clocks under this type of circumstance will only be appropriate for players who were on move during the time the server was down and the game went to ETL during the time the server was down,
- (2) to obtain a resetting of a clock under this circumstance, a player must make a request for such to the relevant TD. The TD will then need to forward the request to the World Tournament Director (WTD) for the game to be reset to ongoing (because TDs cannot reset "finished" games on their own),
- (3) the amount of time to be reset will only be the number of days and hours the server was down, rounded to the nearest full hour (as determined by the Services Director or the Deputy Services Director and communicated to the WTD and published on the ICCF home page),
- (4) the person responsible for ensuring games that went to ETL specifically during the time the server was down are reset to ongoing with reset clocks as the WTD, but only for those games where the request is made by "defaulting" player or that player's team captain.

### Rationale

A recent experience with Rule 3.16.1.(b). showed a wide variety of player and TD responses to the server's being down for more than 8 hours. The vast majority of players never submitted a request for their clocks to be reset. A number of players did so request despite the fact their games were not in "a time critical phase" as required by Rule 3.16.1.(b). TDs, in response quite regularly reset the clocks of any player who submitted such a request, again despite the fact that the games were not in "a time critical phase". The amount of time put back on clocks by TDs varied. Not every TD reset clocks just because a player submitted a request.

One player who was denied the resetting of his (non-critical phase) clocks filed an appeal to the Appeals Committee. After the AC made its ruling in the case, the Chair of the AC suggested to the Rules Commissioner that the Rule needed to be clarified to avoid this type of mixed response in the future.

The details stated in this proposal concerning Rules 3.16.1.(b) and 3.16.2. are thought to reflect the current words in the Rule as well as the currently required procedures to accomplish the stated ends. The purpose



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

of this proposal is not to change the existing rule, but solely to add enough details to clarify when and how it is to be implemented and avoid ambiguity in the Rule's implementation.

**Assessment**

The server being down for an extended period of time is rare. Whenever that next occasion occurs, the WTD will be able to see to what degree there is still variability in the implementation of 3.16.1.(b) and 3.16.2. That variability can then be compared to what recently occurred, to see what improvement was accomplished.

**Effort**

Since the proposal just involves clarification of an existing Rule and current procedures to implement that Rule, there is no cost associated with this proposal.

**Considerations**

The Rules Commission had divided views about various aspects of Rule 3.16.1.(b) and 3.16.2. Arguments were made both in support of the existing rules and wanting changes. Essentially, the argument for change reflected the view that 3.16.1.(b) was too limited in its application and should be applied to more players; that number ranging from a few extra who had little extra time on their clocks but did not go ETL, to all players.

I, as Rules Commissioner, took the stance that while these perspectives looking to change the rules had valid arguments, they went beyond the clarification requested by the Chair of the AC. The current proposal solely reflects the Commission's clarification of the existing rules. If there is a desire for changing either 3.16.1.(b) and/or 3.16.2., that will need to occur through a different proposal.

**Documentation**

Rules 3.16.1.(b) and 3.16.2. will need to be updated with the new language herein proposed.

**Comments**

**27/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

I was informed that the wording of the title might be confusing. The phrase "down server" in the title and anywhere else in the proposal is meant to include any time the server is unavailable, with this proposal being applicable when the server is unavailable for an extended period of time (that is, at least 8 consecutive hours) for any reason. Additionally, the resetting of clocks will need to be rounded to the nearest full day, rounded up, instead of what is written above involving minutes, due to current server constraints.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean rules will be clarified related to when and how the resetting of clocks will occur after the server is down for extended period.

A vote of NO will mean no rule clarification will occur, indicating the same variability in implementation can be expected next time the server is down for an extended period.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

## 2020-024 Establish "Regional" Tournaments

Proposed by Austin Lockwood, On behalf of the Welsh Correspondence Chess Federation

### Abstract

Last year, Congress reaffirmed the requirement for all international tournaments to be approved by the World Tournament Director; this caused some confusion among some member federations and sub-federation organizations which had been running unapproved tournaments for many years, inviting players from other federations.

Many federations organize small tournaments where a very limited number of players from other federations take part. These tournaments are all now approved by the WTD, however they don't all fit neatly into the definitions of "Open" or "Invitational" events. These tournaments are typically small in size and involve players from a small number of member federations.

There is a need to recognize these as international events separately from global invitational or open events.

### Proposal

A new class of international tournament (in addition to Invitational and Open tournaments) will be established called "Regional Tournaments".

Regional tournaments will be administered by groups of between two and six member federations, the structure, entry fee, prizes, etc. will be internal matters for the participating federations to agree upon but must be declared on the application to the WTD. There will be no limit to the number of regional tournaments which can be organized.

Regional tournaments must have the following properties:

- Regional tournaments are the responsibility of between two and six participating member federations.
- Applications for regional tournaments must be submitted to the ICCF WTD at least one month before it is due to start. It must not be advertised until ICCF approval has been formally confirmed. All participating member federations must be signatory to the application.
- Regional tournaments must use standard ICCF rules.
- Only players from the participating federations and isolated players may participate.
- The ICCF Finance Director will invoice the first applicant at the rate listed in the Financial Regulations.
- If the first applicant falls into arrears with ICCF, the other applicants will be become liable for any debt outstanding from the tournament.
- Regional tournaments may be rated and may carry title norms, provided they meet the necessary criteria and this is approved as part of the WTD application.
- Regional tournaments will not qualify for ICCF medals or certificates.
- As ICCF sanctioned international tournaments, the games will count towards the IA title for the tournament director.

### Rationale

This proposal will allow sensible restrictions to be placed on member federation's ability to organize large international open tournaments, but also allow long standing events involving small regional groupings of member federations to continue.

### Assessment

A list of Regional tournaments will be included in the WTDs report to Congress in 2021.

### Effort



### Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

No expenditure is anticipated on the server, some extra effort would be required by the WTD in approving these events.

#### Considerations

This proposal will allow the rich culture and diversity of regional correspondence chess to continue. This proposal does not affect any right of member federations to run ICCF approved invitational or open tournaments.

#### Documentation

The ICCF Rules would need to be updated to incorporate this type of tournament.

#### Comments

##### 01/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren

I believe I understand the niche this new type of event would serve. There are some omissions in the proposal that still seem to need to be addressed:

- (1) By making a new category of international individual event besides open and invitational, the proposal leaves open how invitations to individual players are to be allowed: directly from the TO, or made in an open "regional" advertisement, or only through the ND of the involved MF, or are any of these avenues of player solicitation to be allowed?
- (2) Are there any restrictions on what constitutes a "region"? The reason I ask is that this new type of event can be a work-around to offering an open or invitational event by any MF that wants to run a title event while specifying the exact players to be allowed to be involved. Once this type of event exists, if there is no restriction on what constitutes a region, and if there TOs are allowed to send invitations directly to players, then there would be little reason remaining for an MF to run an invitational event (where the choice of players involved is left in the hands of NDs and not TOs). A clear definition of a "region", and/or limiting how TOs can solicit players would avoid this outcome.
- (3) Does this proposal pertain to team events, or just individual events? The reason this matters is that, depending on the answers to #1 and #2 above, the proposal could also allow TOs potentially to compose all of the teams themselves (when using only players from the 2-6 MFs and isolated players) according to whatever parameters the TO wants. TOs do not have this ability in any other circumstance, and I am wondering if it is intended to be allowed through the proposed new type of event.

To be clear, current ICCF rules do not require this proposal to define "region" or even limit what TOs can do in organizing the proposed "regional" events. The above critique simply points out the increased latitude being allowed in the creation of these events if the proposal is not made more specific and hence more limiting in what is to be allowed.

