

**CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA
GOVERNORS' LETTER FOUR
2003-2004**



Responses may be mailed, faxed or E-mailed to the Chess Federation of Canada, E-1 2212 Gladwin Crescent, Ottawa, ON, K1B 5N1, fax: 613-733-5209, E-Mail: info@chess.ca

Deadline for submissions to GL #5: February 26, 2004.

President's Message

The Executive of the CFC voted to change the name of our magazine back to Chess Canada Echecs from En Passant. I hope this will make our magazine more accessible to the general public.

The rules for the new rules for the certification of tournament directors are published elsewhere in the GL. The 2003 Annual Meeting in Kapuskasing authorized the re-writing of the rules and reactivation of this program. The major change in the new program is that it allows tournament organizers to offer a regularly rated tournament held at multiple locations provided that these all locations are properly supervised by CFC certified tournament directors.

I would like to direct Governors to the discussion of junior chess by Patrick McDonald and the new draft CYCC rule proposed elsewhere in this GL. I support qualification through the CYCC. The only by-pass of the CYCC that I am prepared to support is for juniors that are representing Canada on a national team. It is important for Provincial Chess Associations to organize qualification events and to fund the participation of finalists from their Province to the CYCC. If donations in support of junior chess are sent through the CFC they are tax deductible and Provincial Associations should use this facility.

I would like to congratulate the Ontario Chess Association and its President Barry Thorvardson on their wonderful bid for the 2004 Canadian Zonal in Toronto. I would like to encourage Provincial Chess Associations to support the 2004 Zonal by sending their strongest players to this event.

Keeping Governors Informed

Motion 2004-01 (Toronto Canadian Closed bid) has passed by a vote of 34-0. The vote breaks down as follows:

Yes: Neil Sutherland, Ari Mendrinis, Stijn DeKerpel, Roger Patterson, Rodrigue Hébert, Ken Craft, Ronald Hinds, Maurice Smith, Alvah Mayo, Eric Newman, Patrick McDonald, Kevin Spraggett, Dilip Panjwani, Steve Killi, Halldor Palsson, Michael Barron, Mike Stanford, Hugh Brodie, Adrien Regimbald, Bela Kosoian, Frank Dixon, Nava Starr, Wilf Ferner, Lyle Craver, Stephen Wright, Caesar Posylek, Barry Thorvardson, Pierre Denomee, Mark Dutton, Phil Haley, Douglas Hoch, Peter Stockhausen, Hal Bond and John Remillard.

No: None.

Abstain: None.

The following players have been awarded titles by FIDE:

FM Thomas Krnan

WFM Yamei Wang

WFM Dina Kagramanov

Junior Co-ordinator

It is the beginning of the year, and I hope that everyone has enjoyed their respective holidays.

This year, there has been much discussion around youth. I am happy to hear all the interest in youth affairs. The interest is well deserved as we have had much success with our youth in recent history. For example, 2003 was an especially good year for youth chess in Canada thanks to many supporters, promoters, and organizers.

I would like to hear further discussion around our participation in the World events.

We currently have 3 national youth events to promote our kids to world events.

- The CYCC sends kids to the WYCC (World Youth Chess Championships)
- The Canadian Junior sends kids to the World Junior.
- The Pan Am qualifier sends kids to the Pan American Youth Chess Festival.

Lately, our most successful of these events tends to be the CYCC. The Canadian Junior is much less attended and the Pan Am Qualifier is in real danger, although it is our newest fledgling tournament.

There have been discussions as to whether we should entertain the idea of “seeding” players to the WYCC. While this idea seems logical, it may endanger the CYCC.

Many kids go to the CYCC as the year’s biggest CFC tournament that is youth focused. Many have hopes to qualify for the national team to head off to the WYCC, but many are also just there to experience the National Championships.

This tournament is not only a qualifier to the WYCC, it is our NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP! There is a lot of excitement in every one of the kids that compete in this tournament. They are proud to have the chance to compete against Canada’s top youths in their age categories. It gives them a chance to “measure up”.

If we seed players to the World championships, they are likely not to play in the National Championships. This greatly diminishes the stature of the championship.

Many provinces have Provincial Championships that do the same thing. They are the official Provincial championship and they send representatives to the National. In many cases, there is funding coming directly out of these Provincial Championships to help to pay the representatives' way to the National. Likewise, there are many regions in the provinces that do the same at their level.

While I believe that we most certainly need to be persistent in our search for and lobbying for sponsorships to help all deserving youths get to the next level up, I also believe that if everyone supported the regional/provincial/national/world championship process, we would have a healthier management of our youth talent. The kids would also build up more excitement in the tournaments and in each other as they "make it" through each level.

I am also left wondering why someone would want to be playing chess and want to avoid playing in these prestigious tournaments.

Patrick S. McDonald
Chess Federation of Canada Youth Co-ordinator

TOURNAMENT DIRECTOR & ORGANIZER CERTIFICATION PROGRAM (TDOCP)

TDOCP - General Information

- 2000.** The purpose of the TDOCP is to recognize Tournament Directors (TDs) and Tournament Organizers. The CFC objective with this program is to improve the quality of tournament directing in Canada.
- 2001.** The TDOCP exam asks the kind of questions that a TD\organizer needs to know. The exam is open book and there is no time limit. If you do not have a rule-book, you will need one. The CFC recommends the ***CFC Handbook*** which contains up-to-date CFC rules.
- 2002.** There are three levels of certification: you can become a **Local Tournament Director (LTD)** by passing the C part of the exam with 80% or better. No experience is necessary.

A **Regional Tournament Director (RTD)** must pass both parts of the exam and have directed at least **six** tournaments, including one Swiss and one Round-Robin. One Swiss should have included at least 30 participants.

A **National Tournament Director (NTD)** is an RTD who has directed at least one National or International tournament or been an assistant TD at two National tournaments.

- 2003.** If you would like to apply to become a certified TD, send a cheque for \$20.00 (\$30.00 for NTD) to:

**Chess Federation of Canada,
2212 Gladwin Crescent E-1,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1B 5N1**

You will receive the exam and an answer sheet. After you return it, your answer sheet will be marked.

- 2004.** At the next meeting of the TDOCP Committee your application will be considered, and you will be informed of the results. Upon certification, you will be sent a TD card, a diploma and a "Local Tournament Director" pin. Certification is good for a **five** year period.

At any time a TD can apply for a higher level of certification. Upon expiry of your TD card, you may apply to renew your certification. A renewal fee of \$10 is charged by the CFC.

