

# **CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA**

## **GOVERNORS' LETTER FIVE**

### **2004-2005**



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](mailto:info@chess.ca)

**ATTENTION ALL GOVERNORS:** Anyone with an E-Mail address can have their Governors' Letter sent to them via E-Mail and save the CFC paper and postage costs. Please E-Mail [info@chess.ca](mailto:info@chess.ca) if interested.

**Deadline for submissions to GL #6: 19 March, 2005**

## **KEEPING GOVERNORS INFORMED**

### **From the President:**

The report on the CFC financial situation in GL 4 prompted several Governors to ask specific questions about programs and expenditures. In response our Executive Director, Peter Arseneau, the Treasurer and our bookkeeper have been working to provide some answers. This work continues.

In response to Governor Bond's observations concerning why our cash position was so strong if we were losing all this money we discovered that provisions for international tournaments and donations were not being expensed correctly. By expensing donations for the Olympiad and reserves for the World Junior we lowered the -\$22K reported in GL 4 to about -\$8K.

The last three months of 2004-2005 will hopefully allow the CFC to more or less break-even between revenues and expenses. We will have year end adjustments for prepaid expenses like the new furnace, a laser printer and a new computer that lower our expenses but we will also have unearned revenues and overall I expect a small deficit for the 2004-05 year after adjustments.

A detailed report on the 2004 CYCC-WYCC will be contained in our annual report. The CFC paid approximately \$15K for flights and entry fees for nine first place finishers. For the 2004 cycle total CYCC revenues were \$16,845 and total CYCC expenses were \$6,910 including \$3,500 for 4,500 pens which will be used in future years. Currently every pen is expensed and we are at a deficit of \$5K for this program. Depending on the treatment of these pre-paid expenses by our accountant the 2004 CYCC-WYCC might only be at a deficit of about \$2K.

At the end of 2004-05 I expect that the CFC will have about \$55K in cash/working capital on hand. I think it is sufficient for the CFC to have \$40-\$45K in cash/working capital. The CFC should be in a position to send approximately \$10K-\$15K to the Chess Foundation of Canada.

Halldor P. Palsson  
President  
Chess Federation of Canada

### **From the Secretary:**

Thank you for your responses to GL#4. The straw vote concerning format of the GL was overwhelmingly for a single column format so that's how I'll do it henceforth.

I've been offline for about a week due to the death of my mother January 30<sup>th</sup> and thus I'm about a week late at this point. I've had messages of condolence from many of you and I'd like to take this opportunity to express my thanks. Now it's back to work as this is a fairly busy GL.

Best regards,  
Lyle Craver

## **From the Women's Coordinator:**

Greetings to all

Looking back on the events of 2004, I can say with great conviction it was a very productive year for women's chess in Canada. Before getting into the particulars, I would like to start by thanking all the people who helped me coordinate the Women's 2004 Zonal; namely: Hal Bond, Halldor Palsson, Patrick McDonald, Barry Thorvardson, David Cohen, and chess legend Nava Starr. Furthermore, I would like to stress that the tournament would not have been possible without the support of Belzberg Technologies, the Chess Express, the Ontario Chess Association, and the Greater Toronto Chess League.

It was difficult for me as a newcomer to Canada to be able to hold this event. I had to start from scratch, with very little in the way of funding or directives. Coming from Europe where the organization of chess events enjoys a high level logistical, technical and financial support, nothing could have prepared me for the way things work here in Canada. I wrote to my contacts overseas -- including Armenia, France, Germany, Georgia, Greece, and Russia -- to find out about the best practices in other federations. In the end, however, grassroots networking within Canada -- working with a handful of dedicated, exceptional individuals -- provided me with the pool of expertise and support necessary to pull it off. Overall, the Zonal was a great success and on a personal level it proved to be one of the most challenging and rewarding projects I've ever worked on. Of course no tournament report would be complete without a word of praise to our winner, Dinara Khazieyva. On behalf of the CFC I would like to congratulate Dinara on her success.

Unfortunately, the circumstances surrounding the 2004 Chess Olympiad were not as good as might be expected. I must confess my astonishment that there was even a question of not sending a women's team to the Olympiad. The issue of financial constraints should have been anticipated and addressed long beforehand. It is unfortunate women's chess remains, in the minds of far too many, an afterthought when it comes to representing Canada in international competition.

In spite of everything, our women played much better in 2004, with a standing of 41<sup>st</sup> place -- which was better than in 2002 and 2000, where they finished 57<sup>th</sup> and 59<sup>th</sup> respectively. I would like to thank Nava, Dianara, Valentina and Diane for their participation and for doing us proud.

Special mention goes to Dinara and Nava for their strong showing, which pulled up our women's final result. Congratulations and many thanks for your effort, one and all. The tournament was an invaluable learning experience; giving our emerging talent an opportunity to gain some needed international exposure.

On behalf of our women's team, I would like to thank everybody who was involved sending them to the Chess Olympiad. Also, special thanks goes to Brian Hartmann, for being such a supportive team captain.

In closing I have some recommendations I feel need to be taken to heart in order to ensure greater success in future Olympiads.

The first and undeniably most important point remains the matter of securing financial support for our players. This needs to be a top priority for the CFC. The funds have to be in place well in advance of any future Olympiad. We need a concerted effort on the part of everybody to promote chess in Canada and find sponsors; otherwise we court disaster every time we have to scrounge for last minute support.

It is equally important for the team selection process to be done long before any competition takes place -- thereby allowing them to concentrate on tournament preparation. Unfortunately, arrangements in the past had been so short that some women had to improvise their departure schedule.

I have also concluded from my analysis that our team would better their prospects of winning games if they were given the time and means to meet and train with their coach before competition. Team spirit and team solidarity are factors we shouldn't overlook.

I look forward to better things in 2005 and beyond.

Bela Kossoian  
Women's Coordinator

### Youth Coordinator's Report.

I will again encourage all governors to ensure that the youth in their regions are all aware of and encouraged to participate in the upcoming tournaments:

The CYCC – Our annual championship by age categories. This is an excellent opportunity to see a different part of our country and measure up against the other youth players of your age. This is going to be quite a well run event. I have been in constant touch with the organizers and things are shaping up very well. Held in Victoria, BC March 24-27, this promises to be some of Canada's best weather for that time of the year. I am assured that Spring will be well into full swing by then. We will also be using this tournament to select our youth team to send to the World Youth Chess Championships in France in July. We will also be selecting our Youth Team to send to the Pan American Youth Festival in Brazil. (Dates and exact locations have yet to be set for this tournament.)

The other tournament is Canada's Junior Championships in Brantford April 30 – May 4. This is where we will select Canada's Junior Under 20 Champion! Our Junior Champion will be our selected entrant into the World Junior in Turkey this year.

Another project I have been working on is the introduction of Chess into the Standard Curriculum in Ontario. I have to admit that while I have had meetings with a couple of Members of Provincial Parliament, this is proceeding at a rather slow rate.

I am encouraged by some of the responses I have had to my motion (seconded by VP Chris Mallon) to enter into discussions with the Chess 'n Math Association with regard to a possible agreement and process to work together for chess in Canada. Being a parent of a chess player, I have always been somewhat irritated at the use of two different rating systems (and for some 3 or even 4). We need to make this a more cohesive system to better enable a youth's transition from kids chess to regular all ages tournaments. I still feel we lose too many youth players with the current system. I also see the advantage of reducing the workload of the CFC office so that our ED and his staff can better focus on the business of being a National Sports Organization. And Yes, I feel that we should be thinking this way in order to work towards becoming an officially recognized National Sports Organization. If we are able to achieve this recognition in Canada, our jobs will be made much easier to find supporters and sponsors.

Patrick McDonald  
Youth Coordinator, Chess Federation of Canada  
[patrick@psmcd.net](mailto:patrick@psmcd.net)

### **Results of Votes:**

**2005-11: Monthly Governors Letter (Moved Jason Feng / Seconded Peter Stockhausen):** That the Governors Letter be sent to all CFC Governors at least once a month.

**Yes (16)** Barron, Cohen, Craft, Craver, Denomee, Divinsky, Feng, Ferner, Ficzere, Greco , Harper, Hebert, Mallon, Pacey, Starr, Stockhausen

**No (4):** Bond, Jaeger, Nadeau, Smith

**Abstain (2):** Bluvshtein, Dixon

***Motion Passed***

***David Cohen:*** At a minimum, Governors should receive a monthly financial statement. This is normal practice in non-profit organizations. This is particularly important for us because we are operating a business (book and equipment sales).

