

# **CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA**

## **GOVERNORS' LETTER SEVEN**

### **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 #8: Thursday June 30th, 2005**

## **KEEPING GOVERNORS INFORMED**

### **From the President**

I am running for re-election as the President of the Chess Federation of Canada at the AGM in Edmonton. I am running on my record as your President over the past two years.

The last three years have been a period of re-building for the CFC. When I first elected in 2003 I took over from Peter Stockhausen who started the re-building process from a deficit of over \$33,000 left by his predecessor. The number one focus of the CFC Executive in the last two years has been to stabilize the financial situation of the federation while offering a full program. This was primarily done by cutting expenses and increasing membership dues and rating fees.

In the last 2-year cycle the CFC was fortunate to find excellent organizers for all the Canadian championships. These tournaments were well organized and generally well received by the players. The CFC managed to send a full complement to the Chess Olympiad in 2004 despite significant fundraising difficulties.

I would like to see the CFC make a significant contribution to the Chess Foundation of Canada at the AGM to better fund Life Memberships and our growing number of Honorary Memberships. This is essential to the long term stability of the CFC.

I am hopeful that the CYCC/WYCC can start contributing to the Pugi Fund to better fund our junior program.

I would like to thank Hans Jung for all his work as the editor of Chess Canada Echecs. The CFC advertised for a new editor and received five proposals. I am very pleased to announce that the new editor of Chess Canada Echecs is Robert Hamilton. I would like to ask all Governors to join me in welcoming Robert Hamilton to his new responsibilities for the CFC.

### **From the Secretary:**

In the last GL I erred in how I recorded Mr. Tony Ficzere's votes – He actually abstained on 2005-19 and voted yes on 2005-20 thus making the votes (yes/no/abstain) 24-3-2 and 27-2-2 respectively. This does not of course change the outcome of either vote.

This is my third draft of GL#7 as the first was lost in a hardware failure while the second was either a hardware or software glitch. Fortunately I had a mid-point backup to restore from.

GL#8 will be the last of 2004-05 and will contain the Annual General Meeting proxies.

### **From the FIDE Representative:**

Dear Governors:

Mr. Frank Dixon is perfectly correct in wanting a full FIDE report about the meeting in Calvio in October 2004 – a report like the ones produced by Smith, Haley, Divinsky and Prentice, in the past.

At Calvio there was much talk but few decisions. Therefore I held back giving a short and perhaps boring report. However, here it is:

FIDE Report

Calvio

October 2004

The important items for Canada were the two titles awarded – the GM title to Mark Bluvshtein and the International Arbiter title to Patrick McDonald.

There are of course a great many applications for a variety of titles. These are all carefully examined by committees and many hours are spent on them. There is a feeling of being overwhelmed by the volume of the work and the examiners become extremely strict. The slightest question or doubt often leads to rejection. It is therefore important for us to have a representative at these meetings to make sure that doubts are immediately answered. I was fortunate to be able to save one of our titles when doubts were raised.

The big debate concerned a major fee restructuring plan submitted by FIDE treasurer David Barrett of England.

At present, there is a minim annual fee of 600 Swiss Francs for federations with less than 3000 members. The maximum fee is 4500 S.F. Canada pays 1360 S.F. Nearly 75% of the federations pay the minimum fee.

The new proposal was to raise the minimum to 1000 S.F., to raise the maximum to 5500 S.F. and to have a new evaluation system which would drop the number of federations on the minimum, to 60%. Under this new plan, Canada would have to pay 2000 S.F. Russia, Germany and Spain would pay the maximum.

The new plan would produce 240,250 S.F. per year. The present plan produces 155,150 S.F.

This quiet sounding proposal raised a furor. Many speakers spoke out strongly against the new plan on the grounds that their federations simply could not afford it. Then there were about 20 speakers (from the countries paying above the minimum) all in favour of the new plan because they felt they were carrying the main financial burden and deserved some relief. The debate grew heated and went on for a long time.

Meantime an important decision had to be made about the site of the 38<sup>th</sup> Olympiad in 2008. There were two serious bids: Dresden in Germany and Tallinn in Estonia. The delegates from these two cities had arrived, with their mayors and Reeves and important city officials. They were to present speeches and videos. They waited patiently while the fee schedule debate raged on. When they could barely wait any longer, the chair stopped the fee debate and switched over to Dresden versus Tallinn.

After long presentations by both sides, the meeting ended very late, without any decisions! The fee topic was deferred to the next FIDE meeting. The next day, Dresden was chosen over Tallinn.

No progress was made in settling the world championship. Kasparov was supposed to play a match with Rustam Kasimdzhanov but this plan unfortunately collapsed.

There had been a major power struggle between Mr. Noureddine Tabbane, the general secretary, and Mr. Makropoulos. The result was that Mr. Tabbane was out and Mr. Ignatious Leong is the new general secretary.

I was disappointed that the FIDE president H.E.Kirsan Ilyumzhinov did not attend the meetings. I am pleased to report that Canada continues to be highly respected in FIDE.

Sincerely,

Nathan Divinsky

FIDE Representative  
Chess Federation of Canada  
Fédération canadienne des échecs

## **Results of Votes:**

**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.

**Yes: (15)** Barron, Bluvshstein, Cohen, Dénomée, Dixon, Dutton, Ferner, Ficzere, Harper, McDonald, Nadeau, Nikouline, Starr, Stockhausen, Thorvardson

**No: (3)** Craver, Greco , Thurairasah

**Abstentions:** none

### ***Motion Passed***

***Michael Barron:*** My vote is: **YES**

But I would like to pay attention to unpleasant incident that recently took place on one of junior events in Toronto Area: the CMA Ontario Coordinator Leslie Armstrong prohibited staff of the Chess Academy of Canada to enter the site of the event and distribute their materials to young players and their parents.