TDOCP Committee Powers and Responsibilities

- 2020.** The President of the CFC is a member of the TDOCP committee. The AGM elects the other two members of the committee. The TDOCP committee can appoint any Provincial Chess Association, IA, NTD or RTD to administer its certification training and tests. The President appoints members when someone resigns from the TDOCP during the year. If there is no TDOCP committee elected at the AGM its duties are discharged by the CFC Executive.
- 2021.** The TDOCP Committee has the power to change the CFC Handbook in order to reflect changes in FIDE rules and interpretations.
- 2022.** The Executive, upon recommendation of the TDOCP Committee, is empowered to change the CFC Tournament Rules and Pairing Rules (Sec 6). [see Motion 82-26; GL, September 1982, p. 1-5]
- 2023.** The TDOCP Committee hears complaints related to Guaranteed Prize Funds (see Sec 1650).
- 2024.** The TDOCP Committee determines whether bids for National events have been honoured (see Sec 980).

- 2025.** In Round-Robin National tournaments, players from the same province should not play against each other in the last three rounds. Pairings should be made in public prior to the first round. The technical details are to be determined by the TDOCP Committee. [see Motion 82-5; GL, July 1981, p. 1-27. See section 652 for the usual RR pairing method.]

The following method, suggested by Yuri Averbakh, may be found to work if there are not too many players from one province:

- a) The players are divided into groups by province; the largest group draws first; the second largest second, etc.
- b) After the first player from the group has selected his number from the full set, the Chief Arbiter takes away the numbers with whom that player has to play in the last three rounds;
- c) Repeat b) as necessary.

Supervision of Inter-City Matches and Other Satellite Tournament Sites

- 2030.** A satellite tournament site is a playing venue located away from the main tournament site. If the chess games played under these conditions are going to be **regularly rated** by the CFC the main and the satellite tournament site must be controlled by at least one certified TD. The tournament must be advertised as having a satellite site for such pairings to be **binding** on participants.
- 2031.** The chief arbiter and organizer of the tournament or inter-city match are responsible for testing the means of communication between the main tournament site and the satellite location(s) of the tournament.
- 2032.** Only certified TDs are allowed to run satellite tournament sites. Satellite tournament sites must be open to spectators. A certified TD cannot run more than four boards at a satellite tournament site.
- 2034.** At all tournament sites the operation of the equipment used to transmit the tournament game (phone, e-mail, internet interface) is the responsibility of the certified TD.
- 2040.** The conduct of the game. The player makes his move and presses his clock as he would in any normal tournament game. The certified TD sends his moves to his opponent. The certified TD on site operates the transmission equipment and makes the move for the distant opponent and presses his clock. The certified TD is responsible for calling time forfeits on the player(s) he supervises at his location. The time on the clock at his location governs the game for the player. A player cannot be subjected to a claim of forfeit on time by his opponent or the certified TD at the other site.
- 2041.** If the certified TD makes an error in transmitting moves they should be corrected and the clocks of the players reset for the times used. If the error is discovered

too late to make it practical to reset the game, the chief arbiter may reschedule, adjudicate or abort the game. In a Swiss tournament, the chief arbiter should award half or full point byes for pairing purposes and then proceed with the next round.

- 2042.** If there is equipment failure and the game cannot be played it should be rescheduled. If the equipment failure occurs late chief arbiter can adjudicate the game. In a Swiss tournament, the chief arbiter at the main tournament site can award half point byes to deal with failure to play and proceed with the next round.

Governor's Comments

Neil Sutherland: Greetings from the snow bound NWT! It's not cold here (only -10) but about seven cm fell in eight hours last night. Kevin Spraggett reminded me to vote on the Toronto bid and as Governor for the NWT my vote is yes.

I would like a ruling on the northern Canada bids if any as it costs an arm and a leg to get here and I know Yellowknife and Iqaluit are very expensive. It is for that reason they do not put in any bids. Some time ago I submitted a bid for the Arctic Winter Games and have heard nothing back from the CFC as to what they plan on doing to get CHESS promoted in these World Games.

Some of the areas represented are: Alaska, Yukon, NWT, Nunavut, Greenland, Russia (2 areas), Northern Alberta and Northern Quebec. At the last event Sweden, Norway and Finland were observers planning to participate in future Games.

Gerry Thick out of Whitehorse is the spokesperson for these Games known as the Arctic Winter Games. Please look into this matter and get back to me so I can work with Andrew Plunkett and the other governors in the other areas in getting this up and running.

Thank you for getting to the heart of the matter on this. I want to let you know of my support for the Toronto bid and also to let you know why you never see anyone from the NWT or Nunavut at these tournaments -- the cost is very outrageous as it costs over \$1000.00 just to get to EDMONTON from Yellowknife and even more to get anywhere in CANADA. I trust that it is much more expensive to get south from Iqaluit.

We would like to apply for some tournaments but with the high cost of everything here in Yellowknife it is next to impossible to host anything. This is one area that no Chess Federation tournament has taken place and until things get cheaper never will. Once again I wish to say Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year for everyone.

Ari Mendrinos: On motion 2004-01 (Mayo/Newman) Canadian Closed Bid I vote YES as we have an excellent management this time.

Stijn DeKerpel: I am in favour of the motion for the Canadian Closed bid.

Alvah Mayo: There were several comments in GL #3 which I would like to address.

Lyle Craver stated that he felt there was no good faith argument against BC organizers holding the Western Canadian Open on the same dates as the Canadian Open. I do not agree. I have seen many public comments from a vocal minority connected with the WCO which I would characterize as nothing more than sour grapes. I believe such resentment to be misplaced.

I do not believe that any major event should be scheduled specifically to compete with the Canadian Open. This case is made optically worse by the fact that the BCCF organized the WCO only after they failed to win the rights to the 2004 Canadian Open. Evidence of this is seen in GL #1 where the BCCF Canadian Open bid document does not list a playing site in Vancouver. Surely this would have been listed on the document had the site already been secured.

I do not propose any action against the WCO although I would like to see protection for future editions of the Canadian Open. Regardless of the facts of the situation, it is clear from Lyle's comments that the CFC has a significant perception problem in British Columbia's chess community. I for one will not add fuel to that fire. To do so would only give a disgruntled few the opportunity to say, "See? There goes the CFC sticking it to B.C yet again!"

Good people like Lyle Craver and the rest of the B.C governors have a unique understanding of the situation on the ground in that province. We need to continue the dialogue with them so we can turn that perception around one hundred and eighty degrees. I would welcome specific ideas on how we can best accomplish this.