***Lyle Craver:*** As stated previously I think this is a good objective though we need everyone's help particularly the CFC Executive to keep this schedule.

***Pierre Dénommée :*** I support the motion. Even if the GL contains no new motions or new information, this will speed-up the decision making process. A motion is discussed twice before being voted and more GL means faster decision taking.

***Frank Dixon:*** My feeling is that the new Governors' Board will speed the process of discussion. I would like to see more time for Governors to read the GL before having to respond to the next one. I got my GL#4 by mail, it was long and complex, and I had only a couple of days to respond. How about 8 GL's per year, about one every 45 days, along with the AGM / GL, with a minimum of ten days' reflection time for Governors, which right now we are not getting. Otherwise I am very impressed with the GLs this year; they are a dramatic improvement over last year, and this will be reflected in the quality of the discussion and development we produce.

***Martin Jaeger:*** no to 11, no to 12. The treasurer should be a member of any committee going to make recommendations that could cost a bundle. Co-opting of members for the committee by the others is not a good idea. A GL every two months is enough. Having one more often encourages governors to confuse the responsibilities of governors with those of the executive.

***Maurice Smith:*** I vote NO Comments: It seems that our current Secretary, Lyle Craver has put out the most GLs in one year, 9. Currently in six months we have had 4, which on that basis would mean 8 for the year. Lyle is the most efficient Secretary, but he will not always be the Secretary, so what happens when the next one is elected. Since the most productive Secretary cannot produce 12 in a year, the prognosis would be that the number would decrease. What do we do then? Fire the Secretary? As I pointed out in the last GL, urgent items can be resolved by e-mail. Therefore this motion is unnecessary, impractical and unenforceable.

***2005-12: National Championship Committee***

***Motion: (Moved Bruce Harper / Seconded Chris Mallon)*** That a committee be formed to consider and analyze various options for holding the Canadian Championship and the Canadian Women's Championship and report to the Governors on the results of their deliberations and with their recommendations for a suitable format for these events.

The committee shall consist of Eddie Urquhart (Masters Representative), Jack Yoos, Nava Starr, (all of whom have indicated they are prepared to serve on such a commitment), Pascal Charbonneau (Canadian Champion) and Sid Belzberg. If Pascal Charbonneau and Sid Belzberg are unable or unwilling to serve, the other three committee members shall select suitable replacements.

The committee shall submit a report to the Governors, with their recommendations, by December 31,

2004.

**Yes (16):** Barron ,Bluvshtein, Bond, Cohen, Craft, Craver, Divinsky, Feng, Ferner, Ficzere, Greco , Harper, Hebert, Mallon, Pacey, Stockhausen

**No (3):** Denomee, Jaeger, Smith

**Abstentions:** none

***Motion passed***

**David Cohen:** As the specified reporting deadline has passed, I suggest that the committee report to the Annual Meeting.

**Pierre Dénommée** I cannot vote for a motion that demands a report to be submitted in December 2004. Furthermore, the committee has neither an organiser nor an arbiter. Nice ideas must be implemented, so the committee should include an organiser. Nice ideas might run contrary to numerous FIDE regulations, so the committee should include an IA. It would be easy to have numerous IM and more than two FM from the Zonal by simply changing the format of the competition to a round robin. Something we should think about.

**Frank Dixon:** Yes. Looks like we missed the deadline of Dec. 31 / 04 on this, but the principle is sound.

**Maurice Smith:** I vote NO Comments: If the movers had just left it at the first paragraph, and refrained from the statements in the second half, I would probably have voted in favour. However, having a National Championship Committee that does not include one organizer severely limits the knowledge that comes with experience that the Committee needs. Also saying that a report would be submitted by December 31st, 2004 is impossible. If this was a court document, lawyers would have a great time with the credibility of the originators of that document. How can you vote for something that is impossible?

**Nava Starr:** The deadline of December 31/04 has passed, but I would like to be working on the Committee for the next NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIPS.

**2005-24 (STRAW VOTE on GL format):**

There were three options presented:

- a) I prefer the GL be published in one column format
- b) I prefer the GL be published in two column format
- c) I have no preference

**( a ) (12):** Barron, Bluvshtein, Bond, Craft, Dixon, Ferner, Ficzere, Hebert, Mallon, Pacey, Smith, Starr

**( b ) (1):** Stockhausen

**( c ): none**

As a straw vote this is non-binding but there seems to be a strong preference for (a) so (a) it is.

**Discussion of Motions:**

**MOTIONS FOR FINAL VOTE:**

**Motion 2005-14:** Moved by David Cohen, Seconded Kevin Pacey

That CFC Handbook 375 Tournament Playing Fee be amended by adding the sentence: "At any national Championship, this fee is not permitted as a substitute for CFC membership."

**Michael Barron:** I support this motion. Moreover, I believe we should extend the membership requirements for Championships on all levels, including Provincial, regional and municipal (except for Open Championships).

On the other hand, respective chess organizations (CFC, Provincial, regional and municipal associations) should sponsor their Championships to reduce participants' expenses.

**Pierre Dénommée** I support the motion. Whoever wants to play in a national championship should show support to his federation. We would look silly if a Canadian Champion is not a member.

**Frank Dixon:** I definitely support this idea from Governor Cohen for national events.

**Wilf Ferner:** En Passant issue #144 June 1997 announces a new type of Adult Tournament membership and a Junior Tournament membership. For Nova Scotia, Alberta, BC, and Ontario the rates are \$10(Adult) \$5 (Junior). Elsewhere in Canada the rates are \$6(Adult) \$3(Junior). It goes on to explain "This membership will entitle a person to play in one CFC rated event only. Take advantage of this membership to encourage non-members in your community, to play in your tournaments." As as I am concerned, the rules & regulations on the CFC website are not up-to-date sometimes. I would like to see a copy of the motions passed by the governors in 97 and the original motion a few years earlier. I am sure there are a few governors amongst us who participated in the formulation of these motions. When I dealt with the previous CFC executive director, in my capacity as OCA treasurer, again the word "membership" was always used.

**Tony Ficzere:** 2005-14 - Seems reasonable, can't believe this is an issue.

**Maurice Smith:** I agree with this motion. I have never really liked the Tournament Playing Fee anyway. I do not feel that the modest CFC membership should be a deterrent to anyone. I never would have thought that anyone who was not a legitimate CFC member could play for a National Championship. I thank the movers for bringing this to our attention.

**Peter Stockhausen:** That sounds like a reasonable motion to me.

**Motion 2005-15:** Moved by Michael Barron, Seconded by Frank Dixon/Bela Kossoian that the CFC Handbook should include the following regulation:

"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 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."

**Michael Barron:** This motion was submitted for 03-04 GL#4 in December 2003 and finally made its way to Governors' vote! Its intent was to define clearly the mechanism of how motions are made, discussed and voted upon. But now it's passed too much time and a lot of important decisions were made by the Assembly of Governors. Now we know the outcome of the vote on Motion 2005-08, and I hope, Bruce, for your help in the proper re-phrasing of this motion.

**Lyle Craver:** I am opposed to allowing unseconded motions to be published in the GL particularly since we are in regular e-mail contact with each other. As CFC Secretary I routinely get suggestions for motions or requests to help phrase them into "Handbook language" and am glad to be able to help. Some I

I'm happy to support, others I don't usually saying why. Some I will second for discussion purposes if I think the idea merits debate. Governors need to bear in mind that "one of the CFC directors preparing current GLs" is basically the Secretary and not the rest of the Executive except for officers' reports. That effectively gives me powers I neither want nor need.

I do NOT support the idea of short-circuiting the discussion process and going to an immediate vote on most matters – if a matter really is an emergency it normally gets dealt with at the Executive level though we are trying to make less use of that power.

I think the need for such a motion is much diminished as we move to a more frequent Governors' Letter. I do welcome more frequent use of Straw Votes to get a better feel for the prevailing opinion of the Governors and am happy to facilitate requests for these.

**Frank Dixon:** 2005-15: Although I am down as a seconder of this, it seems not as relevant now as when it was discussed earlier, since the new Governors' Board should speed efficiency and bring Governors closer together on issues.