It looks like some CMA employees understand “CMA is responsible for junior chess in Canada under the umbrella of the CFC” as “CMA has exclusive rights for all junior chess activities in Canada” and want to prevent all other organizations from developing junior chess!

I found such attitude completely inappropriate – if you want to be the best, you need to do more and better, but not make others doing less and worse.

***Lyle Craver:*** Books and equipment is one of the core services the CFC provides to its members. To get out of this key area removes one of the key reasons I enjoy being a CFC member.

***Peter Stockhausen: 2005 – 23 Yes*** - With the explicit understanding that all qualification tournaments for FIDE Championships remain under the sole jurisdiction and control of the CFC.

**Motion 2005-35** moved by Bruce Harper, seconded by David Cohen:

That the deadline for the committee established by Motion 2005-12 to consider the format and timing of the Canadian Championship and the Canadian Women's Championship be extended, with the committee to report to CFC prior to the 2005 Annual General Meeting.

**Yes:** (16) Barron ,Bluvshtain, Cohen, Craver, Dénomée, Dixon, Ferner, Ficzere, Harper, McDonald, Nadeau, Nikouline, Starr, Stockhausen, Thorvardson, Thurairasah

**No:** (2) Dutton, Greco

**Abstentions:** none

### ***Motion Passed***

**Bruce Harper:** This is listed under motions for second discussion, but the President says there is to be a vote. If so, I vote in favour. I'm much more concerned whether this committee exists, whether the people on it know they are one, and whether they are doing anything.

**Michael Barron:** My vote is: YES

But I would like to get answers to my questions about the procedure:  
That is the purpose of discussion? How could we amend the initial text of a Motion? What does it mean "straw vote"? How could we use it?

We have already spent 8 months for discussion and voting for **Motion 2005-12**, and now we are going to spend 2 months more for amending it! Isn't it silly?

I suggest the straw vote:

"During discussion every Governor could suggest amendment to the discussed Motion. In such case for final vote could be presented several revisions of the same Motion."

## **Discussion of Motions:**

### **MOTIONS FOR FINAL VOTE:**

**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."

**Michael Barron:** Thanks to Peter Stockhausen who provided cost estimate for this motion! We can see that even after rebates the CFC will get substantial profit.

I don't understand the Bruce Harper's objection - this is the purpose of this motion: to create a "British Columbia" and many others chess clubs across the country with no membership fee and to get additional CFC members.

Where has he found abuse here?

**Pierre Dénommée** Clubs are really the most important part of Chess life, especially in remote areas. Although I would support a constitutional change to give some form of official recognition to the clubs, I am reluctant to adopt a measure that could impact negatively on the CFC finances, especially in a year in which we have an anticipated deficit.

**Mark Dutton:** "This looks to be a very dangerous and costly motion. I agree with Peter Stockhausen that "a financial impact analysis provided by the ED and or Treasurer" should be done before we vote on this motion."

**Wilf Ferner:** This motion is contrary to the current practice of sending all collected memberships and rating fees promptly to the CFC. The CFC needs to have sufficient cash flow on hand to enable it to carry out its financial commitments. Governor Ficzer's suggestion to update the Affiliate program makes sense to me. 50% of the CFC portion is much too much. The wording restricting the % reduction to chess clubs should be changed to read "OTB event organizer" and "that sell to club members" should be changed to "that sell to event participants" In other words, any organizer should be rewarded if her/his uniquely focused efforts manage to get persons back as CFC members.

**Bruce Harper:** I still oppose this motion. It might not even work if everyone behaved properly, but it is an invitation to abuse. Almost everyone who was inclined to join the CFC would join through a club, and the income to the CFC from membership dues would drop significantly for no purpose.

**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.

**Michael Barron:** I don't understand the Bruce Harper's objection to this motion as well. The chess has many different variants. I know bughouse is very popular in British Columbia. But I hope the regular CFC-rated tournaments in British Columbia obey the commonly known worldwide Laws of Chess that are approved by FIDE. Or he wants to create a new variant - "Canadian chess" with its own homemade rules?

I believe, as FIDE affiliate, the CFC should follow FIDE's Laws of Chess.

**Pierre Dénommée**

To Bruce Harper

Changes are quite minors.

- 1) Capturing the opponent king is now considered an illegal move; this will impact mostly blitzes which are not CFC rated.
- 2) If during a game it is found that an illegal move, **including failing to meet the requirements of the promotion of a pawn or capturing the opponent's king**, has been completed, the position immediately before the irregularity shall be reinstated. If the position immediately before the irregularity cannot be determined, the game shall continue from the last identifiable position prior to the irregularity. The clocks shall be adjusted according to Article 6.14. Article 4.3 applies to the move replacing the illegal move. The game shall then continue from this reinstated position.
- 3) **It is forbidden to write the moves in advance**, unless the player is claiming a draw according to Article 9.2 or 9.3.
- 4) **It is strictly forbidden to bring mobile phones or other electronic means of communication, not authorised by the arbiter, into the playing venue. If a player's mobile phone rings in the playing venue during play, that player shall lose the game. The score of the opponent shall be determined by the arbiter.**
- 5) The arbiter shall refrain from informing a player that his opponent has completed a move or **that the player has not pressed his clock**.
- 6) Rapidplay rule An illegal move is completed once the opponent's clock has been started. The opponent is then entitled to claim that the player completed an illegal move before the claimant has

made his move. Only after such a claim, shall the arbiter make a ruling. **However, if both Kings are in check or the promotion of a pawn is not completed, the arbiter shall intervene, if possible.**

#### Article 10: Quickplay Finish

10.1 A 'quickplay finish' is the phase of a game, when all the (remaining) moves must be made in a limited time.

10.2 If the player, having the move, has less than two minutes left on his clock, he may claim a draw before his flag falls. He shall stop the clocks and summon the arbiter.