Roger Patterson: I vote in favour of motion 2004-1 (Ontario bid for Canadian Closed)

In reference to motion 2004-2, the secretary stated "the organizers failed to submit any motion". It is not the job of the organizers to submit a motion. It is entirely possible that the organizers are not CFC governors for example and not allowed to submit a motion. I'm not sure whose job it is to submit the motion but I suspect it is the job of the Executive.

Mr. Barron is in favour of encouraging all tournaments in Canada to use the FIDE time control of Game in 90 plus 30 second increment in order to help Canadians prepare for international competitions. Hans Ree in *New In Chess* described FIDE's unilateral declaration of this control as vandalism of chess, a sentiment I tend to agree with.

In any case, many people do not like playing with that control and it does not appear to have widespread support either here or internationally. In particular, at the Canadian Championship in Montreal 2001, this time control was used and there was widespread dissatisfaction with it. (perhaps Pierre Denomee could comment - he took an informal poll].

My experience playing in Europe over the last few years is that most tournaments there are run at something like 40/2 followed by Game/1. It may be that official FIDE

events use only that control and some experience playing at that speed would be a good thing but outside of FIDE events, it is not the norm. The number of people qualifying for FIDE events is quite small. (what - the Canadian Champion, Olympic team, and all those juniors?) This hardly justifies supporting the FIDE time control for all tournaments (or perhaps even the national championships).

I'm not sure I understand the fuss over the format of the GL. I do prefer one column but really... whatever.

Rodrigue Hébert: On Motion 2004-01 I vote Yes.

Ken Craft: I vote yes to 2004-01.

2004-02: The President ruled this motion out of order. I hereby formally challenge that ruling. Any discussion of whether a motion is in order or out of order must be kept to that question and not delve into the advisability of the motion. The President erred when he discussed the substance of the motion in his ruling. I will therefore refrain from discussing the advisability of the motion. The motion is clearly in order. The relevant section of the bylaws of the Federation is

11. POWERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The Board of Directors shall manage the affairs of the corporation between meetings of the Assembly.

Where an issue arises with respect to any of the following matters:

The qualification, participation and selection of Canadian chess players to and in FIDE events.

The qualification, participation and selection of participants to and in any national championship.

The determination or amending of any rules for holding national championships.

The determination or amending of any rules of play for tournaments or for match play.

The awarding of national championship tournaments to individuals or groups, where there are competing bids for the tournament.

Then, provided that there is time for the matter to be voted upon the Assembly in a mail vote, then such vote shall be taken. However, if in the opinion of the President, there is insufficient time for the Assembly to make a decision by mail vote then the Board of Directors shall make the decision and the results of the decision shall be communicated to the Assembly as soon as is reasonably possible thereafter.

In matters where an immediate decision is required and where there is insufficient time to consult with all of the members of the Board of Directors then the President shall make the decision after consultation with those members of the Board of Directors who are available for immediate consultation.

The President clearly had to put the motion to a vote of the Assembly. There is clearly "sufficient time" for the Assembly to discuss the motion. I urge all Governors to vote to overturn the President's ruling so that the motion can be debated, amended and voted on as is the prerogative of the Assembly of Governors.

Halldor P. Palsson: *I rule that Governor **Ken Craft** does not have standing to challenge my ruling as he did not move or second the motion that was the subject of my ruling.*

Ronald Hinds: I vote in favour of Motion 2004-01.

Maurice Smith: I vote in favour of the motion to accept the bid of Barry Thorvardson for the Canadian Zonal Tournament.

It was noted by some people that raising membership and rating fees may have an adverse effect. Their reasoning was that memberships would drop and organizers would not run tournaments because of the higher rating fees.

Well, it turns out the opposite is true. Membership revenue is up. Also even though rating fees were increased by 50%, revenues from rating fees are up 49% since the increase was initiated. This shows virtually no drop in tournaments being rated. Organizers are to be congratulated for understanding the financial needs of the CFC and adjusting their tournaments accordingly.

This is in response to comments made in the last GL by Lyle Craver, Stephen Wright, Frank Dixon and the Wright/Craver motion that was ruled out of order.

Lyle Craver - On the President's remarks for the country to unite for one national event. "Finally - on the one national event per year question - we do indeed unite for such an event right now. That event is the Canadian Championship otherwise known as the Canadian Closed."

Maurice Smith - Well Lyle, the Canadian Open has the word Canadian in its title and therefore is a national event and is the only national OPEN event. So it does not seem unreasonable to ask the country to unite for this tournament. When the Canadian Open was in Vancouver, I would have been absolutely dead against any competing tournament in Ontario, no matter what the circumstances.

Lyle Craver - FIDE Titles " I am totally mystified why ONLY Alex Davies would be recognized in the GL as the following have also received FIDE titles since the last GL: LeFong Hua FM, Zhe Quan FM, Thomas Roussel Roozmon FM, Mark Barnes IA, Lyle Craver IA, Lynn Stringer IA. In short, I don't recall the last time Canada had so many

titles awarded in such a short period! It's my belief that FIDE titles should be announced either by the President or the FIDE Rep and if anyone's title is mentioned they ALL should be mentioned. Certainly these new titles should be mentioned in EP."

Maurice Smith - We get notification of FIDE titles at various times and we try and publish them as soon as possible. You will remember that I helped you and your B.C. TDs with all the procedures in order that you received the IA titles. Very soon after that I asked the Office to put them on the CFC website for all the world to see. They appeared August 26th and they are still there.

It seems to me somewhat redundant to have titles published on the website, the GL and the magazine as well. However, if you think it is worthwhile, you could suggest to the President to make such a ruling. I think that if the FIDE Representative is informed of title awards he should see that they are published. However, I do not think it is within his mandate to advise the Office to put on the website, advise the Secretary to include in the GL and advise the En Passant Editor to include in the magazine as well.

Stephen Wright - FIDE rating regulations - "Thank you to Gerry for the notification concerning changes to the FIDE rating regulations. However, this has been in effect since July 1st; it would be nice to know of such changes in advance, rather than after the fact. Would it be possible for our FIDE representative to make announcements of significant changes in the FIDE regulations?"

Maurice Smith - First of all Stephen, you need to realize how FIDE operates. At the various meetings including the one where the new rules were discussed, there is often no motion to either accept or not accept any new proposal. Discussion often ends with "Any other comments?" or "Any objections?" and then the Chairman goes on to another topic.

When many items are discussed at a meeting, you often leave wondering exactly what was accomplished. You would really need to have the minutes of each meeting to know for sure what was judged to have occurred. By the way, I received the minutes of the November 2003 meetings in Bled in July this year.