**Maurice Smith:** I would be against this motion because it goes against parliamentary and organizational procedure known the world over. Requiring a seconder for a motion considerably reduces the number of absurd ego driven motions that are time wasting for everyone. That is why this rule has been kept in effect for so long, because it works well. Of course any Governor can put his views in the Comments Section of the GL. If anyone else has enough interest then a motion could be formed. There are no restrictions on a Governor making his views known.

**Peter Stockhausen:** We already suffer from a surplus of badly written motions. This motion, if passed, will make a poor situation even worse. Besides, we do have a mechanism for "straw-votes."

**Halldor Palsson:** The CFC Assembly of Governors has always used Roberts Rules of Order. Governors have access to the Comments section of the GL or our Discussion Forum for expressions of opinions envisioned by this motion.

**Motion 2005-16:** Moved by Frank Dixon, and seconded by Patrick McDonald: Pending the approval of the new organization by CFC Governors, to be voted upon this time, the Coordinator of the Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association (currently myself) will report to the CFC Youth Coordinator.

**Michael Barron:** I support this motion.

**Pierre Dénommée:** I support this motion.

**Frank Dixon:** I wish to thank Governors for their support of the affiliation of the Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association with the CFC. We may be the new kids on the block, but we increased our participation numbers significantly in 2005 at our championship in Toronto! We had 23 teams and 92 players on a mid-January weekend, playing a team Swiss in two sections, for the first time. The 2005 Post-Secondary team champions are the UQAM from Montreal -- Congratulations!! Their team is: Simon Gravel, Hugues Masse, Olivier Tessier, and Anne Marie Charbonneau. The UQAM team emerged in a very tight, thrilling battle over higher-rated teams from Waterloo, Toronto, and McGill. I want to thank the organizers from the University of Toronto, and especially TD Alex Lambruschini, for their stellar efforts. The site for the 2006 Championship will be McGill University in Montreal, in mid-January, 2006. I will have more information on developments in this portfolio for the next GL.

Frank Dixon  
CPSCA / CFC Liaison and Coordinator

**Peter Stockhausen:** This sounds like putting the cart before the horse, so to speak. If we decide that it would be beneficial to join Sports Canada, we should get from them a list of conditions that we would have to meet. If memory serves, we were once members of Sports Canada, but dropped the whole thing because it was expensive and our chances of being recognized as a “sport” never mind receiving funding was less than zero.

**Motion 2005-17:** Moved by Pierre Denommee and seconded by Michael Barron:

**Pierre Dénommée:** (In response to Bruce Harper) The motion does not require any rewriting of existing regulation. It simply provide for a way to obtain redress when the *current* regulations are not followed.

(In response to Les Bunning) Not really a body, a body is something permanent. Appeals against decisions of the CFC are not supposed to be current, they should be exceptional. The Appeal panel does not exist until somebody actually files an Appeal and it is dissolved after the case has been dealt with. The CFC itself has a right to Appeal the decision of the Appeal Panel to the Sport Dispute Resolution Centre of Canada

You should check the jurisprudence at [http://www.adrsportred.ca/resource\\_centre/jurisprudence/index\\_e.cfm](http://www.adrsportred.ca/resource_centre/jurisprudence/index_e.cfm). They do have time to deal with contractual matters (employment contract) and they most likely do not have the authority to do so. Their primary goals are

- To ensure access to *independent*, alternative dispute resolution (ADR) solutions for all participants in the Canadian sport system
- *To strengthen the transparency and accountability* of the national sport system and national sports organizations by clarifying their responsibilities to athletes, coaches and other stakeholders
- To ensure that independent alternative dispute resolution (ADR) processes are *equitable for all participants*
- To offer a *low-cost* mechanism throughout Canada in both official languages.

They deal mostly with urgent decisions concerning the composition of national teams and Olympic Selections.

(in response to Halldor Palsson) It does not affect the right to go to court, but the judge will declare the lawsuit out of order. The Federal Government has decided that cases involving National Sport Organisation should go to arbitration rather than to regular courts. Mandatory arbitration clauses in contracts are both binding and legal, especially when they are encouraged by Ottawa.

**Halldor Palsson:** This is a constitutional amendment so this motion will require a 2/3 vote. As stated by Pierre Dénommée if there is a contract between CFC and the participants requiring arbitration is feasible. Presently the CFC only requires Olympiad participants to sign contracts. An alternative to contracts for other events might be to add an arbitration clause into the bylaws governing them.

**Michael Barron:** The intent of this motion is - to initiate the process of recognition of chess as a sport in Canada and the CFC as a National Sport Organization. This process could take several years, but we need to start it as soon as possible.

Probably we need to create a special CFC Committee for preparation of the CFC application for Sport Funding and Accountability Framework (<http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/prog/cfrs->

[sfaf/criteriasfaf3\\_e.doc](#)) and all necessary changes in the CFC regulations intended to meet their eligibility criteria and recognize chess as a sport in Canada and the CFC as a National Sport Organization.

**Frank Dixon:** Although I greatly admire the proposal by Governor Denommee on Appeals, the complexity of this motion renders it problematic for proper debate in the Governors' Letter. The CFC definitely needs to embrace some of the principles discussed in this motion. I suggest that this topic be tackled by a dedicated committee, which would then report back at a later date, on suggestions for interweaving this motion's many ideas with what we already have. This committee should have plenty of time to tackle this, as it seems very challenging. I for one do not feel qualified to offer debate on this Appeals platform, since specialized knowledge is required to do so. Let us take the time and do it properly.

**Motion 2005-18:** Moved by Michael Barron, seconded by Michael Dougherty:

(Full text of the motion in Appendix 1)

**Michael Barron:** President Palsson insists that I have my facts wrong. Maybe I am wrong and he is right. But I provide real facts and refer to real documents, and he provides only his opinion. All my specific questions remain unanswered. I have to repeat my questions:  
Could you please publish in the GL a real FIDE bill?  
How much CFC paid to FIDE for Toronto Easter Open 2004?

President Palsson refers to Peter Stockhausen as the author of the last revision in the fees charged. Peter, could you please confirm this? I suppose that even a year ago the CFC regulation "790. FIDE-Rated Events" was NOT containing requirement of "additional a \$100 flat fee per tournament".

If the CFC has never had a tournament rated for free by FIDE, it's a CFC's fault. The FIDE Handbook contains such possibility, and other federations use it to reduce their expenses. Why not CFC?

**Halldor Palsson:** I do not have a lot to add to my previous answer. Attached is the FIDE bill for 2004. The tournament registrations of 2,220 CHF and 367.50 CHF are for ratings.

**Pierre Dénommée** There is a maximum rating fee charged by FIDE of 4 000 Swiss Francs per year. If we organise many tournaments, we will get some for free. Furthermore, if 75 % of the tournament reports are sent by format approved electronic data, the federation will have a 50% discount (FIDE Handbook A.03.B.8.1) . We should get the discount by sending data to FIDE in the required database format.

**Halldor Palsson:** The CFC is already submitting tournaments as electronic data in the required format. See our FIDE bill for details.

**Motion 2005-19:** Moved by Bruce Harper, Seconded Peter Stockhausen  
That rule 1014 be amended to read as follows:

1014. Organization:

Bids for the CYCC shall be submitted to the CFC in the same manner as bids for other national events.

(a) Bids to hold the CYCC shall be reviewed by the Junior Coordinator for conformity with the general CFC standard for bids and to ensure that the particular requirements of the CYCC are met. Bids that meet CFC standards shall be put before the Governors for selection of a winning bid for the year in question.

(b) All bids for the CYCC must set out the anticipated expenses related to the event, including site rental,

trophies and medals, prizes, publicity and advertising, tournament director and organizer fees, equipment costs and other expenses.

- (c) The entry fee to the CYCC shall be \$150 per player, paid directly to the CFC. For each entry fee:
  - (i) \$100 per player shall be retained by the CFC to cover the costs of trips to the WYCC for the year in question.
  - (ii) Up to \$50 per player shall be used to reimburse the organizers of the CYCC for expenses incurred in relation to the event.
  - (iii) Any surplus funds remaining after the expenses of the event are paid shall be used by the CFC for future Junior activities or transferred to the Junior (Kalev Pugi) Fund.
- (d) If circumstances, including the scheduling of the WYCC, permit, it is desirable that the CYCC be held shortly before, and at the same location as, the Canadian Open for that year.

**Michael Barron:** I support this motion.

**Peter Stockhausen:** I understand that some organizers, particularly the “for profit variety”, like to get their hands on the CYCC money. We should resist this. In 2006, for example the CYCC will pay \$2,000 rent for facilities for parents! To my mind, this is not a prudent way to spent scarce CYCC money.