- a. If the arbiter agrees the opponent is making no effort to win the game by normal means, or that it is not possible to win by normal means, then he shall declare the game drawn. Otherwise he shall postpone his decision or reject the claim.
- b. If the arbiter postpones his decision, the opponent may be awarded two extra minutes and the game shall continue in the presence of an arbiter, if possible. The arbiter shall declare the final result **later in the game** or after a flag has fallen. He shall declare the game drawn if he agrees that the final position cannot be won by normal means, or that the opponent was not making **sufficient attempts** to win by normal means.
- c. If the arbiter has rejected the claim, the opponent shall be awarded two extra minutes time.
- d. The decision of the arbiter shall be final relating to 10.2 a, b, c.

There is no requirement to use any time control. Such a requirement does not belong into the Laws of Chess.

2) may have some effects because if an illegal promotion occurs near the end of the game when nobody is recording the game, the position will have to be reverted to the last identifiable position before the irregularity which will most likely be the last move for which there is a recording. There is a potential for abuse if a player deliberately performs an illegal promotion with the intent of reverting to a position prior to a serious blunder; of course the opponent is supposed to claim it instantaneously, but this is not always the case.

5) is the most problematic change: because many electronic clocks count the moves, the 2001 version of the Laws of Chess did lift the prohibition to inform a player that he has failed to press his clock. If a player fails to press his clock, the move counter will be fooled. Consequently, at move 39, the clock will call a flag down situation which is false because although 40 moves have been played, only 39 have been recorded; the arbiter will have to intervene in order to correct the situation. This problem occurs with DGT 2000 clocks only when they are used with a time increment: with the standard 40/120 followed by G/60 the DGT does not add the extra time until a flag is down. With the new DGT XL, it is possible to disable the move counter, but we are not FIDE and many older digital clocks are going to be in circulation. Although the arbiter could still intervene based on the fact that he must act in the best interest of the competition, we could make a CFC tournament rule to further legalise the arbiter intervention in the game in order to prevent a false flag fall.

There are two changes in 10.2. The most significant improvement is that the arbiter can declare the game drawn at any time after the claim without having to wait for a flag fall. Under the previous rules, if a player has 1 hour while his opponent has less than 2 minutes, the arbiter was not allowed to decide in favour of a draw until one of the flags has fallen, even if the player with one hour on his clock is not trying to win on the chessboard. Furthermore, the arbiter was supposed to observe only this game until he has other more pressing duties. The second change is the introduction of the expression *sufficient attempts to win by normal means* which replaces the expression *no attempts to win by normal means*. So the next time that you see a 2300 player trying to win using childish tricks that would not work against a 1200 player,

you will be able to inform him that his attempts to win by normal means are not sufficient.

**Lyle Craver:** As CFC Secretary I am editor of the GL and do not normally view other people's contributions before writing my own but I think a response to M. Dénommée is called for here. A couple of people have said that people in BC play a different brand of chess than those elsewhere.

Uh – not really. What is true is that there have been more than the usual number of non-CFC rated events held in Vancouver in the past year. One tournament was not rated because of a time-control handicap system, another was not rated as the standard 1 point for a win, none for a loss, half for a draw was being experimented with. (Draws were being resolved by speed chess tie-breaks) These were all promotional type events and the game itself at the board was what we all know. Certainly these were not chess variant events like bughouse which is hugely entertaining but simply not chess!

One additional point I want to respond to is the assumption that the CFC rules will always be brought into strict alignment with FIDE. As an International Arbiter obviously I think this is a good general principle. As someone who has seen friends doing CFC Handbook revisions I can tell you it is a painstaking and thankless task to do a Handbook revision and I have the utmost respect for these people.

So yes I think this motion is a good thing – just let no one think this is an easy task. I wish I had the time to do it properly myself but there's no question it's a big job for the "lucky volunteer"

**Mark Dutton:** "CFC Handbook cosmetic amendment seems fine"

**Bruce Harper:** I still don't know what FIDE rule changes the CFC is being asked to incorporate, so I oppose this motion.

**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.

**Michael Barron:** Once again, it's not a matter of organizer's preference or players' understanding – it's a matter of conformance with international rules, approved by FIDE. Otherwise our tournaments may be not rated by FIDE. I believe, as FIDE affiliate, the CFC should follow FIDE's Swiss pairings rules.

**Pierre Dénommée:** To Bruce Harper: organiser can use whatever pairing they want if the tournament is not FIDE rated. If it is FIDE rated, FIDE pairing should be used. FIDE has shown a lot of leniency in the last years, but theoretically, a tournament using unapproved pairings can be refused by FIDE. Windows based FIDE endorsed pairing programs are now available and FIDE forms now ask which program has been used or who was responsible for the pairings. It is just a question of time before someone in FIDE gets the guts to refuse a norm because the pairings were non-standard.

**Mark Dutton:** not necessary to enforce pairing system - too restrictive to organizers"

**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.

**Michael Barron:** I don't know who could answer all the questions regarding this motion – this is a new idea for CFC. But we really need to coordinate our efforts in this direction. We – the Assembly of

Governors – have to say what is the nature of this position. My opinion is: the Director of Fundraising should NOT be a member of the CFC Executive, the person should report to the Assembly of Governors and could retain a portion of the money raised.

**Mark Dutton:** "Support this concept - 'incentives' to be worked out"

**Wilf Ferner:** If motion 2005-23 is successful in section e, the executive director will have plenty of time to take on a more substantial role as fundraiser.

**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.

**Michael Barron:** There are other examples of a “general officer” in the CFC: Masters Representative or Women’s Coordinator – please see the CFC Handbook, BY-LAW NUMBER TWO OF THE CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA ([http://chess.ca/section\\_2.htm](http://chess.ca/section_2.htm)).

I don't think we need a formal market study to find our potential clients – it's sufficient simply to look around. Our potential clients are everywhere – in schools, universities, community clubs, US tournaments... How to attract them? Organize chess tournaments! We need a SYSTEM of annual chess competitions – local, municipal, regional, provincial and National Championships – between juniors, seniors, women, men... Look at CMA – they are counting their participants by thousands! Why? Because they have annual hierarchical system of competitions – open for everybody on bottom levels with strict qualification on top levels and International opportunities for Canadian Champions! And this system works in the same Canadian society where “hockey rules”.