##### 01/06/2020 Austin Lockwo

In answer to your questions:

1. Recruitment arrangements would be agreed between the organizers; as these tournaments would be organized jointly by a small number of federations, and only players of those federations would be involved, there is no chance of players being recruited without the consent of their member federation.
2. No, a "region" is just a collaboration of two to six member federations, there is no geographical specificity.
3. The proposal applies to both individual and team events.

Essentially, the purpose of the proposal is to allow the continuation of many events which already run as very small open tournaments in the case of ICCF limiting the number of open events which member federations are permitted to run.

##### 07/07/2020 Mariusz Wojnar



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

Austin, but we have running already several strong regional tournaments such as Slav Cup TT, Baltic Team Tournament, Rochade, etc. And the current rules are enough. At least I think so.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean groups of federations will be able to organize regional tournaments from 2021 onwards.

A vote of NO will mean these tournaments will continue to be classed as either "Open" or "Invitational" tournaments and be subject to any limitation imposed by Congress this year.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-025 Norm Tournaments: Switching of an Entry When the Player's Rating Changes**

Proposed by Gian-Maria Tani, Title Tournament Commissioner

**Abstract**

ICCF Rule 1.2.4 (11 b) states that if a new official rating list becomes available after a player has registered, but prior to the event's going online, and his new rating goes into a range corresponding to a different tournament, the player can be transferred to the tournament corresponding to his new rating, but only if it is a tournament of the same type.

In practice, a player can be "promoted" from a SIM/B to a SIM/A, or "relegated" from a MN/A to a MN/B, but he cannot be switched from a MN/A to a SIM/B (or vice versa).

**Proposal**

I propose that the switching from a Norm Tournament to another, in case of quarterly variation of the player's rating, takes place in any case, regardless of the "type" of tournament.

Rule 1.2.4 (11 b) should be changed in the following way:

"If a new official rating list becomes available after a player has registered, but prior to the event's going online, the player's qualification will be modified, up or down, based on the new official rating."

**Rationale**

The current rule entails a clear inconsistency between the different Norm Tournaments.

The main reason why 10 different Norm Tournaments have been set up was to allow fair and easier achievement of the international titles norms. Allowing a player whose rating has dropped (even a lot!) to play in a tournament of a range higher than his new rating, may oblige all other players to get a higher than usually score to obtain a norm. Similarly, forcing a player whose rating has increased to participate in a tournament with players who all have a rating much lower than his, may oblige him to get a too high score to obtain a norm.

Please consider that the division into 5 different "types" has only a denomination value, indicating "which" title is "more appropriate" for that tournament (but in CCM tournaments, for example, it is also possible to obtain rules for IM -with very high scores- or for CCE -for those who do not yet have one-).

**Assessment**

No assessment will be necessary.

**Effort**

An objection could arise from the fact that the entry fee for Norm Tournaments varies according to the type (generally a difference of € 5).

If a player is switched to a more expensive tournament, he will not be asked for any additional costs; if he is switched to a less expensive tournament, he will receive a voucher corresponding to the difference.

The costs for the ICCF can be quantified in just over € 50 per year.

**Considerations**

N/A

**Documentation**

The only change to the Rules will be the replacement of ICCF rule 1.2.1 (7), as indicated above in "Proposal".

**Comments**

Nobody has commented on this proposal yet.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean that when a new rating list is available the players in the "waiting list" for starting a Norm Tournament will be switched by the TTC to the Norm Tournament corresponding to their new rating.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A vote of NO will mean that when a new rating list is available the players in the waiting list for starting a Norm Tournament will continue to be switched by the TTC to the Norm Tournament corresponding to their new rating, but only if the two tournaments are of the same type (i.e. from MN/A to MN/B and vice versa, but not from MN/A to SIM/B or from MN/B to CCM/A) .

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-027 Updates to the ICCF Voting Regulations and Electoral Procedures [2/3 VOTE]**

Proposed by Michael Millstone, General Secretary

**Abstract**

Routine administrative updates to the ICCF Voting Regulations and Electoral Procedures document.

**Proposal**

Section 1.1 - delete (the bolded passage above the General Provisions notes the requirement for a 2/3 vote for any changes to this document. Section 1.1 confuses this directive).

Section 1.2 - delete (voting is only accomplished by online voting or roll-call).

**Rationale**

Administrative update.

**Assessment**

N/A

**Effort**

Update will be made to the 2021 version.

**Considerations**

N/A

**Documentation**

ICCF Voting Regulations and Electoral Procedures

**Comments**

**09/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

There is one thing that will be missing, if I understand correctly in that both paragraphs shall be deleted in full.

In 1.2 it says: "a secret ballot will be held if this is requested by at least two thirds of voting delegates."

This will then no longer be possible to ask for, or am I wrong? I do find situations where it can be used for other issues than electing EB members. My strong belief is that the possibility should remain! I do recall at least one situation where it occurred, that a secret ballot was requested.

**11/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

Let me offer an example: Once Congress had to vote about a penalty to a specific player. Afterwards the concerned player wrote a message and gave his opinion on the vote, addressed personally to the federation's Delegate. I find this to not be appropriate, and by requesting a secret ballot, we can avoid such possible unpleasantness.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean the changes will be incorporated..

A vote of NO will mean the changes will not be incorporated and ICCF documentation will not follow procedures.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

### 2020-028 Electronic Awards

Proposed by Uwe Staroske, Qualifications and Ratings Commissioner

#### Abstract

Substitution of awards (printed certificates and medals) by electronic certificates and electronic medals.

#### Proposal

Currently every new titleholder receives a certificate and a medal for the major titles. In general, these are handed over to the player's delegate or to an appointed designee in an awarding ceremony. CCE and CCM medals are handed over outside the awards ceremony to the delegate or an appointed designee in a batch for several years.

Players personally present at the Congress receive a medal and a certificate.

Experience has shown, that the eagerness of delegates to collect and to distribute title awards differs considerably. There is reason to assume, that not every award is distributed to the players.

The proposal aims at improving this:

In general, titles are awarded electronically (there is an electronic certificate as well as an electronic medal under the achievements tab of the players)

Physical awards (printed certificate + medal) are awarded to the players, if they visit the Congress in person.

Furthermore a medal and a certificate are presented to the delegates (or a designee) for the following achievements, even if the players do not visit the Congress in person:

places 1-3 of the Final of the World Championships

places 1-3 of the olympiads

places 1-3 of the acknowledged Zonal Championships (individual)

places 1-3 of the acknowledged Zonal Championships (team)

#### Rationale

Every year delegates have difficulties to collect the players' awards properly:

Delegates unable to join the Congress in person often did not nominate a designee in time. Some delegates did not answer the inquiry to estimate the number of CCM/CCE medals for the next years and wondered, why they did not get CCM/CCE medals.

Repeatedly awards were found in the dustbin after the awards ceremony.

The electronic certificates have been improved in the recent past and may be considered to be a full equivalent to the physical awards.

Those players who wish to earn a printed certificate and a medal are still welcome to join the official awards ceremony.

#### Assessment

The current situation does not allow an assessment, if and when there is going to be a personal ICCF Congress in the future. Although there is a proposal for the year 2021 it cannot be foreseen, if the general framework is going to allow this.

Furthermore ICCF spends quite an amount of money on the awards. An alternative would be to lower the entry fees. This proposals addresses both issues.

#### Effort

Rules update necessary.

Rule 1.5.4

Replace item 1 by the following:

Every titleholder receives an electronic certificate and an electronic medal, which are awarded under the achievements tab of the player.



### Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A printed certificate and a medal will be presented during the awarding ceremony of the Congress to the member federation delegate (or appointed designee) in the following cases:

places 1-3 of the Final of the World Championships

places 1-3 of the Olympiads

places 1-3 of the acknowledged Zonal Championships (individual)

places 1-3 of the acknowledged Zonal Championships (team)

Medals will only be provided if the member federation delegate is attending Congress or has nominated a person to receive and distribute the medals at least six weeks in advance of Congress.

Furthermore players attending the Congress in person will receive a certificate and a medal for a new title.

#### Considerations

N/A

#### Documentation

Rules update.

#### Comments

##### 24/06/2020 Marjan Šemrl

I am seriously concerned that this proposal could be accepted. Medals in physical form are an important part of the motivation of Slovenian correspondence chess players. Correspondence chess players are usually very attached to their home. But once a year we organize a meeting where the ceremonial awarding of ICCF medals is one of the main points of the program. The awarding of medals is photographed and published in the media, which further contributes to the popularization of correspondence chess. After the meeting, the players will work hard again next year to get the next medal. The above proposal removes this possibility and would therefore objectively speaking, do great harm to Slovenian correspondence chess. Therefore I suggest that the option of electronic medals can become an additional, but by no means the only option on offer.

##### 24/06/2020 Garvin Gray

Marjan: I can understand your concern, but I believe some, if not all of your concerns are covered in the proposal:

Medals will only be provided if the member federation delegate is attending Congress or has nominated a person to receive and distribute the medals at least six weeks in advance of Congress.

So, to still cover your ceremonial awards, you would need to appoint someone to get the medals and certificates at each Congress.

##### 24/06/2020 Marjan Šemrl

Garvin: Maybe I don't understand correctly. The proposal states:

"Every titleholder receives an electronic certificate and an electronic medal, which are awarded under the achievements tab of the player.

A printed certificate and a medal will be presented during the awarding ceremony of the Congress to the member federation delegate (or appointed designee) in the following cases:

places 1-3 of the Final of the World Championships

places 1-3 of the olympiads

places 1-3 of the acknowledged Zonal Championships (individual)

places 1-3 of the acknowledged Zonal Championships (team)."

..... and further:

"Furthermore players attending the Congress in person will receive a certificate and a medal for a new title."



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

I understand that the only way that NEW TITLEHOLDERS (GM, SIM, IM, CCM, and CCE) will receive a physical medal is, if they attend the congress in person.

**24/06/2020 Garvin Gray**

Marjan: Thank you for the correction. The full statement says:

Physical awards (printed certificate + medal) are awarded to the players, if they visit the Congress in person.

Furthermore a medal and a certificate are presented to the delegates (or a designee) for the following achievements, even if the players do not visit the Congress in person:

Places 1-3 of the Final of the World Championships

Places 1-3 of the Olympiads

Places 1-3 of the acknowledged Zonal Championships (individual)

Places 1-3 of the acknowledged Zonal Championships (team).

**06/07/2020 Russell Sherwood**

For many players the physical Medal and Certificate for Individual titles are of great importance. It seems to rather favor players who live in countries (Western Europe) where Congresses mainly take place and be unfavorable for those who do not.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean that electronic awards will be implemented.

A vote of NO will mean that nothing will change.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments

**2020-029 - Allowing FIDE GMs to Play Free in ICCF GMN Events**

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules Commissioner

**Abstract**

The current rule stating that ICCF GMs can play without charge in ICCF GMN events may not be allowing FIDE GMs the same benefit. This proposal would allow FIDE GM holders to play without charge in ICCF GMN events.

**Proposal**

ICCF Rule 1.2.4.(9) states "Holders of the ICCF Grandmaster title or players with a fixed rating of 2600 or above on the latest ICCF rating list may participate in Grandmaster Norm Tournaments free of charge". This proposal would change the phrase "ICCF Grandmaster title" in this rule to "ICCF or FIDE Grandmaster title".

**Rationale**

The ICCF benefits from recruiting highly rated FIDE players into our events. Allowing these players to play without charge in our GMN events is one way to facilitate this recruitment. Additionally, if we are going to allow FIDE ratings to be used in our events, and even including FIDE GM titles in counting the number of GM opponents in earning the ICCF GM title, then it is consistent to allow holders of GM titles the same benefit of free play in GMN events that holders of ICCF GM titles have.



### Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

#### **Assessment**

The Title Tournament Commissioner could assess, after a year's time, to what degree there has been an increase in the registration of FIDE GMs in ICCF GMN events.

#### **Effort**

The only financial cost from this proposal would be the lack of registration fees otherwise paid by FIDE GMs into GMN events.

Rule 1.2.4. (9) would need to be updated.

#### **Considerations**

The Title Tournament Commissioner directly stated having no input into the fees to be charged, seeing that as a matter for Congress.

The position of ICCF Finance Director was vacant at the time this proposal was considered and submitted.

Hence, there is no input from such a person.

The Rules Commission brought this issue to this proposal with near unanimity.

#### **Documentation**

Rule 1.2.4 (9) would need to be updated.

#### **Comments**

##### **16/06/2020 Garvin Gray**

Since ICCF GM's can play for free in GMN events, then I agree with this addition for FIDE GM's.

Dennis: Can you confirm if the only event that ICCF GM's can play in for free is GMN's events?

##### **17/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Garvin, to my knowledge, the GMN events are the only ones listed in the ICCF Rules where the Rules specify ICCF GMs are allowed to play for free. There are other events for which the GM title (coupled with a certain rating, or 5 GM norms serve as a qualification to enter an event (e.g., WCCC Semi-finals, WCCC Candidates). Whether or not these qualifications include FIDE GMs is not addressed in this proposal, having not been an issue to date.

##### **18/06/2020 Uwe Staroske**

Dear all,

We have to decide:

Either we accept Fide titles and ratings or we do not acknowledge them.

As currently in principle ICCF accepts Fide ratings and titles I see no reason not to allow Fide GMs to play for free. To treat a Fide GM title similar to an ICCF GM with regard to the qualification, but to treat them differently with regard to the entry fee is not comprehensible. Therefore I am in favor of this proposal.

There is another issue:

Fide players rated > 2.600 are allowed to play a GM norm tournament, but unlike ICCF players > 2.600 they have to pay an entry fee, although our website under the new events tab states:

"The holders of the ICCF Grandmaster Title and any players rated more than 2600 can enter these tournaments free of charge."

Recently a Fide player rated > 2.600 entered a GM norm tournament and was required to pay.

What kind of marketing is this - and are we really in the situation to send new players away?

All the best,

Uwe

##### **18/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

There is a difference here, a FIDE-GM will compete and possible earn an ICCF Title. Why shouldn't he/she pay?



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

An entering ICCF-GM has not that much to gain. OK he/she can get another GM-norm and add it to his/hers CV, perhaps become the player with most GM-norms!

**21/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

I agree FIDE GM's should be allowed to play for free in these events. Paying for the event does not earn them the title of ICCF GM, it is their performance therefore treating them the same way we treat ICCF GM's should be the rule for this particular event

**21/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

Gino: Who said that paying means you get a title?

You compete in GMN to get GM-norms, correct? For someone who already is ICCF-GM, another norm means very little, while for a FIDE-GM it means that enough norms will qualify for an ICCF-GM title.

**22/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Just to clarify something: this proposal is meant to indicate that, if approved, the ICCF would not be charging either a player registering through DE or an MF in any case for an eligible FIDE GM to be playing in a GMN event. If an MF wishes to charge the player a fee anyway, that will remain the business of the MF and will not be affected by this proposal.