**Motion 2005-20**, moved by Bruce Harper, seconded by Jason Feng:

That 1. Article 5 of the CFC Olympiad Regulations ("The Selection Committee") be amended by replacing

"To avoid any conflict of interest, neither member of this committee can become part of the Canadian National Team for the Olympiad in question"

with

"Neither member of the Selection Committee may play for the Canadian National Team in the Olympiad in question".

**Lyle Craver:** Historically if there's one matter guaranteed to get the blood boiling before every Olympiad it's surely this matter – and we seem to go through discussions on this all the time. This motion seems to be an attempt to regularize things and ending this circle well before the next Olympiad would be MOST welcome.

**Frank Dixon:** The Olympic issue is very important, but we have a lot of time to solve this particular problem for 2006. I am somewhat saddened to see the bitterness of the debate between President Palsson and Governor Harper, as presented in GL#4. Both people are stalwarts in the Canadian chess community, who have done much to develop it. I don't wish to take sides on this issue. The Olympic problem which occurred in 2004 was of an unforeseen nature; these things happen, despite everyone's best efforts. Remember especially that we are all volunteers. To get to the heart of the dispute between President Palsson and Governor Harper, again very important, which is being researched by Governor Bunning, who is a lawyer, I am wondering if there is a precedent on this point lying somewhere in Governors' Letters from past years. Perhaps one of our veteran Governors could help on this.

**Tony Ficzere:** Yes. Had this been in place, we would not have gone through all the acrimony regarding the appointment of the Captain. Why is it so hard to follow the rules anyway? The emergency situation was created by the President anyway. Had he done his job to begin with, we wouldn't be wasting time on

the issue.

## MOTIONS FOR SECOND DISCUSSION:

### **Motion 2005-23** (Moved and seconded by Patrick McDonald and Chris Mallon)

That the CFC Youth Coordinator be given the mandate by the Assembly of Governors to strike a committee to pursue an agreement with the Chess 'n Math Association that will see better and more cooperation between the two organizations (CFC and CMA) subject to the following guidelines.:

- a) CMA is responsible for junior chess in Canada under the umbrella of the CFC. The position of CFC Youth Coordinator continues to exist and is the link between the two organizations.
- b) CMA is responsible for book & equipment sales with an amount being turned over to the CFC every 3 months based on the net profits earned by the CFC in the last 3 years in this area. CFC would no longer operate a Book & Equipment business.
- c) The CFC is responsible for the rating of all players. CMA would no longer operate a separate rating system. All the CMA official events would be rated with the CFC.

*Michael Barron:* I support this motion.

*Hal Bond:* Contrary to President Palsson's opinion I believe this negotiation could be very productive. It is not solely up to CMA to submit a proposal for us to review. The basic idea in the motion is one I have favoured for several years. It is worth developing.

*David Cohen:* 2005-23 CFC/CMA

I would like to know how much of the Executive Director's TIME would be freed up, if we did not have a sales business to operate. I would also like to know how much SALARY (ED, non-sales staff) would the CFC have to cover, if we did not have a sales business to operate. In other words, if we take away the profits from the sales, as well as the expenses of staff hired just for sales, how would our financial picture change?

Once this is determined, we would know how much revenue we would need from CMA to maintain the current salary of the ED and the non-sales staff. I am hoping that obtaining such a revenue stream would leave us better off, since the ED would have TIME to pursue other methods of obtaining revenue, e.g., lobbying government, applying for foundation grants, searching for sponsorships.

If the Governors ultimately decide NOT to take this route, then we must recognize that our situation will not change, as the ED has no TIME for these alternative fundraising methods. We must then try other solutions, such as volunteering the time ourselves, e.g., forming a Committee on fundraising.

*Frank Dixon:* I support the integration of the rating systems between the CFC and CMA, and am willing to offer my professional mathematician's skills to the CFC and CMA, free of charge, to resolve this integration, should it ever come about. There are some complex technical issues here involving the merging of statistical distributions. Just briefly, the CMA system is somewhat flawed, due to no fault of Larry Bevand or anyone else. The flaws are inherent in the specialized population and lower experience levels of the CMA members; this does not correspond that well to the model developed by Professor Arpad Elo, who invented the rating systems used around the world today. I believe there is a significant deflation at the lower levels of the CMA system. Also, likely, the higher ratings the CMA has were not actually earned WITHIN its own system, but were pegged there based on the CFC ratings of Masters such as IM Stephen Glinert, for example. This complicates any calculation of a formula for correlation and correction between the two systems.

**Tony Ficzere:** In my opinion, the executive should pursue negotiations with CMA. The CFC has more to gain than to lose. Of course, the right deal would have to be struck, but in principal, working together is far better than working against each other. Seems to me the CFC does little for juniors in this country, so let someone who can service them properly take control. CMA has a proven track record here. I'm not sure what people are afraid of. I also believe now is the time for the CFC to get out of the books & equipment business. Sales will likely be in decline in the foreseeable future. If we don't get out soon (unless the trend reverses, but I doubt it will), we may have to bail out at even greater cost in the future.

**Bruce Harper:** I strongly endorse this initiative and look forward to Patrick's report. The CFC President is wrong in thinking this motion is "not needed", as the views of the CFC Governors on such policy questions are relevant.

## **MOTIONS FOR FIRST DISCUSSION:**

**Motion 2005-25:** Moved by Michael Barron/Kevin Pacey:

"Any chess club may retain 50% from the CFC portion (now it's \$18 for Adult, \$12 for Junior, \$6 for Junior Participating and \$9 for Family Membership) of any new CFC memberships (for persons who have not been CFC members for at least 5 years) that they sell to club members.

The CFC shall still pay provincial affiliates their full portion of the CFC membership fees that are received."

**Motion 2005-26:** Moved by Pierre Dénommée / Michael Barron:

That the CFC Handbook be amended to replace, on July 1st 2005, the actual Laws of Chess by the new Laws of Chess that have been adopted at the FIDE AGM and that will come in force on July 1st 2005.

**Motion 2005-27:** Moved by Pierre Dénommée / Michael Barron:

Long ago, in 1992, the FIDE AGM did approve the Swiss System Based on Rating (FIDE Handbook C.04.1) Furthermore, FIDE has also adopted the DUBOV Swiss Pairing System (FIDE Handbook C.04.3). We shall amend the CFC Handbook to include those two pairing systems.

**Motion 2005-28:** Director of Fundraising (Moved by Kevin Pacey, seconded by David Cohen)

At the 2005 annual meeting the Assembly shall appoint a general officer known as the Director of Fundraising, whose duty is to apply for government and foundation grants, and seek corporate sponsorship on behalf of the CFC.

**Motion 2005-29:** Director of Publicity (Moved by Kevin Pacey, seconded by David Cohen)

At the 2005 annual meeting the Assembly shall appoint a general officer known as the Director of Publicity, whose duty is to obtain publicity in the interest of the objectives of the CFC.

Motion 2005-30: Moved Hal Bond, seconded by Lyle Craver

That Handbook paragraph 7.14 c) (Rating Regulations) be modified by deleting the *peak rating* stipulation be removed from the calculation of bonus points.

Paragraph 7.14 c) would now read:

**714c)** Except for players with provisional ratings, bonus points are awarded in tournaments with 4 or more rounds actually played according to the following rules.

**Definitions:**

i) RI is 24 points for 4 rounds and 2 points higher for each additional round.

ii)  $R_t = (R_n - R_o) - RI$

iii) deleted.

iv) Rp is the performance rating determined by Equation 714a.

**The number of bonus points Rb is calculated as follows:**

i)  $R_b = 0$  if  $R_n$  is greater than or equal to 1999

ii)  $R_b = \text{the lesser of: } R_t, 1999 - R_n, Rp - R_n$ .

**Hal Bond:** Background: The demographics of CFC membership is changing as more youth players take up OTB chess. As a group, their initial rating tends to quite low and they improve quickly. The ratings of our adult class players have suffered as a result. I believe this ratings decline has demoralized a portion of our once stable clientele, and has contributed to their departure.

Removing the peak rating stipulation will enable players to recover lost points more easily, and mitigate the problem of declining membership. Dozens of players have mentioned this concern to me, and I believe this motion can help.

**Lyle Craver:** Besides the points raised by Hal I would like to point out that the changes adopted were expected to produce a rating deflation that were expected to bring CFC ratings more closely into alignment with FIDE ratings. Then president Francisco Cabanas told me at the time he expected this process to take three to five years which has now gone by.