**Mark Dutton:** Again, I support this approach - 'publicity' is very important

**Wilf Ferner:** Publicity is a critical issue. We need to increase positive images in the media. Again, as in my comment re 2005-28, the executive director can be the key person in this regard. Our website should, in great detail, inform all our organizers, how to go about getting advertising and results re OTB events into newspapers, etc.

**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)** R<sub>1</sub> is 24 points for 4 rounds and 2 points higher for each additional round.

**ii)** R<sub>t</sub> = (R<sub>n</sub> - R<sub>0</sub>) - R<sub>1</sub>

**iii)** deleted.

**iv)** R<sub>p</sub> is the performance rating determined by Equation 714a.

**The number of bonus points R<sub>b</sub> is calculated as follows:**

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

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

**Michael Barron:** It is clear that the CFC rating system is seriously flawed and needs adjustment. It's better to have carefully considered and comprehensive solution. But we cannot wait until January 2006! What we can fix now – should be fixed immediately! Just like in case of the Olympiad Regulations – we need both Motions 2005-20 and 2005-32, in this case we as well need both Motions 2005-30 and 2005-36.

**Mark Dutton:** "Good motion Hal - it is a good start even if 'the CFC rating system is seriously flawed and needs adjustment', this will improve it immediately."

**Bruce Harper:** I oppose this as being an ad hoc, piecemeal solution. Larger changes are needed.

## **MOTIONS FOR SECOND DISCUSSION:**

**Motion 2005-31**, moved by Bruce Harper, seconded by Joshua Henson:

That CFC By-Law Number Two, Paragraph 3 (although it is not actually numbered), which reads:

[3.] NUMBERS OF GOVERNORS FOR EACH PROVINCE

Each provincial association shall be entitled to elect or appoint a number of Governors as follows:

For the first fifty or part thereof of ordinary per capita fee payments, and number of life memberships combined, one Governor shall be allotted and for each subsequent fifty or part thereof one additional governor shall be allotted.

be amended to read:

For the first hundred or part thereof of ordinary per capita fee payments, and number of life memberships combined, one Governor shall be allotted and for each subsequent hundred or part thereof one additional Governor shall be allotted.

**Bruce Harper:** The rationale for this motion is fairly obvious. About half the Governors never comment or vote on anything. They likely won't even vote on whether their positions should be abolished. For Governors, quality, not quantity, should be the goal.

The President thinks that CFC Governors should raise money for the CFC and donate money themselves. This notion could be tested by enacting a motion should be made that no one may stand as a CFC Governor unless they donate, say, \$500 to the CFC. That would certainly reduce the number of Governors...

**Michael Barron:** I oppose this motion. The main problem of the CFC is – unacceptable slow process of decision-making. The life around us is changing frequently, but the CFC need months and years to react appropriately. Why? Because it's the same people manage the CFC year after year. We need new people and new ideas. But if we reduce the number of elected Governors, it's will be more difficult for a new person to become a CFC Governor.

Furthermore, the life Governors votes become more important. If we really need to reduce the number of

elected Governors, such changes should be combined with a change of the life Governors' status – they should be non-voting Governors. They could participate in the discussions, but only elected Governors should vote and make decisions.

**Lyle Craver:** Besides being CFC Secretary I am Secretary-Treasurer of the BC Chess Federation. During nominations for the position of CFC Governor at the BCCF AGM each year I routinely tell people “Don’t let your name stand in nomination for Governor if you’re not going to be active”. I also track the votes and see which BC Governors are voting regularly and report back to the provincial executive semi-annually. Besides my chess activities I am a member of a municipal financial advisory committee which is appointed by our Mayor and Council. When you accept such an appointment you sign an undertaking that non-attendance for three consecutive monthly meetings is deemed to be resignation. Perhaps that is what we need with the Governors.

Personally if I were ever unable to carry out the duties of being an active Governor I would offer my resignation to my provincial president and ask him to recommend a replacement. I think that would be a better solution than what this motion proposes.

**Pierre Dénommée:** The impact of this motion on provinces with few CFC members would be substantial. This is certainly not the right way to reduce the number of Governors, even if one believe that this would be a good idea.

**Mark Dutton:** This motion seems to be regressive - we need more involvement - not less! 'Many hands make light work' I oppose this motion.

**Alex Nikouline:** I am against that motion. I do not see a need to reduce twice the number of elected/appointed governors. That would not make the rest of them more efficient. For me the right way to go is to increase participation of governors including remote voting at AGM.

**Motion 2005-32**, moved by Bruce Harper, seconded by Pascal Charbonneau:

That the CFC Olympiad Regulations be repealed and replaced by the following (see other document for text of the proposed Regulations). (see Appendix GL #6)

**Bruce Harper:** I read from the President “I have given the movers of this motion direction(!) to produce a rationale for the proposed amendments...” The first I saw of such a “direction” was his comment in the Governors’ Letter. I haven’t asked Pascal whether he received a similar “direction”.

Reality check. I don’t take “direction” from our President, whose autocratic posturing has already crippled the CFC. So I will not obey his orders.

**Halldor Palsson:** The chair asks you to speak to your motion – this is normal procedure. This session had dealt with Olympiad Regulations as amended by you and the new version(s) were therefore moved to be considered by the incoming assembly.

**Bruce Harper:** I’m sure the CFC Governors are quite capable, if they are so inclined, of reading the motion and determining how this would change the way our Olympiad teams are handled. The controversial items (at least in my mind), are:

- a. Should there be a CFC Executive position of “Olympiad coordinator” created to oversee the entire process?

b. Is there a way to ensure that participants who commit to playing won't withdraw shortly before the event (other than by having a deposit)?