So what I try and do is pick out the highlights of the meetings that I know for sure and include them in my FIDE Delegate's report. Also Gerry Litchfield and/or I sometimes receive various news items from FIDE. If they are really newsworthy, they are passed on. If the item is addressed just to me, then I would ask Gerry to forward it to the appropriate people, seeing that the Office has all the Governors e-mail addresses and also sends out the GL.

Anyway, your point is noted and we will try and keep people updated in the manner I have mentioned. Also, I suggest that any organizer or TD interested in FIDE rulings check the FIDE website often.

Wright/Craver Motion 2004-2 Item 3 and Discussion:

"Any player rated as high or higher than the lowest rated qualifier from the CYCC, taken from the most recently published rating list prior to the CYCC, may attend the WYCC at his or her own expense."

Discussion: "This year a number of our stronger juniors were unable to make the journey to Kapuskasing. Consequently, they had no means of qualifying for the WYCC, and as a result our team in Greece was significantly weaker than it could have been. This motion would allow our high-rated juniors to participate in the WYCC at their own expense without having to qualify via the CYCC, thus allowing Canada to field our strongest team possible at the world event."

Maurice Smith - The Discussion comments are contradictory and illogical. They suggest{and I have also heard} that juniors have said it was too expensive to go to our national finals. So the motion would then allow them to go to the World Championships in Europe or Asia where they would have to pay their own travel expenses at a much higher cost.

I don't see how anyone who could not afford to go to Kapuskasing from anywhere in Canada could afford to go to Greece. I was in both places and believe me, it was much more expensive going to Greece. That would have been true whether the person was travelling from Vancouver or St John's Newfoundland. Surely a high rated player would welcome playing in a less expensive national tournament for a chance to play in a more expensive world tournament with his expenses paid.

I know from the movers that this was a well intentioned motion. However, it hits right at the framework of the CFC whose responsibility it is to qualify players for World Championships by qualifying tournaments. Because of this and the logic that went into item 3, I think that the President was quite right to rule it out of order.

I suggest to the movers, and actually all Governors, the best way is to try and organize some sponsorship for our highest rated players to go to our national finals. That seems the best answer to this situation. Of course if the players do not want to go for any other reason, well that is their problem.

Frank Dixon - Conflict of Interest Issue - "I would like to open discussion on the issue of conflict of interest in Canadian chess, as it applies to the organization and direction of tournaments, when fellow family members are taking part."

Maurice Smith - This is an issue that seems to be clear cut. Just ban parents from being tournament directors in tournaments where any family member is playing. However, there are real problems with this. Many parents get into chess because their children become chess players. Often and particularly in small towns, volunteers are desperately needed to run chess tournaments.

Parents volunteer using their time, energy and usually some expense to make sure there is a tournament. This is also true to some extent in large cities. Therefore I do not think you can automatically ban parents from being involved in all tournaments.

In large tournaments there is usually at least one assistant TD so the main TD who is a parent can ask the assistant to arbitrate any dispute involving his/her child. Also, of course there is the National Appeals Committee.

In general, any parents I have known to be involved have done an excellent job in helping organize and direct tournaments. It is unfortunate that the isolated bad situation whenever it happens is made to sound like an everyday occurrence.

Frank Dixon - Moving the Canadian Open around the country.

Maurice Smith - I agree that the Canadian Open needs to be moved around the country. However, what happens if you have no other decent bid or no bid at all other than one good bid from the previous year organizers? I am not specifically thinking of Kapuskasing, as this could happen at any time. So what do you do? Have no tournament at all? I don't think so, but I am glad Frank brought this up. It is an interesting issue worthy of discussion.

Patrick McDonald: I vote in favour of motion 2004-01 to accept the OCA bid for the Canadian Closed and Zonal.

Kevin Spraggett: I vote yes for the bid for the Toronto 2004 Zonal.

Dilip Panjwani: I vote in favour of this motion (2004-01).

Steve Killi: My vote on the Toronto Zonal is yes.

Halldor Palsson: I vote for the OCA Zonal bid.

Michael Barron: The following is my response to Governors' Letter #3:
Financial Management: I'm afraid the increase in CFC membership fee and rating fee will not give us an increase in CFC revenue, but rather the opposite result – a decrease of CFC revenue.

The latest example: Greater Toronto Chess League decided this year to increase entry fee to GTCL Team event from \$5 to \$7 per player (a 40% increase). As a result, the number of participating teams was reduced from 7 to 3, the number of players was reduced from 49 to 21, the amount of collected entry fees was reduced from \$245 to \$147 (a 40% decrease) and the amount of CFC rating fees collected was reduced from \$98 to \$63 (36% decrease).

I guess CFC will get the similar results from other tournaments too. How many former CFC members decided not to renew their CFC membership this year? The real problem is

not lack of leisure time for playing chess, but lack of CFC popularity among chess players. It is not occasionally non-CFC-rated events became more popular last time.

People simply don't want to pay for an organization that does nothing for its members. Which benefits could an ordinary chess player get from his CFC membership? One of these benefits could be a CFC rating without any additional rating fees – it's already covered by CFC membership! Only non-CFC members should pay for CFC rating calculation. Such a system could encourage CFC members to play more in CFC-rated events and encourage non-CFC members to buy CFC membership.

The Canadian Zonal 2004: I vote in favour of the Ontario Chess Association's bid for the Canadian Zonal 2004.

The procedure of motion submission: What is the procedure of motion submission to CFC? I have posted this question on the CFC Governor's Board, but didn't receive any answer. It seems that such a procedure isn't declared clearly in the CFC Handbook. Therefore I would like to submit the following motion:

“The procedure of motion submission to CFC:

1. Every CFC Governor can submit a motion in his response to Governors' Letter.
2. If one of the CFC Directors preparing current Governors' Letter has found this motion important for CFC, he can second this motion and call for vote in the current Governors' Letter.
3. Otherwise, this motion is called for discussion in the current Governors' Letter.
4. If one of CFC Governors (besides the motion originator) has found this motion important for CFC, he can second this motion and call for vote in the next Governors' Letter.”

One national event per year: As was mentioned by Lyle Craver, we do indeed unite for such an event right now. That event is the Canadian Championship otherwise known as the Canadian Closed. The only problem is – this event should be every year, but not once in a while!

Motion 2004-02: The motion is clearly in order. The President clearly had to put the motion to a vote of the Assembly of Governors. There is clearly "sufficient time" for the Assembly to discuss the motion. I support Ken Craft's formal challenge of the President's ruling about this motion. The motion should be debated, amended and voted on, as it is the prerogative of the Assembly of Governors.