According to <http://www.chess.ca/CFCvsFIDE.htm> (which I have independently verified by loading the last TD list into an Excel spreadsheet) based on the Rating list of April 21st, 2004; For Players CFC 2200+:  $FIDE = CFC - 53.3$  // For Players CFC U2200:  $FIDE = CFC + 34.9$ . It seems reasonable to break these two groups out separately since the masters can reasonably be expected to play more FIDE-rated games than non-masters and it does suggest that non-masters are deflated compared to FIDE.

I am not in the habit of discussing my academic credentials but should point out that my undergraduate degree is in applied mathematics and I was a graduate teaching assistant in statistics courses. I have also corresponded with Dr. Ken Sloan former chair of the USCF Ratings Committee. I do not say this to boast but rather to suggest I have had more than the usual interest in ratings matters.

### **General comments from Governors:**

**Michael Barron:** Concerning the President's message, I would like to see a clarification regarding to the significant expenses for the WYCC and other international programs in 2004.

What does it mean "other international programs"?

According to the President, the CFC spent in 2004 about \$24,000 for the Olympiad and about \$81,100 for the WYCC. Is it correct?

If it's really so, we need to congratulate our successful Youth Coordinator! But we need to think about proper proportion between junior and adult chess. Maybe we need Adult Coordinator as well?

Thanks to the Treasurer for Interim Financial Report! But to understand what is going on, we need much more details, especially regarding the most expensive category – "International Programs".

Thanks to the Secretary for well done Governors' Letter! I like the idea of the Appendix usage for long motions.

Thanks to the President for sending us “PRIMER FOR DIRECTORS OF NOT-FOR-PROFIT CORPORATIONS” recently! It’s really an interesting document, and I hope we will use it in our work for the CFC benefit. I would like to mention 2 excerpts from this document describing good corporate practice:

“A recent report of the Institute on Governance suggests good governance is about achieving desired results in a way consistent with democratic values and social justice. It identifies the elements of good governance as:

...*Vision* (envisioning the future), *Direction* (setting goals and providing a general ‘road map’), *Resources* (securing resources necessary to achieve the goals or reach the direction), *Monitoring* (periodically ensuring that the organizational vehicle is well-maintained and progressing, within legal limits, toward its destination), and *Accountability* (ensuring efficient use of resources; reporting progress and detours to stakeholders).”

“...not-for-profit directors should always try to be closely attuned to the views and interests of the members of their corporation and other stakeholders.

Failure to do so is apt to result in one or both of two outcomes: either the members of the corporation will lose their commitment to the corporation and/or different factions promoting their own agendas will develop within the corporation. When this happens, the smooth operation of the organization is hampered, or in extreme circumstances, the existence of the corporation is at risk.”

Let’s be closely attuned to the views and interests of the CFC members and avoid the risk for the CFC! I believe that Motion 2005-18 is an example of such views and interests of the CFC members.

***David Cohen:*** RE: Nominations for Governors 2005-6

I received a package from the Canadian Olympic Committee which describes their procedure for nominating their next Board. Among their requirements (Appendix 7, page 1) which I think we should adopt for the CFC Board of Governors:

Letter from the nominee indicating willingness to accept;

Black and white photograph;

Brief (max. 2 pages) biographical sketch.

***Pierre Dénommée*** (in response to David Cohen: on FUTURE DIRECTION FOR THE CFC BOARD OF GOVERNORS ) You can count me in for handbook revisions committee and TDOCP. We still need a constitutional amendment to create all the required committees.

***Frank Dixon:*** Governor Cohen's points: Outstanding!! Let us all strive to work together much better than we are doing. Specialized areas of need and study must be recognized and set up in committee format, then tackled by smaller groups of Governors and others who have specialized knowledge and interests. I will help however I can.

Responding to Governor Smith: I thank Governor Smith for his responses. I am glad that this idea of elimination of Governors is being dropped. Governor Cohen is much more on the right track, when he writes of utilizing the many talents that we already have, in more effective ways. I raised the issue of the 2006 Canadian Open bid by Toronto (which then didn't happen) because I had written in the October 2004 issue of CCE, in my report on the 2004 Canadian Open and CFC Meetings, that Toronto would bid for 2006, so wished to clarify the details for the record.

I want to thank Governor Van Dusen for his financial report. I would like to see a more detailed breakdown of the expenses in our International programs, since this is our biggest single line item, and scrutiny and discussion could potentially lead to improvements there, which are much needed, given our financial outlook.

***Nathan Divinsky: RE BRIAN HARTMAN as TEAM CAPTAIN:***

I am sorry to read about the controversy over Hartman's Captaincy. I was in Majorca for the full Olympiad (as women's team captain) and in my judgement he was the best, most sympathetic and understanding, knowledgeable and successful team captain that Canada has ever had (from our very first Olympiad in 1939, to the recent one in 2004). I can even give you proof positive -- he was much better than I ever was!

I would like to see all this controversy disappear because I would like to move that

Brian Hartman be appointed Canada's  
National Team Captain for the next 8 years.

Will someone please second this motion!

Sincerely,

Nathan Divinsky

***Bruce Harper:*** President's message: I did not find anything in the President's message worthy of comment. His intolerance of dissent, his demands for "loyalty" and his accusations of "bad faith" against anyone who disagrees with him and his view of how he should run the CFC are sad.

Treasurer's message: I share the concerns of many other Governors that the CFC is in financial trouble and that the situation is getting worse. I too would like to know the full CFC financial picture following the low turnout at the 2004 CYCC and the Olympiad expenditures (which have not been fully covered by donations).

I did not find the early deadline for comments (a result of the delay in issuing GL4, through no fault of the CFC Secretary) allowed me time for additional comment.

***Peter Stockhausen: Re President's Message***

- Contrary to the President's assertion, I can think of a few "reasonable opinions" we could have on 2005-22 and the subsequent ruling. Fascinating to think that people who might think differently from the President, simply hold "unreasonable opinions." The whole situation was created because the President did not act in a timely fashion to move the "Olympic file" along, despite being reminded by a very detailed memo on May 6<sup>th</sup>!
- I cannot recall being "peppered with incomplete or misleading representation".
- Could we make an effort and at least spell the name of our main sponsor, Belzberg, properly?
- Regarding our financial results for the first eight months, instead of rambling prose, with some random numbers thrown in, could we have the questions answered that I posed to the Treasurer in my e-mail of January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2005. How long can this possibly take?

(Response to Bruce Harper's Comments)

Bruce makes many sensible observations. The CFC and its predecessor have been around for some 130

years or so. A couple of times, the organization undertook major changes, adapting to changes in our environment. We are conceivably at another such junction.

We now have a secure forum on our web site (THANK YOU, Mr. Mallon!). Can we put up some secure polls, questioning our members on some of the more far reaching changes?

In the mean time, we could strike a committee of three to five people, who could focus on the viability, financially and otherwise, of these changes:

- 1, Convert the printed magazine to an electronic magazine.
- 2, Reduce adult and junior membership fees.
- 3, Sell our book and equipment business to the CMA.
- 4, Sell our business condominium and transfer the funds to the Chess Foundation of Canada.

**Deadline for Submissions to GL #6: 19 March 2005**

## **Appendix 1 Motions for Discussion**

**Motion 2005-17:** Moved by Pierre Denommee and seconded by Michael Barron:

**Motion:** That the CFC initiates the process of becoming compliant to all Sports Canada Eligibility criteria, except criteria A1 which is the only one that we cannot currently meet. We should also lobby for the modification of the definition of sport in Canada.

That we immediately add the following to the CFC Handbook:

"Chess Federation of Canada Appeals Policy

### **SCOPE OF APPEAL**

1. Any member of the Chess Federation of Canada who is affected by a decision of the Board of Directors, of any Committee of the Board of Directors, or of any body or individual who has been delegated authority to make decisions on behalf of the Board of Director, shall have the right to appeal that decision, provided there are sufficient grounds for the appeal as set out in Paragraph 5 of this Policy. Such decisions may include, but are not limited to, employment, contract matters, harassment, selection and discipline.

2. This policy shall not apply to matters relating to the rules of Chess, which may not be appealed under this policy.

### **TIMING OF APPEAL**

3. Members who wish to appeal a decision shall have 21 days from the date on which they received notice of the decision, to submit written notice of their intention to appeal, along with detailed reasons for the appeal, to the Chairperson of Appeal Panel.