I don't consider the election of the team captain(s) to be controversial, since a number of top players and Brian Hartmann, who some have wanted to appoint "captain for life", endorse this approach, which gives legitimacy to the captains' authority.

Other concerns arising out of the performance of certain team members in 2004 should be addressed if the time frame set out in the amendments are taken seriously, so that all team members have time to prepare for the event.

**Michael Barron:** It is clear that the CFC Olympiad Regulations are seriously flawed and need adjustment. But do proposed changes really help us to meet the declared main objectives of participating in the Chess Olympiad - to field teams which will achieve the highest possible results?

I found it necessary to ask opinions of the players – members of Canadian Olympic team. Nava Starr and Mark Bluvshtein have already presented their opinions in the email discussion last month. For my request responded 2 other players - Dmitry Tyomkin and Igor Zugic. I ask them to answer a few specific questions, and would like to present their answers:

1) Do you think that proposed deposit could keep the strongest players in the team?

**Dmitry Tyomkin:** The deposit idea isn't serious and this is just insulting to charge players who go to Olympiad to represent their country; but the contract must take place. Also the appearance fees must be mentioned in this contract. I doubt top Canadian players will agree to go to the next Olympiad for free as we did for the last one.

**Igor Zugic:** I do not think that deposit would keep the strongest players in the team especially if a Provincial federation or a third party pays the deposit. If strongest players decide they would like to play in the Olympiad, and later on something comes up and they would not want to play anymore, I do not think a deposit would be the decision breaker.

However, the deposit is probably a good idea. It would discourage players from saying they would like to play but when in reality they are not sure and want to postpone the decision. I believe players should still have some window of opportunity to decide to withdraw from the team without financial or any other penalties (for example 3 months before the Olympiad).

2) Is it a good idea to define board order by rating?

**Dmitry Tyomkin:** Bad idea. Captain must decide. Of course, he can consult about that with the players of a team as Brian did for the last Olympiad.

**Igor Zugic:** It is a good idea to define board order by rating. In fact, I think it is the only non-controversial (or least-controversial) method. If someone has earned a higher rating, he/she should be rewarded with a higher board placement unless the person prefers to play a lower board (but I do not think that is ever the case!).

3) Which ratings should be use for selection (and board order): FIDE, CFC, or both?

**Dmitry Tyomkin:** Captain must select players, or the selection committee when the captain is a member of it.

**Igor Zugic:** I think both CFC and FIDE ratings should be used for selection. They both have their good and bad points so combining them makes sense to me. Anyways, I do not see anybody at the top of Canadian rating list with a big discrepancy between the two ratings.

4) What is better: first select the players and let them elect the captain - or first select the captain and let him select the players?

**Dimity Tyomkin:** Captain must be selected ASAP - we are 1 year before the Olympiad 2006, so if a captain is appointed now he will have enough time to raise funds and to build a good team.

**Igor Zugic:** Neither option is perfect: captain selecting players or players selecting a captain.

My proposal is that CFC Executives choose a team captain they think would make a good choice before the players are selected. In the process of selecting a team captain, the top players should be consulted. As I said on numerous occasions before I think Mr. Brian Hartman should be named the team captain for the next Olympiad as soon as possible, if he wants to assume that role again. He did a terrific job last time, and there is a lot he would be able to do for next year's team as well.

In turn, team captain should have an input on who the selection committee selects (but probably not make the final call).

With my proposal everyone gets a say (the prospective team players in selecting a captain, and the captain in selecting some players).

5) Maybe 4 players are enough for the team?

**Dimity Tyomkin:** The men's team must include 6 players. Less number is unacceptable- it gives opponent's teams big advantage, as well as puts a lot of pressure of players as well as players get exhausted at the end.

**Igor Zugic:** 4 players are definitely not enough for a team if we are going for a best result possible. The Olympiad is very long (14 rounds) and either the players would burn out at the end or there would be a lot of "non-games" (short draws with white). There are a lot of people worldwide following the Olympiad, and there is a sense of responsibility of playing the games out, trying to achieve the best result possible. Whoever makes the team next year, I would love to see a good, uncompromising attitude of playing every game and match for a maximum result (which means no quick draws with white; especially since with black pieces there would normally not even be an opportunity for a quick draw versus a strong player). 5 players is still a bit of a disadvantage, but not nearly as much as people make it out to be. There are 56 games per team (14 rounds x 4 games), so 11 games per player is not that bad. Of course it is better to have 6 players, in which case average is about 9 games per player.

6) Maybe 3 players are enough for the Women's team?

**Dimity Tyomkin:** Less harm in this case since there are no professional players in women's team, but I believe the players will feel bad with that anyhow- if only 3 in the team means players must play all 14 games.

**Igor Zugic:** For the women's team 3 players would not be enough - 4 players are absolutely essential.

And the general comments:

**Dimity Tyomkin:** I fully support and agree with all written in Nava's letter. I'd be glad to see Brian as a captain for the next Olympiad, and CFC should appoint the captain ASAP. I'd like to make it clear that I will not play for the Canadian team on future Olympiads without getting paid reasonably.

**Igor Zugic:** I think players should be awarded based on their performance (create a table of a certain fee for a certain performance) rather than in terms of appearance fees. Whoever plays a higher board has a better chance of getting a higher performance because losses do not make as big of an impact as on lower boards. Anyways, for players with higher ratings it is logical for them to have a higher performance.

This way, players with higher ratings are not penalized and everyone is given a fair chance. Also, it gives players an even greater motivation to play hard every single game instead of taking a cheque in the beginning and then cruising through the Olympiad.

I do not like the idea of just rewarding wins as was done in some previous Olympiads. It is better to look at a whole picture.

My opinion is the Canadian Champion should get a guaranteed spot on the team only once (based on the last championship held before the Olympiad). If the Canadian championship is not held between two Olympiads, I do not believe it is fair for one player to be continually rewarded while the rest of the top players are denied a chance of competing for the spot.