Halldor Palsson: *I rule that Governor **Michael Barron** does not have standing to challenge my ruling as he did not move or second the motion that was the subject of my ruling.*

Concerning discrimination against women by the CFC: Current revision of the Section 12 of the CFC Handbook is clearly discriminating against the Women's Team. Canada has several promising girls in chess. But these girls are growing up and becoming

women. We need to change obsolete discriminatory CFC regulations now to secure their chess future!

The speculations about possibility for women to play in Men's Team don't make sense - it has never happened in Canada before and won't happen in the near future. We should declare equal rights for women members in Women's Team and for men members in Men's Team.

The Olympiad Regulations: The President ruled my motion about changing of the Section 12 of the CFC Handbook as out of order. This ruling is incorrect, because:

The new Assembly of Governors has right to reconsider decision made by previous Assembly of Governors, if it isn't good enough. The motion in question is not the same as motion 2003-08. The motion 2003-08, amendment 3 wasn't voted on AGM.

At the last AGM only ten outgoing Governors were present: Maurice Smith, David Cohen, Alvah Mayo, Halldor Palsson, Neil Macleod, Dilip Panjwani, Ellen Nadeau, Caesar Posylek, John Quiring and Alick Tsui. The CFC has sixty Governors and every Governor has the right to express his opinion.

I hereby formally challenge the President's ruling about this motion and call for discussion.

Halldor Palsson: I am forced to rule that the motion introduced by Governor Michael Barron has to stay out of order. The motion was not seconded. If the motion is re-introduced and seconded by somebody, the challenge that it is the same as 2003-08 can go out for an immediate vote.

Kevin Spraggett wrote on ChessTalk to Bruce Harper:
"I would second your motion, but only if you rewrote the entire section (Section 10)."
I hope Mr. Spraggett would second my motion too, because I rewrote the entire section (Section 12).

Censoring of Governors' Letter: The CFC Handbook declares:

"340. Governors' Letter

a) Comments by Governors on motions under consideration are not censored. All comments are published in the Governors' Letters provided that they do not exceed a reasonable length."

I don't think that my proposal for the corrected revision of the Section 12 of the CFC Handbook exceed a reasonable length, therefore I insist on including it in the Governors' Letter so as to compare it with the current revision.

The CFC Constitution: Does the Chess Federation of Canada have its Constitution?

I encountered several references to it, but can't find the CFC Constitution on the CFC site. I believe it should be a separate section in the CFC Handbook named "The CFC Constitution".

The CFC Tasks: The main CFC tasks, declared in the CFC Constitution, should be the following:

To represent and popularize the game of chess in the Canadian society.

To organize chess competitions in Canada.

To represent Canada on the international chess arena.

One of the main goals should be recognition of game of chess in Canada as a sport and a popular recreational activity. To achieve this goal we need to organize publicity for chess in all possible ways: by newspapers, by radio, by TV, by internet, by participation in election campaigns on all levels, by talks with Canadian politicians and businessmen on all levels. Who can do it if not the Chess Federation of Canada?

I really know nothing about CFC activity in this area. Who from the CFC officials has talked with Paul Martin lately about chess in Canada?

However only talking about chess is not sufficient – we need regular visible chess competitions in Canada. How many sponsors and fans could have the best Canadian hockey teams, if they were playing only once in three years?

The importance of Annual Meeting: If ten dedicated Governors (from sixty Governors in total) can sit down face to face and openly discuss the issues affecting the CFC, I don't have anything against it. But if they are playing by proxies like pawns and then announce that "there were 37 votes", it looks ridiculous.

I'm ready to admit that not every CFC Governor has a computer and high speed internet at home, therefore not every CFC Governor can use e-mail or e-board. But we have to also admit that not every CFC Governor has enough spare time and money to attend the Annual Meeting in Kapuskasing.

If we want to keep the Chess Federation of Canada, we need to give every CFC Governor the ability to express his opinion and let every CFC Governor choose an appropriate method of communication: Annual Meeting, e-mail, regular mail or phone.

The CFC Governor's Board: Finally, I would like to thank Neil James Frarey for his excellent initiative in introducing the Chess Federation of Canada Governor's Board. I submit a motion to make this Chess Federation of Canada Governor's Board the working instrument of the CFC – for open discussions and for vote of issues affecting the CFC. Without communication, we will fail to function!

Mike Stanford: Regarding the Canadian Closed Toronto Bid, I vote yes.

I do wish that I would have had a chance to vote on the motion that was ruled out of order in the previous GL by our President. I hope that he will not be ruling many other legitimate motions out of order in the future.

Hugh Brodie: I vote YES to motion 2004-01 (Canadian Closed for Toronto).

Adrien Regimbald: Motion 2004-01: I vote in favour of this motion. While there are some aspects of the bid that I think could use some improvement, there also aren't any alternative bids and this bid seems fundamentally positive. When one considers the trouble we've had getting this event hosted, it seems that we should be grateful to have a bid at all.

Bela Kosoian: First of all, I would like to wish everybody happy holidays. I vote "yes" for the Canadian Zonal 2004 Toronto bid.

Frank Dixon: I am voting in favour of the 2004 Toronto bid for the Canadian Closed and Zonal.

I wish to apologize, in front of all Governors and readers, to CFC Executive Director Mr. Gerry Litchfield, for incorrectly blaming him for the confused and poor production of GL#2, in my last submission. I have since been informed that Mr. Litchfield does not put together the material for the Letters, and that this is in fact the responsibility of CFC Secretary Mr. Alvah Mayo.

Having said this, I now want to compliment and thank Mr. Mayo for his vastly improved effort on GL #3. This was the best GL I have seen in the last 18 months, since I became a Governor. The flow of material, readability, and content were all first-rate.

I want to compliment and thank Mr. Maurice Smith, FIDE Representative, and Mr. Patrick MacDonald, Youth Coordinator, for their outstanding reports in GL #3. Also, CFC President Mr. Halldor Palsson made a sincere effort to respond to Governors' questions.

I am still confused over many items around the 2004 Kapuskasing Canadian Open bid, but this seems to be a super-complex issue, and perhaps it is better if we move on, having learned some lessons.

I do have one question for Mr. Palsson about the 2003 CYCC financials. How is it that the town of Kapuskasing picked up a share of \$15,250 for this event, as outlined in GL#3? Will there be a similar situation in 2004 when Kapuskasing once again hosts the CYCC and the Canadian Open? This is a very big share of the budget for this event. I realize that Mr. Palsson was not CFC President going into Kapuskasing so he would have had no say in the situation for 2003.