4. Any party wishing to initiate an appeal beyond the 21 days period must provide a written request stating reasons for an exemption to this requirement. The decision to allow or not allow an appeal outside of the 21-day period shall be at the sole discretion of the Executive Director.

### **GROUNDS FOR APPEAL**

5. A decision cannot be appealed on its merits alone. An appeal may be heard only if there are sufficient grounds for the appeal. To have sufficient grounds, the appeal must be based on one or more of the followings potential errors having been made by the respondent:

- a) making a decision for which it did not have authority or jurisdiction as set out in governing documents;
- b) failing to follow procedures as laid out in the By-Laws or approved policies of the CFC;
- c) making a decision which was influenced by bias, where bias is defined as a lack of neutrality to such an extent that the decision maker is unable to consider other views;
- d) exercising its discretion for an improper purpose;
- e) making a decision which was grossly unreasonable.

### **SCREENING OF APPEAL**

6. Within 3 days of receiving notice of appeal the chairperson shall decide whether or not the appeal is based on one or more of the categories of possible error by the respondent as set out in Section 5. The

chairperson shall not determine if an error has been made, only if the appeal is based on such an allegation of error by the respondent. In the absence of the chairperson, a member of the Executive shall perform this function.

7. If the appeal is denied on the basis of insufficient grounds, the appellant shall be notified of this decision in writing, stating reasons. This decision is at the sole discretion of the chairperson and may not be appealed.

#### APPEALS PANEL

8. If the chairperson is satisfied that there are sufficient grounds for an appeal, within 10 days of having received the original notice of appeal, he or she shall establish an Appeal Panel, with the "Panel" as follows:

- a) The Panel shall be comprised of three individuals who shall have no significant relationship with the affected parties, shall have had no involvement with the decision being appealed, and shall be free from any other actual or perceived bias or conflict.
- b) At least one of the Panel's members shall be from among the appellant's peers.
- c) The appellant shall be given the opportunity to recommend the peer member on the Panel, provided that member satisfies criteria (a), above.
- d) Should the appellant not recommend the Panel member as set out in c), above, within 5 days, the President shall appoint the peer member of the Panel.

#### PRELIMINARY CONFERENCE

9. The Panel may determine that the circumstances of the dispute warrant a preliminary conference:

- a) The matters which may be considered at a preliminary conference include the date and location of hearing, timelines for exchange of documents, format for the appeal, clarification of issues in dispute, any procedural matter, order and procedure of hearing, remedies being sought, identification of witnesses, and any other matter which may assist in expediting the appeal proceedings.
- b) The Panel may delegate to its Chairperson the authority to deal with these preliminary matters.

#### PROCEDURE FOR THE APPEAL

10. The Panel shall govern the appeal by such procedures as it deems appropriate, provided that:

- a) The appeal hearing shall be held within 21 days of the Panel's appointment;
- b) The appellant, respondent and affected parties shall be given 14 days written notice of the date, time and place of the appeal hearing;
- c) The Panel's members shall select from themselves a Chairperson;
- d) A quorum shall be all three Panel members;
- e) Decisions shall be by majority vote, where the Chairperson carries a vote.;
- f) Copies of any written documents which any of the parties would like the Panel to consider shall be provided to the Panel and to all other parties, at least 5 days in advance of the hearing;
- g) Any of the parties may be accompanied by a representative or advisor, including legal counsel.
- h) If the matter under appeal relates to team selection, any person potentially affected by the decision of the Panel shall become a party to the appeal;
- i) The Panel may direct that any other individual participate in the appeal;
- j) In the event that one of the Panel's members is unable or unwilling to continue with the appeal the matter will be concluded by the remaining two panel members;
- k) Unless otherwise agreed to by the parties, there shall be no communication between Panel members and the parties except in the presence of, or by copy to, the other parties.

11. In order to keep costs to a reasonable level, the Panel may conduct the appeal by means of a conference call or video conference.

#### APPEAL DECISION

12. Within 7 days of concluding the appeal, the Panel shall issue its written decision, with reasons. In making its decision, the Panel shall have no greater authority than that of the original decision maker. The Panel may decide:

- a) To void or confirm the decision being appealed;
- b) To refer the matter back to the initial decision-maker for a new decision; and
- c) To vary the decision where it is found that an error occurred and such an error cannot be corrected by the original decision-maker for reasons which included, but are not limited to, lack of clear procedure, lack of time, or lack of neutrality;
- d) To determine how costs of the appeal shall be allocated, if at all.

13. A copy of this decision shall be provided to each of the parties and to the President.

#### TIMELINES

14. If the circumstances of the dispute are such that this policy will not allow a timely appeal the Panel may direct that these timelines be abridged. If the circumstances of the disputes are such the appeal cannot be concluded within the timelines dictated in this Policy, the Panel may direct that these timelines be extended.

#### DOCUMENTARY APPEAL

15. Any party to the appeal may request that the Panel conduct the appeal by way of documentary evidence. The Panel may seek agreement from the other parties to proceed in this fashion. If agreement is not forthcoming, the Panel shall decide whether the appeal shall proceed by way of documentary evidence, or in-person hearing.

#### ARBITRATION

16. All differences or disputes shall first be submitted to appeal pursuant to the appeal process set out in this Policy. If any party believes the Appeal Panel has made an error such as those described in Paragraph 5 of this Policy, the matter shall be referred to arbitration, such arbitration to be administered under the Alternate Dispute (ADR) Program for Amateur Sport and its Rules of Arbitration, as amended from time to time.

17. Should a matter be referred to arbitration, all parties to the original appeal shall be parties to the arbitration.

18. The parties to an arbitration shall enter into a formal Arbitration Agreement and the decision of any arbitration shall be final and binding and not subject to any further review by any court of competent jurisdiction or any other body.

#### LOCATION AND JURISDICTION

19. Any appeal shall take place in the National Capital Region, unless held by way of telephone conference call or held elsewhere as may be decided by the Panel as a preliminary matter.

20. This policy shall be governed and construed in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario.

21. No action or legal proceeding shall be commenced against the Chess Federation of Canada in respect of a dispute, unless Chess Federation of Canada has refused or failed to abide by the provisions for appeal and/or arbitration of the dispute, as set out in this policy."

**Motion 2005-18:** Moved by Michael Barron, seconded by Michael Dougherty:

To encourage chess organizers in Canada to hold FIDE-Rated events and to resolve discrepancy between the current FIDE regulations (<http://www.fide.com/official/handbook.asp?level=b03>):

"03. FIDE Registration of International Competitions

Approved by the 1980 General Assembly.

Amended by the 1984, 1995 and 1996 General Assemblies and 1999 Executive Board.

FIDE provides an umbrella for vital services such as categorisation of tournaments and title norms. For these services FIDE should be properly funded. On registration FIDE shall supervise the proper scheduling of important events to avoid conflicts in the chess calendar. Registration shall consist of:

a. Certification by the national federation that it approves the event.

b. Arbitrator's report submitted not later than two weeks after conclusion of the event, including details of results, tournament category, norms, ratings of players, protests and other significant incidents.

c. The national federations in whose territories international chess competitions are held, are to register these tournaments at the FIDE Secretariat; a list of the registered tournaments will be published regularly; the federations will be invoiced once a year, effective with events beginning on or after January 1st, 1981, on the basis of the following division:

d. The registration fee is calculated on the basis of the following division: (GA '95)

Tournaments of categories 0 to 3 - 50 Swiss Francs (EB '99)

Tournaments of categories 4 and 5 - 100 Swiss Francs

Tournaments of categories 6 and 7 - 150 Swiss Francs

Tournaments of categories 8 to 10 - 200 Swiss Francs

Other categories multiply 40 Swiss Francs by the category.