In the case when the Championship is skipped, then it is fair to select an additional player for the team from the rating list.

I propose that new rule be implemented after next year's Olympiad in Italy.

For the next year's Olympiad it does not really matter because Pascal Charbonneau would probably make the team anyways, but if a total outsider wins a championship it could create a problem in the future. It is very possible that majority of top players might not be able to play in some Canadian Championship and some "underdog" wins it.

Last comment (I promise :) since the team has gotten a lot younger in the past few years, it would make sense to modify the rules now and select top 5 by rating and 1 by the committee. Last November in Spain, the ages on our team were (in board order):

21(Pascal), 27(Dima), 16(Mark), 22(me), and 29(Yan).

And my (**Michael Barron**) comments:

I think the proposed Olympiad Regulations are much better than existing ones, but still need serious amendments, based on the input of prospective Team members.

So, before voting on **Motion 2005-32** I suggest the following straw votes:

- 1) Do you think that proposed deposit could keep the strongest players in the team?
- 2) Is it a good idea to define board order by rating?
- 3) Which ratings should be use for selection (and board order): FIDE, CFC, or both?
- 4) What is better: first select the players and let them elect the captain - or first select the captain and let him select the players?
- 5) Maybe 4 players are enough for the team?
- 6) Maybe 3 players are enough for the Women's team?

**Frank Dixon:** I want to support the excellent and thorough work which has gone into this! I do have several suggestions. **SELECTION RATINGS:** I would like to see FIDE ratings also brought into the equation for selections; I have made this point before. In Olympiads, Canada will be competing against International players, NOT against Canadians, so FIDE-rated play offers a better and more objective measure of playing strength than CFC-rated play. **TIMELINES:** I very much like the forwarded timelines and the detailed steps for selection. This will hopefully allow us to avoid the logistical problems of the past, when events were constantly compressed against the deadline of the tournament's start. **BOARD ORDER:** I would like to see some flexibility built in here, factoring in experience, instead of simply using ratings.

**Mark Dutton:** This seems like a good idea to improve by 'CFC Olympiad Regulations be repealed and replaced' with thoughtful improvements and adjustments to the existing system.

**Alex Nikouline:** My understanding is that Olympiad Regulations were discussed and adopted just last year. Are they outdated? If they require modification let's discuss the modifications. Besides the suggested regulations assume that one member on the team pays his own way. This contradicts the declared goals of Canada's participation in the Olympiad, because such an approach will definitely undermine team spirit and will not guarantee the strongest team possible.

**Motion 2005-34** Moved by Christopher Mallon Seconded by Kevin Pacey

Motion: a) That the CFC declare and promote the week of October 3rd-9th, 2005 as National Chess Week.  
b) That the CFC executive will appoint a coordinator to oversee National Chess Week  
c) That the coordinator will be provided complimentary advertising on the CFC web site and in CCE to promote NCW events.  
d) That NCW will include country-wide simul events held at malls or schools all on the same date, with a goal

of having 10,000 chess games being played at the same time.

- e) That all Canadian Chess Clubs will be encouraged to run free to the public events during the week to promote chess
- f) That the CFC will produce a small information booklet about chess in Canada which can be distributed at all of the events

**Pierre Dénommée** Does any other counties has a National Chess Week? The idea is great if it can be implemented efficiently. I would like to see on the front page of the Globe and Mail "The first National Chess Week has begun, look inside for places to play Chess".

**Mark Dutton:** I support the concept of 'National Chess Week' - with the details to be refined as per Halldor's concerns that he ruled out of order.

**Bruce Harper:** This is probably a good idea. And yet parts of this were 0-0-0 as well! I don't think I'm alone in thinking the "F" in "CFC" stands for "farce".

**Motion 2005-36**, moved by Bruce Harper, seconded by Peter Stockhausen:

That a committee of five qualified individuals, to be selected by the CFC Executive, be formed to review the CFC Rating System and make recommendations for changes and improvements. This committee would report to the CFC prior to the 2005 Annual General Meeting.

**Bruce Harper:** Since I made this motion, I should say what a splendid idea it is.

**Frank Dixon:** 2005-36: Rating System examination and recommendations -- The problem is important, but I feel we need more time for this complex topic. Early July is too soon to study and report; I would suggest Dec. 31, 2005.

**Mark Dutton:** in ADDITION TO supporting motion 2005-30, this is ALSO an excellent idea and should be pursued.

**Tony Ficzere:** Vote Yes. We had better hurry here if we want a report for the 2005 AGM.

**Alex Nikouline:** Surely I am for this motion, moreover I volunteer to be on such a committee. Do we need the motion 2005-30 that case?

**Motion 2005-37:** Online magazine committee (Moved by Pacey, seconded by Ficzere)

The CFC Executive shall be given a mandate to strike a committee to determine the viability of putting the contents of the CCE magazine on the CFC website, possibly in conjunction with a reduction of CFC membership fees.

**Lyle Craver:** I do not object to studying the suggestion but think it is a bad one. I was an enthusiastic subscriber to **Inside Chess** (from the third issue of the first year) and just want to note that the magazine basically folded when it went online. To a certain extent publications like **The Week in Chess** killed **Inside Chess** but I really do think we should be thinking in terms of adding perceived value to our magazine in terms of downloadable games, pictures etc. to our members to be offered via our web site rather than taking the entire publication online. I have a nearly complete collection of TWIC on my hard drive but one would be naïve to think I refer to it often.

I would strongly favor surveying members to see what parts of the CFC membership they value most and least.

**Halldor Palsson:** I would like Governors to send examples of praxis by other chess federations and chess magazine publishers. Many CFC Governors are like me former subscribers to Inside Chess and that is their starting point. My example is Danish. All members of the Danish Chess Federation (Dansk Skak Union) get a paper magazine (Skakbladet = the Chess paper!) sent to them and then the whole magazine is also available on line as a PDF file (see: <http://www.ds.dk/skakblad/sb-index.htm>) from 2002-2205. Subscriptions are Kr. 220 or approximately \$37 per year. There is no on-line option only for memberships. It seems to me that other chess federations are much more selective in putting the contents of the membership magazine on line.