I would like to compliment and thank FM Hans Jung for a very strong effort with his first issue, December 2003, as editor of En Passant magazine.

Now, I would like to open a new topic, concerning the Canadian Closed and Zonal. I realize that this is not my event to run for next year, 2004, so I apologize in advance to the organizers if I seem to be foisting my idea upon them.

What I propose is to set up a Group II Canadian Closed Championship, at the same date and site as the main event. Any player rated between 2200 and 2000, who wished to enter, would have to play in this group, leaving the top group to players rated over 2200.

In the past two editions of the Canadian Closed (Brantford 1999 and Richmond 2002) there were several players rated between 2200 and 2000 who played in these tournaments. This was certainly a boost to entry fees and gave these players a chance to compete. It also diluted the quality of the field and may have significantly distorted the results and norm possibilities because of the inequality of pairings involving these weaker players.

If we have a second group then most, if not all, regions of Canada could conceivably be represented among at least one of the two groups. It would also be a great training event for upcoming juniors, who could test themselves, and then move on to the higher level when ready. To stimulate interest, perhaps the top two finishers in Group II could qualify for the top Group the next time the Canadian Closed is held. Entry fees from Group II could go to support the prize structure in Group I, while still providing for some prizes in Group II.

Since this is a new idea I am setting it out here, to see if there is any interest in this, and to generate discussion among Governors. It may be too late to get it going for 2004, and I do not want to impose upon the very fine bid put together by the Toronto organizers. Depending on what Governors think about it (and if the Toronto organizers agreed) this 2004 event would be an excellent time to try it. Toronto is a large city in a central location which hasn't had much strong Open chess competition recently. Many players between 2200 and 2000 could possibly be interested in playing in a separate event held there.

Nava Starr: I am in favour of holding the Canadian Closed 2004 in Toronto.

Wilf Ferner: My vote is YES regarding Motion 2004-01 Canadian Closed (Toronto) bid.

Lyle Craver: Motion 2004-01 (Toronto Canadian Closed Bid) – I vote YES

GL Submissions: As the former GL Editor I have to agree with Alvah's comments about separating GL from non-GL submissions. I came to grief with one well known Governor on this subject last year - it's a "damned if you do and damned if you don't" situation and anything Governors can do to avoid putting Gerry or the Secretary in this position is certainly appreciated.

FIDE: an international ranking system of the type suggested is just plain dumb dumb dumb and I hope Maurice continues to speak out on this.

Re my comments in GL#2: With all due respect to the Nadeaus, what seems to have happened at the Kapuskasing AGM is as follows - none of the bidders made a full and proper bid for the AGM to support and that HAVING ALREADY SEEN THE OTHER 3 BIDS the Kapuskasing organizers were allowed to revise their bid.

This is to my mind a perversion of the bidding process and given it determines the site of both the 2004 CFC AGM and the 2004 CYCC has far reaching ramifications. The correct procedure would have been to reject ALL the bids and call for new bids - to me this is a no-brainer.

I intend to do everything in my power to ensure any future BC bids will be complete by the CFC AGM as there is no way we want to give any legitimate excuse for any further travesties of this sort. I have not decided whether the President or the governors present at this AGM were chiefly responsible but the motion by Stephen Wright presented in the last GL and ruled out of order by the President was an attempt to ameliorate the effects of what I consider an unjust bid process. If we can't help the adults at least we can try to help the kids.

As such I will happily second Mr. Kraft's move to challenge the chair as I believe Halldor's reasons were both incorrect and the effects (which I don't believe were anticipated by him) unjust.

I think Mr. Dixon's comments concerning the GL go too far - stylistically GL#3 shows Alvah doing a better job than previously and I expect him to improve as time goes on. GL#1 is ALWAYS a pain for the GL Editor due to the volume of AGM material to be presented compared to the actual "new" material. Perhaps it could be sent ASAP after the AGM to the incoming governors (as a sort of "pre-GL")?

One beef many governors have had for a long time is that the AGM is in early July yet we don't usually hear anything from it (except via ChessTalk and other routes) until mid to late September. I think that can and SHOULD be corrected though I think calling for apologies is going a bit far.

The best of the season to all of you.

Stephen Wright: Motion 2004-01: I vote YES.

Motion 2004-02: I am seconding the appeal from the ruling of the president that this motion is out of order, as made by Ken Craft elsewhere in this issue. I gather that the original CYCC regulations were accepted and implemented through a vote of the Governors. I therefore fail to see why the Governors are not being allowed to vote on a modification of those same regulations.

Tournament memberships: there always seems to be confusion surrounding this topic, so I am bringing it up for discussion and clarification. Here is the appropriate section of the CFC handbook:

375. Tournament Playing Fee: A tournament fee for first time players in CFC events, for foreign players, and for players whose name does not appear on the last Annual List, of \$10.00 may be paid in lieu of CFC membership. The player will then receive a rating, one copy of the magazine, and an invitation to join the CFC. [see Motion 90-9, as amended, GL, September 1990, p.1-12]

As I do not have access to the GL's of that time period I cannot read about the rationale behind the motion, but I'm assuming the main reason was to allow new and lapsed members a chance to play in a tournament without having to pay for a full membership.

The question then arises of how many times a player can do this; current practice seems to be that a player can simply pay this tournament membership whenever they enter an event. But presumably the original intent in 1990 was to allow a taste of tournament play, then insist that a player take out a membership if they wished to play in more events.

Therefore, could we decide exactly how this tournament membership is to be applied and the handbook updated accordingly? In particular, are multiple payments of this fee allowed by the same player? (Incidentally, the category of expired players "whose name does not appear on the last Annual List" is difficult to determine these days, when most of us are using an electronic TD list.)

On a related matter: what percentage of the \$10 fee goes to the CFC and what percentage to the provincial affiliate?

Motion 2003-09 concerning unrated players: despite having been voted on and passed at the AGM, this motion has yet to find its way into the online CFC Handbook.

Caesar Posylek: Gentlemen, I'd like to vote YES in favour of this motion (2004-01).

Barry Thorvardson: I vote yes to motion 2004-01.

Pierre Denomee: I vote in favor of the Toronto bid.

Very important decisions were taken in the meeting of the FIDE rules and tournament regulation committee. Chairman Guert Gijssen published them on chesscafe.com.

1. Once published, Swiss pairings cannot be changed even if they are wrong. This was already in the FIDE Swiss rules. This rule is for the benefit of professional players who prepare openings for specific opponents. It might be possible to change the pairing 15 minutes before the beginning of the round only if the players involved agree.