Swiss Tournaments (Number of players multiplied by SFr.2 for up to 300 players and then multiply by SFr.1)

Team Tournaments (SFr.30 per team, except for national championship which will pay a maximum of SFr.200)

Matches, according to category above

e. (GA '95) However, in no case shall a federation be charged more than SFr.4,000. per year.

f. For the time being no registration fees will be required for ladies' tournaments although these tournaments as a matter of course should be registered.

g. Small tournaments such as local Swiss tournaments shall be exempt from registration fees. (GA '80)

h. Secretariat will exempt from registration fee an event in which less than five rateable results have been

reported. (GA '80)

i. (GA '96) Announcements of open tournaments should also be sent by email in ASCII text to FIDE for publication on the FIDE Web site."

and the current CFC regulations ([http://chess.ca/section\\_7.htm](http://chess.ca/section_7.htm)):

"790. FIDE-Rated Events

Events may be rated by FIDE if they meet the following requirements:

- a) In a Round-Robin, at least 3 of the players must be rated.
- b) In a Swiss or Team event, only games against rated players are counted. If a player meets less than 3 rated opponents in an event, that event will not count towards his rating.
- c) Each player must have a minimum of 120 minutes. No more than two rounds per day are allowed.
- d) The event must be pre-registered with the CFC office at least four months before the start of the event. The FIDE Events pre-registration form to be sent to the CFC office is here. The crosstable must be sent to the CFC within one week of the completion of the event along with an updated event registration form, and the FIDE rating fee payment.
- e) The following scheduled FIDE rating fee structure is payable to the CFC provided the event is submitted within 1 week to the CFC office. If the event is submitted to the CFC office after 1 week, then there is a \$110 late fee due to the policies of FIDE. [see Motion 2003-05; 02-03GL4, January 2003]

Round Robin & Matches: Category 0 - 3 \$55, Category 4 & 5 \$110, Category 6 & 7 \$165, Category 8 to 10 \$220. For higher categories, multiply category by \$44.

Swiss Tournaments: Players 1 to 300 = \$2.20 per player; Players 301 & up = \$1.10 per player. In addition, there is a \$100 flat fee per tournament. So, if there are several FIDE rated sections in one tournament, you would still pay \$100.

Team Tournaments: Per Team = \$33.

FIDE Regulation B.01/8.11 states that "Games played against opponents who do not belong to FIDE-Federations or who belong to Federations which have been temporarily excluded are not included" in the composition of a Title Tournament. Accordingly, the CFC requires that all Canadian players who compete in a FIDE registered event be members in good standing of the CFC.

Upon completion of a FIDE-registered event, the CFC will put the crosstable in the required form and send it along to FIDE. Note that rated in a) and b) means FIDE-rated. Lists of Canadian FIDE-rated players are regularly published in our En Passant magazine, and available from the ratings page on our website. (FIDE congress 1982)",

the regulation 790 of the CFC Handbook should be repealed and replaced by the following:

"790. FIDE-Rated Events

Events may be rated by FIDE if they meet the following requirements:

- a) In a Round-Robin, at least 4 of the players must be rated.
- b) In a Swiss or Team event, only games against rated players are counted. If a player meets less than 3 rated opponents in an event, that event will not count towards his rating.
- c) Each player must have a minimum of 120 minutes for a game, assuming the game lasts 60 moves. No more than three rounds per day and a total playing time of no more than 12 hours per day are allowed.
- d) The event must be pre-registered with the CFC office. The FIDE Events pre-registration form to be sent to the CFC office is here (<http://www.chess.ca/pdf/FideEventReg.pdf>). The crosstable must be sent to the CFC within one week of the completion of the event along with an updated event registration form, and the FIDE rating fee payment.
- e) The following scheduled FIDE rating fee structure is payable to the CFC provided the event is submitted within 1 week to the CFC office. If the event is submitted to the CFC office after 1 week, then there is a \$110 late fee due to the policies of FIDE. [see Motion 2003-05; 02-03GL4, January 2003]

Round Robin & Matches: Category 0 to 3 - \$55, Category 4 & 5 - \$110, Category 6 & 7 - \$165, Category 8 to 10 - \$220. For higher categories, multiply category by \$44.

Swiss Tournaments: Number of players multiplied by \$2.20 for up to 300 players and then multiply by \$1.10.

Team Tournaments: \$33 Per Team.

- f) For the time being no FIDE rating fees will be required for ladies' tournaments although these tournaments as a matter of course should be registered.
- g) Small tournaments such as local Swiss tournaments shall be exempt from FIDE rating fees.
- h) All Canadian players who compete in a FIDE registered event should be members in good standing of the CFC.

Upon completion of a FIDE-registered event, the CFC will put the crosstable in the required form and send it along to FIDE. Note that rated in a) and b) means FIDE-rated. Lists of Canadian FIDE-rated players are available from the ratings page on our website."

## Appendix 2:

### Olympic Report from Nava Starr

#### 36th Chess Olympiad in Majorca, Spain

I started on my Olympic Report shortly after I came back from Majorca, but unfortunately for personal reasons (my mother passed away) could not complete it. But a promise is a promise, and I am back to it now.

As you know this was my 11th Olympiad representing Canada. The 1st one I participated in was held in Israel in 1976. At that time I won the GOLD MEDAL on the 2nd board, and I was one of the YOUNGEST players. Then in 1978 I played in Buenos-Aires, Malta in 1980, Switzerland in 1982 (Bronze Medal on the 1st board), Greece in 1984 and again in 1988, Manila in 1992, Moscow in 1994, Yerevan in 1996 and Bled in 2002. All of these Olympiads I remember very well. Some of them were organized better than others, but, nevertheless, each one of them had the CHESS SPIRIT that ONLY the Olympiads can have.

This year, the 36th Chess Olympiad in Majorca, was ONE of the few VERY BEST where I participated, although this time I was one of the OLDEST players! I am very happy that I went. What a pleasure it was to play with all those youngsters on the team! They called me our "Olympian Mama"! This Olympiad was also a different one from all previous for Canadian teams that a real CAPTAIN – IM Brian Hartman made his "mark" – it is a classy act, very hard to follow!

I believe that our National Women's Team did not include the best possible players due to the lack of advanced planning process. However the four of us, Dinara, Diane, Valentina and I fought hard. Unfortunately Diane and Valentina's results were below expectations and only thanks to Dinara's +5 on the second board and my result of +5 on board 1 allowed the Team to show one of the best finishes ever. After losing my first two games due to the long travel plus time difference I had a free day and after that scored 8,5 out of 10 – a half point short of the individual board medal. This is a lesson for the next Olympiad! Now I would like to show some of my best games. Interestingly enough, these are three games from the last three rounds, which are always the most important ones.

Round 12. Connelly (Ireland) – Starr (Canada)

1.e4 g6 2.d4 Bg7 Lately I started to play this opening on 1.e4 more and more frequently. There is practically no theory to learn!  
3.Nc3 c6 4.Nf3 d5 5.h3. The most common move here. White do not give Black the opportunity to play Bg4 to exchange it for the knight on f3.  
5...de4 6.Ne4 Nbd7 7.Bc4 Ngf6 8.Nf6 Nf6 9.0-0 0-0 10.Bf4 Qb6 White is probably better here due to the fact that they have more space.  
11.Bb3 What Black must do now is to develop the c8 bishop; so my next move is obviously Bf5.  
12.Qe2 Rfe8 13.c3 Rad8 14.Ne5 Nd5 15.Bg3 e6. This move is possible because there is no immediate threat of g4. And what I would like to do now is to exchange a few pawns and pieces on the board and open the d-file.  
16.Rfe1 c5 17.dc5 Qc5 18.Rad1 b5. Looks like a logical move in this position with a5 and a4 to follow. My goal is still to exchange my white bishop for a knight or a bishop...  
19.Nd3 Bd3 Finally!! I made this move not even thinking twice!  
20.Rd3 Nb6 With a5-a4 and Nc4 to follow now...

21.Rd1 Rd3 22.Qd3 Bf6 23.Qd6 Qd6 24.Rd6 Rc8 I had a feeling that this position is equal. Maybe if she would offer a draw I would consider to agree. But the game continued...

25.Bf4 Kf8 Now my strategy is to bring the king to the center as soon as possible. White has the advantage of two bishops but both of them are not working.

26.Be3 Ke7 27.Rd2 Rc6 28.Bb6 I was surprised by this exchange. Rb6 29.Kf1 b4 30.c4 I am not sure about this move... 30...Rd6 31.Rd6 Kd6

By exchanging the rooks now Suzanne overlooked that she is loosing the b2 pawn.

Still with the opposite color bishops draw looks like a logical final result. At this point I am already playing for a win. 32. Ke2 Bb2

My plan is to go to the a2 pawn and push a5-a4, which would give me the opportunity to play b3-b2-b1...

33.Kd3 Kc5 From this move on everything seemed very easy...

34. f3 f5

35.g4 Bc1 36.Ba4 Kd6 37.Kd4 Bb2 38.Ke3 g5 39.gf5 ef5 40.Bc2 Ke5 Black dominate now by controlling all the central squares. White's bishop doesn't have good moves at all.