**23/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Per, FIDE GM's and ICCF GM's are very close in significance when it comes to participation in a GM norm tournament, their opponents get similar benefits in regards to availability of norms. ICCF GM are given free entries to encourage them to play in these events. FIDE GM's deserve the same treatment. You said they should pay if they are going to get norms. I say they may not even get any norms why should they pay? Their value in these events is not their ability to get norms but facilitating norms for the rest of players.

**23/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

Why should anyone have to pay a fee - nobody is sure of getting a norm!? Anyway, a norm achieved of a player, not being ICCF-GM, is valuable towards this title.

Besides, there is another proposal to remove this requirement of playing a certain number of SIM/GM/2600+. Not all FIDE-GM's have a high rating, some are at FIDE-ELO 2300!

**23/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

We are not talking about anyone. FIDE GM are better off playing a higher category invitational for free to get their ICCF norms.

**23/06/2020 Austin Lockwood**

Personally, I can't form an opinion about this proposal without knowing the outcomes of 2020-007 and 2020-008.

If a quota of games against GMs is still necessary to earn the ICCF GM title, and if FIDE GMs count towards that quota, then I am strongly in favor of this proposal because these players would be making a direct contribution to ICCF titles.

But if games against FIDE GMs do not count towards this quota, or if there is no quota, then I agree with Per; these players are no different to any other player.

Unfortunately though, because of the way we will be voting this year, we won't know the outcomes of the other two proposals in advance - this is a limitation of the online voting system.

Austin

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean holders of a FIDE GM title will be allowed to play in ICCF GM events without charge. A vote of NO will mean holders of a FIDE GM title will be charged to play in ICCF GMN events at the same rate as anyone else without an ICCF GM title.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



## Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-030 New Title: International Organizer (IO) and its Scales TO Level 1 and TO Level 2**

Proposed by César Jesús Reyes Maldonado, National Delegate of Venezuela

**Abstract**

To acknowledge the fine work done by some tournament organizers, this proposal would create the title of International Organizer (IO) and two lower levels (Level 1 and Level 2) of tournament organizers based on their tournament organizational work. The title and lower levels would be structured in the same way as the IA title, and Level 1 and 2 TDs are currently.

**Proposal**

Create the Title of "International Organizer" (IO) and its corresponding previous scales "TO Level 1" and "TO Level 2". There is no ICCF International Organizer (IO) title that identifies the specialist in this area. It is proposed to value the creation of the figure and title of International Organizer (IO) of ICCF Tournaments, along with their previous TO Level 1 and TO Level 2 scales.

A multidisciplinary technical team made up of: the TD Committee, the World Tournament Director and the Rules Commission will establish the specific requirements for obtaining the title "International Organizer" (IO), as well as the regulations for previous stopovers "TO Level 1" and "TO Level 2", based on a qualification and quantification of the TO Tournament Organizer's own tasks (Section 4 of the ICCF Rules). For guidance only, it is suggested to look at the requirements for Title IA contained in Article 3.6. to outline the qualitative and quantitative requirements for evaluation of TOs and nomination for "TO Level 1", "TO Level 2" and finally the title of "International Arbitrer" (IO).

The appointment of the new TO Level 1, TO Level 2 and "International Organizer" (IO) will be in charge of the Qualifications Commissioner (QC), in accordance with the same procedure that applies to TD Level 1, TD Level 2 titles and "International Arbitrer" (IA) contained in Article 1.5.3 of the ICCF rules.

**Rationale**

The work of the Tournament Organizer (TO) at ICCF so far has not had the incentive of an evaluation and recognition in the form of a norm for the Title of International Organizer (IO), despite the high administrative and technical component of its work.

It is proposed to enhance the role of the Tournament Organizer (TO) and allow organizers to accumulate valid requirements for the title of International Organizer (IO), as does an applicant for International Arbitrer (IA) through the TD norms of Levels 1 and 2.

The functions that a Tournament Organizer (TO) performs commonly include: tournament planning, tournament setup, submission to ICCF, approval request at ICCF, entry of participants into the grid, tournament uploads to the server, interaction with TDs and Backups TD, relationship with player participants and Federations, participation in technical events in ETL cases, Withdrawals, etc. All these activities have a clear administrative and technical component in the planning, execution, inspection, development and completion of a Tournament at ICCF. In addition, it is evident and necessary that a TO handle arbitration knowledge in general to successfully carry out his work as TO. All of these functions are listed in Section 4 of the ICCF Rules.

**Assessment**

The effect of this proposal, if accepted, can be assessed by assessing (a) the number of people who work towards the IO title, and (b) by having the World Tournament Director keep track of the number of new requests to become TOs as compared to the numbers in the past.

**Effort**

The creation of the International Organizing Title (IO) means opening a new section in ICCF Rules 1.5.2. The new articles should define the title of International Organizer (IO) and the requirements and norms





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

necessary to achieve such distinction. Also, include the requirements for scales prior to the maximum degree: TO Level 1 and TO Level 2, for example.

There may be financial cost to this proposal if the counting of games/events organized is done by the server as opposed to manually.

**Considerations**

The title of International Tournament Organizer (IO) is not new in the field of face-to-face Chess (OTB), since FIDE contemplates said title in its Statutes and Hand Book.

**Documentation**

Certain ICCF Rules would need to be created:

1.5.2 would need a new section for the IO title.

A new section in ICCF Rules section 4 would need to be added that would be of similar structure to ICCF Rules 3.6 (concerning the IA title).

**Comments**

**16/06/2020 Garvin Gray**

Whilst, 'just because FIDE does it', does not automatically mean ICCF should follow suit, I think this title is appropriate.

Fide has the IO title: <https://handbook.fide.com/chapter/B09>

**17/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

I would have preferred that this proposal listed the specific details concerning how a TO earns Level 1, Level 2, and the proposed new title IO. Are TOs to be assessed by the number of events they organize, the number of players involved in those events, the status of those events, or some combination of these factors? Are TOs to be assessed using historical information or only future measures of these experiences? Will the number of errors they make in organizing events matter? Do we need a new mentor system, a new testing system analogous to what TDs are required to pass (or some other method training and/or rules knowledge testing for TOs)?

Leaving these details to a yet-to-be-formed committee means the delegates will need to trust this unknown committee to derive proper thresholds for the quantity and quality of experience of each TO, as well as the procedures for how these levels and the title are obtained; without further Congress review.

I also would have preferred that the "assigned" set of people to become responsible for the development of this title system had been asked if they were willing to serve in this capacity.

**19/06/2020 Uwe Staroske**

This proposal appears to be rather blurred - no details at all were elaborated.

Maybe it would have been helpful to contact any of the officials in charge rather than making a general proposal. I see no need for this title. This is a contract at the expense of others - not appreciated.

**23/06/2020 César Jesús Reyes Maldonado**

Dear Garvin: Thankful for considering the IO title proposal "appropriate". Certainly not because it exists in FIDE it has to exist in ICCF. It was brought up for reference only. It is primarily asked to value, assist and enhance the work of the TOs, seeking to put it at the level of the TDs. I think that would be a sufficient consideration.

**23/06/2020 César Jesús Reyes Maldonado**

Dear Dennis: As always, all your observations are very pertinent. I will try to answer some of your concerns: Yes, it is necessary to list the details that imply reaching Levels 1 and 2 as TO and consequently the IO title qualification. Perhaps the way it is done for TDs and AI is a guide, but obviously adapted to the specific work of TO. I think that if the proposal is approved, the previous experience of TOs and IO candidates





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

should be taken into account. In any evaluation they must deprive successes and errors of the organizers of tournaments. Just as there are mentors who promote TDs and future AIs, there must also be mentors who guide IO candidates. It is then necessary to create a manual for the TO, as well as the manual and guide for the TD.