This rule has been criticized in the current issue of *An Arbiter's Notebook*. There, Ken Stewart of Scotland wrote, "Re-pairing. I think it is understandable that players will object to re-pairing at master level. However, I think it is important that rules are not written in such a way as to prevent this being done in tournaments for less strong players. As arbiters at the Glasgow Congress, for example, we usually re-pair after 30 minutes to maximize the number of players actually playing a game, which is what the majority wish."

This issue of professional versus amateur can be seen in other rules as well. Most of the time, it is not possible to have a single rule that would please both type of players.

2. If a player's mobile (that's what they call cellular phones in Europe) rings in the playing venue, then this player shall lose the game. The arbiter shall ensure that all the players are informed in advance of this rule.

3. (A decision of the Swiss pairing committee): For seeding purposes in a FIDE rated Swiss tournament the FIDE ratings shall be used. If a player is not FIDE rated, the national rating, if available, shall be used. We can forget the use of the CFC rating for pairing purpose for the next Canadian Closed. This is bad news for us because the CFC rating is usually the most accurate measurement of the strength of Canadian players.

According to this rule, Zhe Quan must be paired in all FIDE rated Swiss tournament as a 2342 player and not a 2449 player. We should also check with FIDE if we are allowed to pair using the CFC Swiss pairing rules rather than the FIDE Swiss rules. If we are required to use the FIDE Swiss rules it would be urgent to explain them in *En Passant* because most Canadian players don't know them.

The CFC rating program should be able to import the results directly from the Swiss pairing program. Arbiters should be encouraged to submit in electronic format, we could even give rebates for those who submit electronically. All future International Arbiters will be required to know how to use a pairing program.

Halldor Palsson: *We are currently buying programming work so the CFC will be able to import the results directly from a Swiss pairing program.*

With regard to Frank Dixon's comments on conflict of interest, the Canadian Junior and the role of FIDE: FIDE has nothing to say: it is a *privilege* of a national federation that FIDE will not intervene directly in the internal affairs of the Federation. Such a privilege is usually *not granted* to the affiliates of a national federation.

(With regard to Motion 2004-02): I oppose qualification by rating. I have always argued against the current practice in Quebec in which a league can qualify a player for the Quebec Closed in any manner whatsoever (including a vote by the board of governors without any regard for rating) when there would have been plenty of time to run a real qualifier.

If we want to convince the government that chess is an amateur sport we must forget any kind of qualification by rating. The 100 metre world champion must run all the qualifying heats and semi-finals and if he falls, then he is eliminated. Nobody has any favour. FIDE has adopted the principle that nobody should have any favour in the FIDE World Championship so there are no longer any draw odds for the champion and he must begin the competition from the first round, just like every other competitor.

There is also a social aspect for the youth. In scholastic sports, many girls prefer the social gatherings that come with the competition to the competition itself.

(With regard to Michael Barron's call for more national championships) - We should add one Canadian Team Championship and one Canadian Youth Team Championship for selecting the team for the Youth Olympiad.

I hope it is a typo, but on the FIDE web site they have announced the time control of 40 moves in 90 minutes followed by 15 minutes to mate with the addition of 30 seconds after each move for the next World Chess Championship. This time control was supposed to have been withdrawn.

(With regard to Maurice Smith's comments on government funding) - I would add that for Sports Canada chess is *explicitly excluded* from all their support programs, so even if a tribunal would force them to recognise chess as a sport, there would still be no money because chess is explicitly excluded.

Mark Dutton: Motion 2004-01 (Mayo/Newman) Canadian Closed Bid: I am voting YES in favour of this excellent bid.

Phil Haley: I vote Yes on motion 2004 re: the Canadian Closed 2004.

Douglas Hoch: Please register my vote for the Toronto - Canadian Closed 2004 bid as 'YES'.

Peter Stockhausen:

1. I vote YES to the motion for the Canadian Closed by the OCA.

2. The Income Statement for the most recent WYCC does not list the expenses for the coach (Yan Teplitsky). This should be included.

Motion 2004-03:

Moved by Peter Stockhausen/Kevin Spraggett that regulations 1000 – 1015 of the CFC Handbook be repealed and replaced by the following:

1000. Events:

This section establishes the rules for:

(a) The holding of the Canadian Youth Chess Championship (“CYCC”), which consists of the following ten events:

Canadian 18 Championship (open and girls)
Canadian 16 Championship (open and girls)
Canadian 14 Championship (open and girls)
Canadian 12 Championship (open and girls)
Canadian 10 Championship (open and girls)

(b) Canadian representation at the World Youth Chess Championship (“WYCC”).

(c) The financial obligations of the CFC to Canadian participants in the WYCC.

1001. Frequency:

A tournament shall normally be held each year for each category set out in Article 1000.

1002. Format:

The tournament shall use a swiss, single, double or triple round-robin or match format held over three days, with the format and number of rounds to be decided by the tournament organizers, taking into account the number and age of the players.

1003. Players:

The following players shall be eligible to participate in each CYCC event provided they comply with the formal entry requirements of Article 1007:

(a) A player to be chosen by the organizer.

(b) The Provincial Champion ordinarily resident in each Province.

(c) The highest rated player resident in the Territories (the Yukon, N.W.T., and Nunuvut) who is willing to play.

(d) The highest rated players in the sequence of the Canadian Rating List (see Article 1005) until the total allowed to compete is reached. The final number of players shall be determined by the CFC Board of Directors in consultation with the tournament organizers.

1004. Provincial Champion:

Except where Article 1004(c) applies, each Province as specified in Article 1003 shall have the right to determine who shall be their Provincial Champion by choosing as their champion either the winner of a Provincial Championship Tournament who meets the requirements of 1004(a) or the highest rated player who meets the requirements of 1004(b).

(a) To qualify a Provincial Championship Tournament must be held no later than 4 weeks prior to the start of the Youth Tournament. It must be a CFC rated closed tournament restricted to players ordinarily resident in the Province at least six months prior to the start of the CYCC. All tournaments directly qualifying a player to participate in the Provincial Championship Tournament must be CFC rated.

The Province has the discretion to decide the qualification rules and format for the Provincial Championship Tournament provided they otherwise comply with **these** rules. Should the winner of the Provincial Championship Tournament not compete in the Youth Tournament, the runner-up shall be the Provincial Champion for the purposes of qualifying pursuant to 1003(b). Should both the Champion and runner-up not compete in the Youth Tournament the Provincial Champion for qualifying pursuant to 1003(b) shall be the highest rated player in the Province as defined in 1004(b) who is willing to play.