**Pierre Dénommée** This motion is dangerous. What are the perceived benefits of CFC membership from a member's standpoint? Of course not the fact that he has no rights. Playing rated chess and receiving CCE comes first. Some members may only want to read CCE and we are going to lose them if we implement this plan. Reducing services to members is a way to save money that can backfire because it may cause a decline of the membership. Lack of money in a membership association is most likely linked to a lack of members, not a surplus of services. Lack of members is quite obvious if we compare ourselves with other countries: there are more due paying chess players in île de France than in the entire Canada. Examination of the statistics at <http://www.echecs.asso.fr>ListeTops.aspx?Action=LIGUE&Licence=A> show that usually less than 1% of the population actually purchase a full membership (France has two levels of membership: A and B, B members can only play only in rapid tournaments and in competitions chosen by the Assembly of Governors). There is a considerable number of B members (<http://www.echecs.asso.fr>ListeTops.aspx?Action=LIGUE&Licence=B>). The cost of those memberships can be found at <http://www.echecs.asso.fr/Tarifs.aspx>. Just as it is in Canada, the cost is not the same in every region, depending on the regional part of the membership. 40 euros is quite a steep price for a membership and they have no problem selling over 50 000 of them. What is the secret? **911 Chess Clubs** of which 859 are in good standing (have 5 or more A members). The other secret is to promote team Chess rather than individual Chess. Team Chess is more social and is often perceived as more enjoyable but more importantly for the CFC, it results in more rated games being played and more members. Of course, team Chess and clubs go hand in hand because every player plays for his club. We should seriously think about introducing affordable B memberships. A B member can eventually be converted to an A member. Rapid Chess may have a broader appeal because the games are shorter.

**Mark Dutton:** "What is the 'rationale of their motion'?" Not everyone is online! Let's not exclude those who do not have a computer!"

**Tony Ficzere:** The President asks for rationale behind this motion. The idea is based on saving money. We (the CFC) are in a very difficult position financially. I fear our finances will only get worse. I think it would be prudent to investigate the feasibility of putting our magazine on-line. I am not saying we should, only that we look into it. If we don't need a motion to appoint a committee, I believe the President should appoint one. He asks us to rewrite the motion which only wastes more time. Mr. President, please strike a committee to investigate the feasibility of putting our magazine on-line.

**Halldor Palsson:** I asked for a rationale behind the motion because I do not believe that it is clear whether the content on the magazine is going on-line or we are going all electronic, i.e. abandoning the paper version of the magazine with this motion. The editor and the office can put as much or as little of each magazine on line now.

**Bruce Harper:** The President does not see the point to motions which advise or recommend actions to the CFC Executive. I do, and support the motion as currently drafted.

I also think the CFC magazine is not worth the cost and an on-line magazine with much more frequent "issues" and articles would be more cost-effective and interesting. People who wanted to print it could do so. But I would be interested in the recommendations of a committee that considered the matter in more detail and will keep an open mind in the meantime.

**Alex Nikouline:** Though printed magazine has some nostalgic value I think we have to consider online magazine as a cost-saving measure. Do we know how many CFC members do not use computers and Internet? How many of them will quit if there is no printed copy of magazine? How much will be the savings if we are obliged to print a few copies of magazine anyway (surely cost per copy will be higher than that case)? We definitely need to thread carefully.

**Kevin Pacey:** In response to the President's comments, what doesn't he understand about the mandate? Even if he thinks the Executive has the option, ignoring the motion shows contempt for the will of the governors should it pass. And why should there be a justifying rationale if the goal is to simply study the issue, which the Executive doesn't seem to be doing (else it chooses not to inform governors if they are)?

Nevertheless I think that for starters the possibly large savings to the CFC in the event of dropping the printed magazine in favour of an online one, and the possibility of being able to provide a French translation at relatively little cost if the magazine is put online provide a sufficient rationale merely to study the issue. Bear in mind too that a large segment of our population now can access the internet from the comfort of their own home.

## **MOTIONS FOR FIRST DISCUSSION:**

Motion number 2005-38 (Moved/Seconded Pierre Dénommée / Kevin Pacey)

That the CFC create a new category of member called "recreative member". The recreative member will be allowed to play CFC active rated games, which are games played under the rules for rapidplay described in appendix B of the Laws of Chess; they will also be allowed to play in any other tournaments designated by the Assembly of Governors. Apart from those designated tournaments, recreative members are explicitly forbidden from playing any regular rated games. Furthermore, recreative members have no rights within the CFC, they do not receive CCE and they are not allowed to vote for the Governors of their province.

Each provincial association is free to recognise, at the provincial level, whichever rights they see fit to recreatives members, including no rights at all.

The initial membership fee for recreative members will be 5\$ for the CFC plus the provincial part decided by the Provincial Associations. Thereafter, the fee shall be decided by the Assembly of Governors at the AGM.

The rating fee for active games shall be abolished.

**Halldor Palsson:** Memberships are defined in BY-LAW NUMBER ONE OF THE CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA, starting at paragraph 5 defining Ordinary Membership, 6 Family Membership and so forth. This motion therefore requires a 2/3 vote to pass.

## **General comments from Governors:**

**Michael Barron:** Thanks to the President for providing financial report! Unfortunately, the content of his

report is unsatisfactory – we need more detailed information. For example, the largest source of funds in 2005 is “Other Programs” - \$91,000. But what exactly it means? We need to know each of these “Other Programs” separately. The second largest source of funds in 2005 is “Donations” - \$83,600. But if donations for the Olympiad and WYCC are included in the “Other Programs”, where have we spent those \$83,600 of other donations? Or the President simply counted them twice?