Because of the general level of the proposal, delegates are certainly asked to trust the Multidisciplinary Committee that will handle this matter. I recognize that a manifest weakness of our current proposal is the lack of consultation with the projected members of the Commission that would be in charge of structuring the bases for Levels 1 and 2 of the TO and the IO title. I apologize for this and ask the aforementioned members of the TDC, the WTD, the Rules Committee and the Qualifications Commissioner QC, to welcome this proposal. I think it is well worth the extra effort to create and promote level and titled tournament organizers in the immediate future.

**23/06/2020 César Jesús Reyes Maldonado**

Dear Uwe: My respects.

The Necessary and the Fair.

It may not be necessary to appoint the Organizers of IO Tournaments, but it should be fair to recognize this work, which is so important to guarantee the success in the management of tournaments that are promoted every year at ICCF and that certainly give reason to being to ICCF's global chess activity on all its platforms. The tournaments are a gear of intentions where the chess players are the protagonists, the TDs are judges, the Delegates are representatives and the Directors are guarantors. Where is the tournament organizer in all this gear?

I think there is no doubt the merit of the TDs that are trained and guided by renowned mentors up to Levels 1 and 2 and finally to the deserved IA title, after overcoming a series of well-ordered and established requirements in the ICCF rules and that in the end they are approved or not by a Qualifications Commissioner. In their Fair measure, I consider that OTs could have similar merits to TDs in terms of training, evaluation, monitoring and recognition of Levels 1 and 2 as OT. Likewise, the right to obtain the unpublished (in ICCF) IO title after approving the qualitative and quantitative requirements established by the new ICCF Rules that govern the matter.

I think that the definition of these requirements is a matter that requires a deep technical knowledge and experience in similar cases, such as those that defined the bases for the IA title, which has existed for a long time at ICCF. For this, who more than the experts to present the bases of the IO title that the existing Commissions: TDC, WTD, Rules Committee and QC.

Failure to recognize this would imply then appointing a separate, autonomous Commission, probably made up of several National Delegates with proven experience in organizing tournaments, to legislate on the conditions for obtaining the TO Level 1, TO Level 2 recognition and the IO title. We would talk about appointing a TOC with the help of Delegates and probably experts in arbitration technique.

Thank you Uwe for participating with your point of view.

**06/07/2020 Russell Sherwood**

The data to determine who organized events it highly reliable as common practice is that when an office holder changes the events are often moved onto different people. So in the certain events multiple people can have been the Tournament Organizer.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean create the title of "International Organizer" (IO) and its corresponding previous scales "TO Level 1" and "TO Level 2"..



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A vote of NO will mean not create the title of "International Organizer" (IO) and its corresponding previous scales "TO Level 1" and "TO Level 2"..

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-031 Allowing TCs to Make TC-initiated Substitutions Directly**

Proposed by Dennis M. Doren, Rules Commissioner

**Abstract**

Current rules allow team captains (TCs) to authorize substitutions in team events in any case except if the player has been recorded with a withdrawal. The procedure is for the TC to make a "request" of the TD, who is then obliged to record the substitution. Proposed is to allow TCs to make these substitutions directly, without requiring the TD to record the substitution for the TCs.

**Proposal**

ICCF Rule 5.7 states, "If a player has not yet been withdrawn (in any way), ... the TC can substitute a player simply by informing the TD of the desire to substitute without any formal withdrawal. The TC does not need to state a reason to the TD to make this type of substitution. Unlike in §5.6.2., the TC must initiate this request to the TD to implement such a substitution. "Proposed is that Rule 5.7 be changed such that TCs be allowed to make these types of substitutions (but not substitutions following any type of withdrawal) directly, without requiring TDs to implement the substitution for the TCs.

To be clear, the term "substitution" in this proposal should always be understood to include both substitutions and replacements if the rules allow a replacement under the specific circumstance.

Included in this proposal is a new process where the WTD would be allowed to undo any error caused by a TC in enacting, specifically, this type of substitution. TC's who find they made an error could then effectively request the WTD to undo the error and allow the TC to record the substitution properly the second time around. A subsequent error (after the WTD undid the first) in recording the same substitution, however, would lead to the same process as described in 3.17.4 (for when a substitute player is not supplied within the allotted 60 days): "the...player's remaining games [would] be lost by default unless the ...player never played any move in any game. In that circumstance, all of that player's games must be cancelled."

**Rationale**

The process of a TC's needing to submit a request to the TD for a substitution and waiting for the TD to reply seems unnecessary. The current process also increases the likelihood of errors by TDs in recording the TC's requested substitution. Currently, there is no easy way, and sometimes no way at all to undo such an error.

This proposal would allow TCs to accomplish their self-initiated substitutions without being dependent on the timeliness or accuracy of the TD.

At the same time, it is understood that TCs often have received no training, such that errors will likely occur even though the ICCF Rules and specific server instructions are available at each step. Therefore, this proposal would also support the development of a process by which the WTD could be notified when a substitution error has occurred and have the ability to undo the complete process. This would allow TCs to correct their errors (on one occasion per substitution) without any players being penalized or benefiting unfairly. TCs would be held responsible for further errors in recording the desired substitution in keeping with the idea that team members must, at some point, be accountable for what they do.

**Assessment**

If TCs are given the right to make self-initiated substitutions on their own, and they do so correctly, then giving TCs this right will have no negative repercussions. Therefore, the only thing that seems to need assessment is the number of times the WTD needs to undo substitution errors. That count could be reviewed at next year's Congress to see if the system put in place involves what may be considered as "too many" errors.

**Effort**



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

TCs already have the right to stop a player's clock when initiating a substitution. The server would need to be programmed to allow TCs to enact the substitution as well, a procedure that already exists for TDs, so only needs to be transferred to TCs. The WTD would need a new ability to undo any attempted substitution that was in error. The latter is expected to involve some programming costs.

Certain rules would need to be updated by the Rules Commissioner, at no cost to the ICCF.

**Considerations**

The WTD has given his approval for the new procedure described in this proposal allowing him to undo errors made in TCs making substitutions.

The Rules Commission was not unanimous in supporting this proposal. The non-supportive perspective was the belief that having a lot of untrained and not mentored TCs responsible for inputting substitutions was not a good idea. There was also the perspective that if TCs were given the ability to make substitutions directly, their errors should not be forgiven. Instead, they immediately lead to default losses of the remaining games on the relevant board.

**Documentation**

ICCF Rules 5.7 and 3.17.4 would need to be updated.

**Comments**

Nobody has commented on this proposal yet.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean TCs would be allowed to record TC-initiated substitutions directly, without the help of the TD, with the WTD able to undo one occasion of error.

A vote of NO will mean TCs would still need to request TDs to record TC-initiated substitutions.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-032 ICCF Congress 2021-Clydebank Glasgow**

Proposed by Gordon M. Anderson, National Delegate

**Abstract**

The present worldwide pandemic has created challenging circumstances for everyone and has, in fact, created much uncertainty regarding how and when the pandemic will come to an end and just what 'normal' will look like in the future. The Scottish Correspondence Chess Association (Scottish CCA) is grateful to our friends in Wales for offering to host the 2021 Congress in Llandudno. The two Federations (Wales and Scotland) have been in regular contact regarding next year's Congress and, as Scottish National Delegate, I wish to place on record my appreciation of the support, encouragement and understanding of the Welsh Federation as the Scottish CCA wrestled with whether to submit a further proposal to offer to host the 2021 Congress. The risks are considerable and, of course, have been highlighted in the earlier proposal from the Welsh Federation to host once again in Llandudno. As Delegates and ICCF Officials will recall the original Scottish bid, submitted at the Vilnius Congress, was to host at the Glasgow Hilton Hotel, however, that venue withdrew its offer and the amended proposal was to host the event at the Golden Jubilee Conference Hotel, Clydebank Glasgow (<https://www.goldenjubileehotel.com>). Delegates and ICCF Officials may recall that the Golden Jubilee is on the outskirts of Glasgow and is a 15 minute train journey from the City Centre. It is also approx. 15 minutes from Glasgow Airport.