41.Kf2 Bd4 42.Kg2 h5 43.Ba4 h4 Very important to block King's side first and then start action on the Queen's side.

44. Bc6 a5 45. Bd7 Bc5 White is almost in a position of zugzwang.

46. Kf1 Kd4 And now my King starts his winning walk of fame to the a2 pawn, which I was aiming for since move 32...

47. Bf5 Kc3!!!! For sure not King takes on c4. Who cares about this pawn; it's blocked by my bishop anyways.

48. Ke2 Kb2

White resigned

Round 13. Starr (Canada) – Cima (Albania)

1.e4 e5 2.Nf3 Nf6 3.Bc4 Be7 Hungarian Defense, probably a little too passive.

4.d4 ed4 5.Nd4 Ne5? Rather an unusual move. One of the first things I've learned in chess is not to move twice with the same piece in the opening!

6. Bb3 Nf6 Now the knight on e5 is very vulnerable, so my next move is 7.f4 right away. 7...Ng6. And now 8.e5 right away... 8... Ne4 Seems like the only move. 9.0-0 I was thinking about Qd3 instead of 0-0 but decided to castle first.

d5 10.ed6 Nd6 11.Nc3 0-0 12.f5 Continuing my attack. 12...Ne5

13.Qe2 I spent 32 minutes calculating the variation, which she went along with. 13. Bf6 What else? Ne5 to d7 doesn't look natural.

The rest of the moves I made in 2 minutes.

14.Bf4 Re8 15.Ne6! THE WINNING MOVE!!!

15...fe6 The only move. And the rest of the moves were made by force.

16.Be5 Be5 17.Qe5 Nf7 18.fe6 Ne5 19.e7 Kh8 20.ed8Q Rd8 21.Rae1 Ng6 22.Nb5 c6 23.Nd6 Black resigned. They are losing at least a piece in a lost position...

Before going to play the last round I told Dinara and Valentina that to win big would mean 10 to 15 places higher at the end.

We were all in a good mood and ready to fight.

And by winning 3:0 against Luxembourg we finished with a +2 result overall, which was better than in many previous Olympiads.

Here is my game from the last round.

Round 14. Bakalarz (Luxembourg) – Starr (Canada)

1.d4 Nf6 2.Nf3 g6 I guess when you are not sure what to play Nf6 and g6 are safe moves to begin with.  
3.Bg5 Bg7 4.Nbd2 White started passive, probably ready for a quick draw. 4...c5 5.c3 cd4 6.cd4 Nc6 7.e3 Another passive move. I think d5 was better. 7...d6 8.Bc4 0-0 9.0-0 b6 Here I had to figure out my future plan and I have decided to go with b6,Bb7, Rc8 and so on...  
10.Rc1 Bb7 11.Qe2 Rc8 12.Ba6 Ba6 13.Qa6 Qd7 I am not sure that the bishop' exchange was a good idea for white.  
14.a3 Rc7 15.Qd3 Rfc8 Now I have a threat Nxd4, which wins a pawn. So 16. Qb1 seems like the logical move.  
16....Na5 Now I would like to exchange at least one pair of rooks to gain complete control of the c-file.  
17.b4 Nc4 18.Nc4 Rc4 19.Rc4 Rc4 20.Rc1 Qc7 21.Rc4 Qc4 The moment I achieved this position I was sure that I will win. My position is already better.  
22.Bf6 What else to do? 22...Bf6  
23.Nd2 Qc3 I played this ending very well  
24.Nb3 e5 25.de5 Be5 26.g3 a5 27.ba5 ba5 Now I am after the a3 pawn, which will eventually fall...  
28.Qd1 a4 29.Nd2 Qa3 30.Nc4 Qb3 31.Qd5 Kg7  
32.f4 a3 Now my a-pawn is unstoppable...  
33.Qa5 a2 White resigned.

In the end I would like to make some acknowledgements.

First of all, I would like to thank all of our sponsors. At the same time I regret that Belzberg Technologies and Alicia and Sid Belzberg, who showed great generosity and support in Bled, 2002, were unwilling/unable to do the same for this Olympiad.

Secondly, many thanks go out to our captain IM Brian Hartman, who did an outstanding job! I would recommend Brian as captain of the team any time. Also thanks go out to Mr. Nathan Divinsky, who was the Canadian FIDE representative and the captain of our women's team for keeping us in a good mood and making us all laugh during the two weeks in Majorca.

Also, I would like to congratulate our Men's Team on a great performance! With only 5 players they were among the leaders for almost the whole tournament!

Many thanks to the entire Canadian team. I had a wonderful time and now I am looking forward to the next Olympiad in Italy.

Best wishes to all.

Nava Starr

**Motions For Vote:****2005-14: Membership requirements for national events****2005-15: Motions by Governors****2005-16: Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association****2005-17: Appeals****2005-18: Registration of FIDE rated Events****2005-19: CYCC Bid Procedures****2005-20: Olympic Team captain resolution****Motion 2005-14:** Moved by David Cohen, Seconded Kevin Pacey

That CFC Handbook 375 Tournament Playing Fee be amended by adding the sentence: "At any national Championship, this fee is not permitted as a substitute for CFC membership."

**Vote YES NO ABSTAIN****Motion 2005-15:** Moved by Michael Barron, Seconded by Frank Dixon/Bela Kosoian that the CFC

Handbook should include the following regulation:

"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 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."

**Vote YES NO ABSTAIN****Motion 2005-16:** Moved by Frank Dixon, and seconded by Patrick McDonald:

Pending the approval of the new organization by CFC Governors, to be voted upon this time, the Coordinator of the Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association (currently myself) will report to the CFC Youth Coordinator.

**Vote YES NO ABSTAIN****Motion 2005-17:** Moved by Pierre Denommee and seconded by Michael Barron:

(Full text of motion in Appendix 1)

**Vote YES NO ABSTAIN****Motion 2005-18:** Moved by Michael Barron, seconded by Michael Dougherty:

(Full text of the motion in Appendix 1)

**Vote YES NO ABSTAIN****Motion 2005-19:** Moved by Bruce Harper, Seconded Peter Stockhausen

That rule 1014 be amended to read as follows:

1014. Organization:

Bids for the CYCC shall be submitted to the CFC in the same manner as bids for other national events.

- (a) Bids to hold the CYCC shall be reviewed by the Junior Coordinator for conformity with the general CFC standard for bids and to ensure that the particular requirements of the CYCC are met. Bids that meet CFC standards shall be put before the Governors for selection of a winning bid for the year in question.
- (b) All bids for the CYCC must set out the anticipated expenses related to the event, including site rental, trophies and medals, prizes, publicity and advertising, tournament director and organizer fees, equipment costs and other expenses.
- (c) The entry fee to the CYCC shall be \$150 per player, paid directly to the CFC. For each entry fee:
  - (i) \$100 per player shall be retained by the CFC to cover the costs of trips to the WYCC for the year in question.
  - (ii) Up to \$50 per player shall be used to reimburse the organizers of the CYCC for expenses incurred in relation to the event.
  - (iii) Any surplus funds remaining after the expenses of the event are paid shall be used by the CFC for future Junior activities or transferred to the Junior (Kalev Pugi) Fund.
- (d) If circumstances, including the scheduling of the WYCC, permit, it is desirable that the CYCC be held shortly before, and at the same location as, the Canadian Open for that year.

**Vote YES NO ABSTAIN**

**Motion 2005-20**, moved by Bruce Harper, seconded by Jason Feng:

That 1. Article 5 of the CFC Olympiad Regulations ("The Selection Committee") be amended by replacing

"To avoid any conflict of interest, neither member of this committee can become part of the Canadian National Team for the Olympiad in question"

with

"Neither member of the Selection Committee may play for the Canadian National Team in the Olympiad in question".

**Vote YES NO ABSTAIN**

**Motion for Second Discussion:**

**2005-23: Discussions with AEM / CMA?**

**Motions for First Discussion:**

**2005-25: Membership rebates**

**2005-26: CFC / FIDE Handbook reconciliation**

**2005-27: CFC / FIDE Handbook reconciliation (Swiss pairings)**

**2005-28: Director of Fundraising**

**2005-29: Director of Publicity**

**2005-30: Removal of Peak Rating from Bonus Point rating calculation**

**Deadline for Submissions to GL #6: 19 March, 2005**

**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](mailto:info@chess.ca)**