(b) The highest rated player shall be the highest rated player willing to play who is ordinarily resident in the Province six months prior to the start of the Youth Tournament. The rating shall be an established rating and published in the rating list designated by the CFC Board of Directors approximately eight weeks prior to the start of the **CYCC**.

(c) Where a Province does not have a provincial association affiliated to the Chess Federation of Canada then the Highest Rated Player as defined in 1004(b) shall be the Provincial Champion.

Amend 1005 as follows

1005. Rating Requirements:

In determining the rating for qualification pursuant to Article 1003(d) or 1004(b), the following shall apply:

(a) The players rating shall be from the rating list designated by the CFC Board of Director and published approximately eight weeks prior to the **CYCC**.

(b) The ratings used must be Established Ratings unless the CFC Board of Directors decides that the playing strength of a player with a provisional or other rating is sufficient to qualify.

(c) In exceptional circumstances the CFC Board of Directors can qualify a player by rating if tournament results which would qualify a player are not submitted in a timely manner or for any other reason.

1006. Additional Places:

When a player who has qualified to play in the **CYCC** has qualified under more than one Article of section 1003, then the extra place will be filled from the rating list pursuant to Article 1003(d).

1007. Age, Citizenship, and Residency for Canadian Championship:

Each contestant in the **CYCC** must **meet** the age and residency requirements specified by FIDE for the **WYCC**. Each player shall be either (i) a Canadian citizen or (ii) a **permanent resident** of Canada for the twelve-month period immediately preceding the tournament. The admittance to the Tournament of such exceptions shall be entirely at the discretion of the CFC Board of Directors.

1008. Entries:

All eligible players who may qualify pursuant to Article 1003 and who wish to participate in the **CYCC** shall notify the CFC Business Office no later than 45 days before the start of the Championship of their intention to participate, enclosing their entry fee of \$150.00.

The CFC Board of Directors may delegate this function to the tournament organizers. Entries which cannot be accepted because the number exceeds the number of players allowed shall be advised thereof and their entry fee returned to them. Players qualifying pursuant to Article 1003(b) shall send in their entries as soon as is practical after the Provincial Champion is known but in any case no later than three weeks prior to the start of the **CYCC**. In exceptional circumstances, the CFC Board of Directors can vary the time limits in this Article.

1009. Time Control:

Shall be determined by the CFC Board of Directors who may delegate the decision to the tournament organizers.

1010. Tie Break:

Ties for the top three places in the Tournament shall be resolved by a playoff. Which of the following time controls shall be used depends on the time available (the slowest time control shall be used if possible: a) the same time control as used in the tournament; b) One hour per game; c) 30 minutes per game; d) 15 minutes per game; e) 5 minutes per game.

If two players finish the tournament with the same number of points, a two-game playoff shall be played. The player who receives White in the first game shall be determined by lot.

If three or more players finish the tournament with the same number of points, a single round robin playoff shall be played.

If, after a playoff is completed, two or more players are still tied, another playoff shall be held using a faster time control. This process shall be repeated until the tie is broken.

1011. Players' Expenses:

Each player will be responsible for paying his **or her** own travel expenses, accommodation and meal expenses **to the CYCC**. [Amended, see Motion 2003-02, 02-03GL3, December 2002]

1012. Participation in the WYCC:

The following players are eligible to participate in the appropriate category of the WYCC:

(a) The winner of each category in the CYCC. If a winner is unable or unwilling to participate, the second place finisher in that category shall be invited to go in his or her place. If the second place finisher is unable to participate, the third place finisher in that category shall be invited to go in place of the winner. Players who qualify for the world event in this manner shall have their entry fee and air fare to the world event paid by the CFC.

(b) The second and third place finishers in the Tournament.

(c) The top two rated players in each category, selected in accordance with the rating guidelines set out in Article 1005, provided the player has played at least 20 regular rated games since the previous year's CYCC.

(d) Any player who achieved a score of over 50% in the world event in the previous year.

(e) Players who qualify for the world event by Articles 1012(b) 1012(c) and 1012(d) are not guaranteed to receive CFC funding.

1013. Territorial Chess Association:

Upon the request of an affiliated Territorial Chess Association the Board of Directors may authorize a Tournament to select a representative in place of the highest rated player resident in the Territories.

1014. Organization:

The principal organizer of the CYCC is the CFC with the responsibility for the event resting with the Junior Coordinator and the Executive Director. All expenses such as prizes, travel to the world event, trophies, medals, and rent shall be borne by the CFC. The events will be held immediately preceding the Canadian Open tournament. The organizers of the Canadian Open will receive \$5 from each entry for securing the playing site. Any surplus funds generated will be utilized by the CFC for future Junior activities, or transferred to the Junior Fund (Kalev Pugi Fund). [see Motion 2003-02, 02-03GL3, December 2002]

1015. Authority of the Board of Directors:

The CFC Board of Directors shall rule on any situation not covered by these regulations and shall have the authority to rule on any matter which is in dispute.

In support of this motion:

The substantive changes to these regulations are:

A. Article 1002 now allows a round robin or match format, should the number of participants in a category justify such a format.

B. Article 1007 reflects changes in Canadian immigration law.

C. Article 1010 mandates a more equitable tie break procedure, subject to there being sufficient time to hold a proper playoff.

D. Article 1012 both regularizes the current CFC practice (the top three finishers from each CYCC event may go to the WYCC, with the first place finisher having his or her way paid) and permits high-rated players or successful competitors in the previous WYCC to attend the WYCC, at their own expense, without participating in the CYCC. Qualification by rating is subject to an activity requirement (20 regular rated games since the previous CYCC) to ensure that the players both deserve to qualify and are supporting the CFC by participating in other CFC events. This allows Canada to field the strongest possible team at the WYCC, subject to financial considerations, while preserving strong incentives to play in the CYCC.

(Note: Changes to the previous regulations are in red.)

Hal Bond: On Motion 2004-01 (Closed Bid): I vote in favour.

Motion 2004-02: This motion may not be perfect but I would like to see this issue discussed. The idea of seeding players is not new, and the nature of the WYCC seems compatible with seeding some players.

John Remillard: Motion 2004-01: I vote in support of the motion by Alvah Mayo/Eric Newman that the Chess Federation of Canada accepts the Ontario Chess Association bid for the 2004 Canadian Closed Championship (as presented in GL 2003/4-2).

Motions for First Discussion:

Motion 2004-03: (Stockhausen/Spraggett) Canadian/World Youth Championships.

Motions for Second Discussion:

None

Motions for Vote:

None

Deadline for Submissions to GL #5: February 26, 2004.