Following discussions with the Golden Jubilee Conference Hotel, which have been problematic due to the present commercial closure of the hotel, the Scottish Correspondence Chess Association is offering to host the 2021 ICCF Congress at the Golden Jubilee Conference Hotel in Clydebank Glasgow from 29th August to 2nd September 2021.

Because of the uncertainty following the Covid-19 pandemic, some additional financial concessions are requested from ICCF.

**Proposal**

The 2021 ICCF Congress to be held at the Golden Jubilee Conference Hotel, Clydebank Glasgow from 29th August to 2nd September 2021 only if:

- (a) it is safe and legal to host an international event in Scotland
- (b) safe international travel to the United Kingdom without over burdensome quarantine procedures is possible for the majority of delegates.

This will be a full ICCF Congress, however, provision will be made to accommodate whatever social distancing arrangements are required in Scotland at the time, for example, special seating arrangements may be required at meetings, banquets etc.

Unfortunately, currently circumstances make this offer an uncertainty; it is not known, at this time, whether or not unrestricted global travel to the UK from all countries will be possible without strict quarantine conditions. Nor are the restrictions which may still apply to the Scottish hospitality industry yet known. The possibility of running a Congress in 2021 remains uncertain, so making a booking and paying a deposit would represent a considerable financial risk to a relatively small federation like Scotland in these unique and troubled times.

The Scottish CCA therefore requests, like its Welsh counterpart, that if this offer is accepted, ICCF share the financial risk by temporarily removing the limit of 3,000 euro maximum contribution. The Scottish CCA will take care of hospitality and entertainment (including welcome party, partner programme, chess events etc.), but we respectfully request that ICCF accepts, in principle, that ICCF may be required to underwrite some of the "business" expenses (meeting room hire, refreshments and coach hire) in the event that the 2021 Congress becomes impossible due to ongoing issues related to the present Covid-19 pandemic. Determination of any additional support, if any, will not be known for some considerable time and the



## Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

Scottish CCA is only seeking a commitment from ICCF to meet any unexpected non-recoverable additional costs.

**Rationale**

The ICCF Statutes (Article 29) require there to be a Congress at least every other year; as there will be no physical Congress in 2020, it is important that a Congress should take place in 2021.

Scotland, having offered to host in 2020, a Congress which had to be cancelled, considers it prudent to offer to host in 2021. The organization of the 2020 event was well advanced and the Scottish CCA Committee is committed to organizing an excellent Congress in 2021.

The Scottish CCA is a relatively small Federation with limited funds and organizing an international event in the post Covid-19 world represents a considerable financial risk; we therefore request the option of requesting additional financial support from ICCF, if necessary, as a one off exception to the Financial Regulations governing Congress remuneration to host federations.

**Assessment**

N/A

**Effort**

Scottish CCA Officials were well advanced with the planning for 2020 and consider that picking up where they left off will be a straightforward task. The cost to ICCF may be slightly higher than in previous years, however, this reflects the unique uncertainty we find ourselves in in the post Covid-19 world.

**Considerations**

The Golden Jubilee Conference Hotel is a world class conference venue set in picturesque grounds on the banks of the River Clyde. It is Scotland's key dedicated conference venue, combining all the standards of a 4 star hotel with the facilities and first class service required for successful conferences. Hosting events of all kind is the venue's number one priority and the staff are fully committed to providing a dedicated facility for people to confer, meet and collaborate.

The Golden Jubilee Conference Hotel is the only venue in Scotland to be accredited as a "Venue of Excellence" and to be approved by the International Association of Conference Centers.

Room rates will be similar to 2020. Single occupancy room at £92 B&B, with Double room occupancy at £107 B&B. Suites will be available with rates still to be agreed, if Delegates approve this proposal. Cut off time for booking accommodation will be early May 2021 which will provide ample time to finalize room rates for accommodation and to source alternative accommodation for those who prefer not to stay at the Congress venue.

We would ask Delegates to delay making flight or room bookings until the position of the Scottish Government became clearer. If this proposal is accepted, the Scottish CCA undertakes to publish regular updates on the Congress Website re Government imposed restrictions relating to Coronavirus. We will work closely with ICCF Officials regarding the timetable for actions required by those Delegates proposing to attend the 2021 Congress.

**Documentation**

N/A

**Comments****18/06/2020 Garvin Gray**

I am in favor of this proposal. I am also aware that this bid will almost certainly end the bid from Wales as one of their conditions was to host only if no other MF put in a bid.

**18/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

Great News!



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**21/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

Great news, as it was sad to learn that the Scottish Congress would have been cancelled due to the Covid-19 and lost. The best solution was in my mind to postpone it one year.

Kudos also to the Welsh federation for offering is all a way to have a Congress again in person.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean the 2021 ICCF Congress will take place in Clydebank Glasgow if it is possible given present circumstances.

A vote of NO will mean the 2021 ICCF Congress will not take place in Clydebank Glasgow.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-033 Title Norms in Chess 960**

Proposed by Mariusz Wojnar, ND for Poland, Former QC and Deputy RC

**Abstract**

Proposal for title norms in chess 960 and its integration with title system for regular chess events is submitted to have formal approval from delegates. It will certainly increase the attractiveness of 960 chess tournaments and may attract more players.

**Proposal**

The idea is to introduce title norms for chess 960 and integrate them with title system for regular chess events.

Title norms in chess 960 events shall conform requirements placed in Tournament Rules, Section 1.5 and Appendix 2.

Title norms shall be calculated based on chess 960 rating system.

Title norms gained in normal tournaments and chess 960 tournaments are to be equivalent, therefore title can be awarded upon fulfillment mixture of norms, no difference if gained.

To be implemented for all tournaments, including chess 960 events, starting from 2021-01-01.

**Rationale**

Proposal for title norms for chess 960 and their integration with title system for regular chess events is submitted to have formal approval from delegates.

It was raised 3 years ago but maybe now it is better understanding and acceptance for it.

During ICCF Congress 2013 rating system for chess 960 was proposed by me and accepted by delegates with implementation to the server from 2014-01-01. During discussion question about title system for chess 960 was also raised. At that time, I answered that it can be integrated with regular chess events and no further changes in the rules are required. Unfortunately, acceptance for that approach was not placed in the minutes.

Some may say that 960 chess is not chess. In fact, the opposite is true - ordinary chess is a special case, one of the 960 starting positions, and the other rules and skills required are identical!

Believe me, I have experience under both hats as former deputy Ratings Commissioner (RC) and former Qualifications Commissioner (QC) and in addition as new title system inventor. I have considered all necessary issues since chess 960 was introduced. Of course, you may try to find better qualified expert and ask him for opinion.

Why not creating own title system for chess 960?

It's not necessary and explained by me in proposal under Considerations.

Before you reject proposal please reconsider what you are against.

All requirements for title norms described in Tournaments Rules, section 1.5 and Appendix 2, must be fulfilled (!!!), so argument that this proposal diminishes or dilutes title system is missed.

The more, some of you say that chess 960 involves a small number of participants, but it means that influence is negligible (if at all).

Moreover, our initial assumption was to use titles from normal chess, when circumstances permit - see any cross table for chess 960 (!!!) where you see titles. Unless, titles would be removed.

Some of you say that this is different type of chess. Let's think, board is the same and rules of play are the same, the only difference is initial position.

Some of you may object that you cannot use openings theory in chess 960? It should be opposite, because this is advantage for people who are playing real chess!





### Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

In practice results in chess 960 are more valuable, because player plays chess from the early beginning, whilst in normal chess player is exploiting openings theory at that stage of play and only then player is trying to play on his own.

It is worth considering the proposal to include players fighting in chess 960 events also in the fight for titles. This will also increase the attractiveness of the 960 chess tournaments and may attract more players. To date, there have been several tournaments in which players could obtain title norms including GM. I believe that not only Uwe Staroske, QRC, will support this proposal, but also all delegates.

#### **Assessment**

After this proposal is implemented, it will be evaluated under QRC supervision and potential update can be proposed in few years.

#### **Effort**

The technical implementation on the server and the financial implications needs to be assessed by Services Director.

#### **Considerations**

Separate title system for chess 960.

Idea to implement separate title system solely for chess 960 is not reasonable. There are serious constrains for it. First of all there is very few players having fixed rating for chess 960, but enough to have title norms in several regular chess 960 events. Minor titles (CCE, CCM) could be awarded probably quite soon (in 1-2 years), maybe also IM or SIM titles could be gained (in 1-3 years).

Unfortunately, GM titles would be not achieved at all, because one of the requirements for GM title is to have 5 opponents holding GM title!!!

#### **Documentation**

Title norms in chess 960 events shall conform requirements placed in ICCF Rules, Section 1.5 and Appendix 2. It is not excluded that more changes are required.

#### **Comments**

##### **21/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

The 2020/2 Chess960 database shows 117 players ranging from 1498 to 2538, perhaps it could be considered to perform calculations retrospectively and validate norms attained in the past?. I am in favor of this.

##### **21/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

Sorry, Mariusz, but this is not reasonable.

Chess960 is rather different from regular chess, and titles from mixed kind of chess is not requested. If we were to adopt this then any kind of chess can be used for ICCF titles, for example, King Chess must also count for ICCF titles. In particular as we already have a different rating system for the different games. If you desire an ICCF title in regular chess then it must be achieved playing regular chess!

##### **21/06/2020 Mariusz Wojnar**

Remember that the rating system is the same (the same rules of play, the same calculations).

Unfortunately, we have already left an occasion for several tournaments, including really strong World Cup finals, which could have been title tournaments. Below few examples:

-6th Chess 960 World Cup Final, start date: 2020-01-20; Rav=2491; cat=10

1-5th Chess 960 World Cup Final, start date: 2019-04-15; Rav=2469; cat=9

-4th Chess 960 World Cup Final, start date: 2018-01-05; Rav=2444; cat=8

The next ones are expected, including 70th Jubilee Chess 960 top elite event, which may be of category 11, if you accept this congress proposal.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

Let's not let the potential and energy of our players go to waste as we fight to increase attractiveness and opportunities to win norms for ICCF titles, including the highest ones.

Let's vote for this proposal!

**21/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Just to clarify, I am in favor of Chess960 offering its own titles and norms

**21/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren**

Just so the delegates are aware, if this proposal is approved as it currently stands, an IM or SIM earned through Chess 960 would also then serve as a credential for eligibility for the Preliminaries of the WCCC (see Rule 1.2.1.1.) and the Semi-Finals of the WCCC (see Rule 1.2.1.2.). Additionally, there would seem to be ambiguity which rating (standard or Chess 960) would serve as the other component of that WCCC section qualification. (For example, a qualification for the WCCC Preliminaries is an IM coupled with a rating above 2300.) Currently, it is clear that the rating thresholds stated in 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.1.2 refer to our standard rating system. If the titles come to include Chess 960 performance, then the argument might be made that the required ratings can also stem from Chess 960. I, as Rules Commissioner do not currently know how this issue would ultimately be clarified, given this proposal does not make mention of this issue.

**22/06/2020 Garvin Gray**

At the 2018 Llandudno Congress, the Delegates voted by a margin of 29/5 with 23 abstain to not allow the Winner of the Chess 960 World Cup to qualify for the Candidates section.

This proposal would seem to be attempting to move in the opposite direction.

I am of the opinion that Chess 960 and classical chess should be treated differently. I am in favour of separate titles for Chess 960, but that is far as it should go. Chess 960 titles and ratings should only be used for deciding groups etc. for Chess 960 events and there should be no carry over to classical chess.

**22/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

The rules for regular chess and Chess960 are not the same. The Laws of chess specify how the pieces shall be placed at the start of the regular chess game.

**22/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

One idea is to use regular chess rating as provisional Chess960 rating. Another consideration is to go back and recalculate norms in previous Chess960 tournaments. More than that I doubt we can do. In the future however if we find an extremely high correlation between regular chess rating and chess960 rating perhaps this can be reviewed.

**02/07/2020 Michael Roy Freeman**

Mixed feelings. We do have a title system for one of 960 start positions, "regular chess" as Per refers to. So, why have a separate title system for the other 959 positions? Or even worse, 960 title systems, one for each start position. But, we do have a separate rating system and title norms are dependent on ratings, so the same basis for awards are different, which I do not like.

At this point, I would favor separate 960 titles, which is not one of the options to vote for.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean that title norms for chess 960 are implemented and integrated with title system for regular chess events from 2021-01-01.

A vote of NO will mean that title norms for chess 960 will not be implemented.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-034 Limitations to the Number of Open Tournaments Organized by MFs**

Proposed by Michael Millstone, On Behalf of the ICCF Executive Board

**Abstract**

The Executive Board are fully sympathetic to the concerns of our Spanish friends in proposing a limit on the number of ICCF approved tournaments which a member federation can organize annually (Proposal 2020-015). We agree that it should not be possible for member federations to financially exploit their right to run approved international events, and we are fully sympathetic to the lost income experienced by member federations through their members playing in other federations tournaments; however, the EB believes that greater clarity and specificity is required than is provided by 2020-015.

**Proposal**

The following limitations will apply:

**Invitational Tournaments**

Federations may run unlimited invitational tournaments, provided:

- Approval is granted by the ICCF World Tournament Director
- No entry fee is charged
- Invitations are issued correctly

**Open Tournaments**

Federations may run **no more than two** open tournaments per year, for which an entry fee may be charged, provided:

- Approval is granted by the ICCF World Tournament Director
- The ICCF Finance Director confirms that the federation is in good financial standing before player recruitment can start

**Rationale**

This provision will make it difficult for member federations to financially exploit their right to run international tournaments. Additionally, it will not affect the many invitational tournaments which have free entry and are run every year for the benefit of correspondence chess players around the world.

**Assessment**

N/A

**Effort**

No expenditure will be required on server development, tournaments will continue to be monitored and regulated by the World Tournament Director.

**Considerations**

This proposal is in direct conflict with 2020-015, so the provisions described by 1.12 of the Voting Regulations will apply.

**Documentation**

It will be necessary to update the Rules to reflect these changes.

**Comments**

**24/06/2020 Garvin Gray**

As not everyone voting was at the 2019 Congress, I think it would be a good idea for there to be a clear explanation on how 'Conflict Voting' works. Also, if Spain believes this proposal to be better version of their proposal, perhaps they could consider withdrawing their proposal?

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean the provisions as outlined for open and invitational tournaments will be adopted.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A vote of NO will mean no limits to the amount of open and invitational tournaments will be applied (also considering proposal 2020-015).

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-036 New Tournament: World Team Cup**

Proposed by Russell Sherwood, National Delegate, Welsh Correspondence Chess Federation

**Abstract**

Enhance ICCF tournament offerings for players of all ratings. This proposal suggests the addition of such a tournament, which should help improve offerings to players generally not included in either Olympiad or < 2300 Memorial Team Tournaments for larger federations and additional competitive opportunities for smaller federations.

**Proposal**

During the 2020 season, Eurozone has been trialing a new event – The Euro Team Cup. We believe that this event, with a few minor amendments, can be offered to all ICCF member federations. On this basis, we propose:

- A knockout multi-year team tournament, played in a 20 board “friendly” match format, with 2 games per player.
- Triple Block Time Control with guaranteed time to be utilized with each round.
- First-round to commence in June 2021 and subsequent rounds each following June.
- Winning teams to advance until a single champion team remains.
- Tournament to be managed by the Non-Title Tournament Commissioner or appointed officer.
- Multi-federation teams (e.g., a team representing Luxembourg-Belgium) or zonal teams will allow unattached players to maximize participation.
- Other operating rules to be as per the Euro Team Cup (except eligible federations!)
- Medals and certificates to be presented to the final winning team.

As this is simply an extension of the friendly format, we propose this tournament be free to enter.

Note: The event would be complementary to the Euro team cup, not a replacement.

**Rationale**

This tournament format allows an international competitive gap to be filled between the Olympiad and < 2300 Memorial Tournament for players who tend to fall into the rating range 2300-2450. In addition, the additional load of 2 games is likely to fit into any player's game portfolio, allowing wide participation.

**Assessment**

The tournament can be judged by the level of Entries at ICCF Congress 2021.

**Effort**

The main effort is the appointment and work of the Tournament Controller, for which I am happy to volunteer.

**Considerations**

N/A

**Documentation**

Details of the event would be added in section 1.2.6.

**Comments**

**28/06/2020 Garvin Gray**

I am in favor of this new tournament. The only concern I have is that the event should start in the next calendar quarter than the Olympiad and Individual World Championship.

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean to introduce this innovative and appealing tournament format..

A vote of NO will mean that nothing will change.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**2020-037 Friendly Matches Viewing Rules**

Proposed by Russell Sherwood, ICCF Marketing Director

**Abstract**

To allow the promotion of ICCF events viewing rules for all friendly matches to be standardized.

**Proposal**

Very few ICCF events are available to view until after completion of games. To aid in the promotion of correspondence chess, I propose that for all friendly matches (as defined in 1.3.2) started after 1st Jan 2021 have standardized viewing rules for the public of:

- 1) Live to view
- 2) Zero completed games
- 3) 10-move delay

**Rationale**

This change will aid both ICCF and member federations in promoting correspondence chess through the medium of friendly matches.

The 10-move delay will provide for any opening novelties to be shielded.

**Assessment**

The change can be assessed at Congress 2021 in terms of both player retention/recruitment.

**Effort**

From a development perspective, this is a relatively simple activity to change currently adjustable criteria to fixed values.

**Considerations**

This is a simple change, and several federations already utilize these viewing rules.

**Documentation**

1.3.2 would need an amended to detail these rules

**Comments**

**23/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

In our friendly matches, we try to have no delay of moves. Games will be watched in real time! Players are happy and it attracts a lot of attention and is an important way to recruit and maintain our members!

This proposal will very much limit our promotion of these events.

We would certainly prefer to be allowed to decide the number of delay of moves in co-operation with the opponent team. Even when we had discussions in the rules commission, in the past, on how long a delay of showing moves is recommended, the recommendation used to be 3 or 5 moves delay.

SSKK can't understand why we MUST have a delay of 10 moves? Live absolutely - no finished games, yes!

But a hard No Thanks on having such a long delay!

To our federation this will be contra productive and making our promotion of friendship matches more difficult.

**23/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

The reason for having delay of moves was not to keep opening secrets, but to avoid mirror games! Now the rules mention a penalty for mirror games, but it didn't do that 12 years ago.

Further if we play 10/50, then 10 moves could be 3 months of calendar time, leaves uncounted!

Please, be so kind to let the federations decide the delays for friendship games, thank you! Our aim is to have promotion, too!

**24/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

I think the proposal is fair but my question is, has there been a complaint proving the statement that opening novelties require shielding?





Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

I agree with Per and go beyond his statement, all ICCF games should have live display without any move delay. The argument that players must have their opening novelties shielded for at least the duration of the event seems unsubstantiated. If such opening novelties existed, what stops the opponent facing the move from using it in another similar game right away? And the opponent of his opponent, why would he be prevented from playing this opening novelty in another game immediately as well? It is all a myth. Once a move is played, it is public.

**24/06/2020 Joop Jansen**

Total agree with Per. No delay. ALL LIVE!  
SURELY for all see match Lámi-Hall!!

**24/06/2020 Dennis M. Doren** Just to clarify something in this discussion, it seems to me that this proposal is specific to the friendly match viewing rules for the public, and not for the teammates or TC. Therefore, it seems to me that the issue of mirror games is not relevant to this proposal. My understanding is that public viewing rules in friendly matches are only relevant to (a) the timing of disclosure of a player's opening move choices to people not involved in the match, and (b) the degree to which non-involve people could (illegally) make potentially helpful unsolicited commentary to a player about the ongoing games. [This latter issue is only relevant for unsolicited commentary in that any player initiating an (illegal) consultation with a non-team member could do so through private email.] An imposed delay of moves seems designed to address these two issues. From my personal experience organizing 82 friendly matches during the past 8 years, I can say that the first issue has been of importance to some of the highest rated players (from various nations). I have not run into an example of the second issue at all.

**25/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

Yes, this is about public viewing of friendship matches. And, to me, no reason for having a delay of displaying moves. It is all about promotional games!

Our experience says that there is no problem even for stronger players, in example:

<https://www.iccf.com/event?id=76778>

To allow also anyone to look at the games in real time.

Of course, it is a different issue when we are talking World Championships, where seeing how other games are going can be used for benefit.

**26/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Hi Per, I agree with you about this proposal. How can players "get benefit" of a live display in the World Championships but not in a friendly game?

**26/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

In a World Championship and similar, you can adopt your play after what your competitors positions are. You may need a draw or win depending on how other games looks, and this is how you can get benefit from seeing others positions. Such things can decide the World Championship!

In a friendly match you only play 2 games and no one is affected by your games.

**26/06/2020 Gino Franco Figlio**

Hi Per, I think you are describing a personal view of what really happens. A game outcome involves two players, one of them can play for a win or a draw depending on his cross-table position only without paying attention to other players' live game positions. How is this reasonable and allowed but not when you adopt a strategy based on live game positions?

**27/06/2020 Per Söderberg**

A large number of players who plays in World Championships, I don't play there, have expressed that they wish to keep the games secret during the on-going event. That is the view I refer to. However this is not the topic of this proposal. So I will leave it there.



Propunerile ICCF pentru Congresul 2020 (on-line)

**06/07/2020 Russell Sherwood**

Thank-you all for the feedback, much of which I agree with. As it is too late to modify this proposal I will, next year, be proposing one for Friendly Matches very similar to Per's suggestion of allowing the captains to agree a delay but with a maximum number of day delay and 0 finished games. I will also present a separate proposal(s) for other events. Those will be based on some player engagement.

**07/07/2020 Per Söderberg**

Hello Russel,

You may withdraw your proposal and make the proposal for next year.

Best wishes,

Per

**Voting Summary**

A vote of YES will mean friendly match viewing rules are standardized to be live after zero games are finished with a 10 move delay.

A vote of NO will mean nothing changes.

A vote of ABSTAIN is not a vote but means the vote holder has no opinion and does not wish to represent the correspondence chess players of his or her federation in this matter.

Your comments