We could better understand the problem with financial information provided by the President, if we compare FIDE bills provided by the President and published on the FIDE website. On FIDE website we can see how much FIDE charges for each tournament and that the CFC paid 500 SFr fines for late tournament results submission. From information provided by the CFC President it's not obvious. But it's obvious that on 01/01/2004 the CFC had debt 7,215.00 SFr. and on 12/23/2004 this debt was only 4,369.55 SFr. It means that during 2004 year the CFC collected from Canadian chess players for “FIDE rating fees” about \$3,000 more than FIDE charges for them! Surely, the debt should be paid. But not by milking of Canadian chess players! And here come to mind those \$15,000 that the President want to send to the Chess Foundation. I strongly oppose this idea – we could find better usage for those funds – to pay FIDE debt, for example.

The separate question is – where this debt came from? Peter Stockhausen told us that it's because FIDE changed its system of charging but we only reacted to this more than a year later. This is a source of the problem that should be addressed! FIDE changes its system every year, and we should keep the CFC rules in accordance with the FIDE rules. To accomplish it I suggest that the Assembly shall appoint a general officer known as the Director of FIDE rules, whose duty is to watch for changes in the FIDE rules and introduce appropriate changes in the CFC rules. Otherwise the CFC could be in a big trouble.

Thanks to all Governors who approved the **Motion 2005-18** making FIDE rating fees more affordable for Canadian chess players and organizers! Now we can get more Canadian tournaments FIDE-rated for less cost. And the first tournament that FIDE will rate for us without charging according to existing FIDE rules will be Toronto Women's Closed Championship in May – June organized by Greater Toronto Chess League. Traditionally rating fees for Toronto Closed Championships are paid by GTCL, and those extra \$55 wouldn't be excessive for GTCL that has only about \$900 income for whole year!

*Pierre Dénommée* IM Schliefer is usually a nice person, I have never penalised him for any reason. The situation that you have reported brings the sport of Chess into disrepute. There should be a CFC Discipline Commission to deal with such cases because suspension goes beyond the powers of an Arbitrator. Rating should not be an issue during a disciplinary hearing. Treating suspensions on a case by case basis is a poor idea for a National Sport Organisation (NSO) recognised by the Canadian Olympic Committee. A written suspension policy is usually required of NSO, if we were in France, the minister of Sports would force us to add to the CFC Constitution his suspension policy which is the same for all recognised sports.

Coming AGM

I would like to stand for election as CFC Governor for Quebec.

**Frank Dixon:** 2005-17: Sports Canada rules -- Question -- if this passes, would it govern situations which may have occurred BEFORE it was passed!?

General Discussion: Question for President Palsson -- What is the status of the process with IM Michael Schliefer's conduct; it has now been more than two months since the deplorable incident in Ottawa, and there has been no official word. We can't simply let this one slide!

**Frank Dixon:** Canadian Junior 2005: This championship was held in Brantford from April 30 -- May 4. A small field of about a dozen players took part, with only three Masters, one of whom withdrew after three rounds. Comments I heard from some parents of strong players who did NOT take part, indicated that the timing of the event was too close to the 2005 CYCC, the cost of travel and accomodation was expensive (as players did not have friends to stay with in Brantford), and with a small, weak field, only one prize (entry to the World Junior), and the 2004 champion IM (elect) Zhe Quan defending, the perceived benefits were just not there. This was perhaps the weakest field in memory for the Canadian Junior. Also, any post-secondary players of junior-eligible age who may have wished to play in the tournament were preoccupied with examinations at the end of their school terms. While I thank Patrick McDonald and Chris Mallon for staging this event when no one else bid for it, and congratulate the young Master Shiyam Thavandiran who won, this tournament's future viability, both from financial and representative standpoints, seems to be in some question with these dates and format.

#### Post-Secondary Chess Report 2004-2005

Some significant development in post-secondary chess was achieved during 2004-05. The team championship tournament was held in Toronto in January, hosted by the University of Toronto's Hart House Chess Club, which did a superb job. I want to thank especially the U of T organizer Morgan Mills and the TD Alex Lambruschini of Queen's University; these two ran a smooth tournament in my absence, as poor health prevented me from attending in Toronto this time. This was the third in the current series, begun in January 2003 in London, and continued January 2004 in Kingston. The Toronto event was a big success, attracting a new record of 23 four-player teams (and a total of 92 players), which necessitated two sections, and four rounds over three days. A very close and exciting battle developed. The eventual team champion for 2005 was the team from the Universite du Quebec a Montreal, composed of (boards one through four): Simon Gravel, Hugues Masse, Olivier Tessier, and Anne Marie Charbonneau. The UQAM edged out the teams from Waterloo and Toronto, which had won the previous two years respectively. The UQAM will hold for one year the Queen's Cup, donated for annual competition by Queen's University last year. Congratulations!!

Thanks to all teams which took part!! There was a report on this event in the April 2005 issue of *Chess Canada Echecs* magazine, written by Alex Lambruschini. This 2005 championship was self-supporting from a financial standpoint, as were the previous two events.

At the annual meeting of the Canadian Post-Secondary Chess Association, held during the Toronto event, Montreal was chosen as the site for the next championship, to be held in January 2006, and to be organized by McGill University, under the same format which has been used in the three previous tournaments. It is the plan for the next few years to keep the championship site within the Montreal -- London corridor, which will facilitate greater participation, since this densely populated region is home to many post-secondary institutions. At some point, should significantly increased funding become available, it would be desirable to take the event to Atlantic Canada and to Western Canada. Alex Lambruschini was selected to continue as Chair of the CPSCA; Alex is respected by everyone, has been building up his list of contacts at post-secondary institutions across Canada, and has been involved with this group for three years now. One goal of the CPSCA is to give post-secondary students the chance for leadership with their own chess; another is to help train the chess organizers of the future.

On the organizational front, the affiliation of the CFC with the new CPSCA has now been achieved, with the CFC recognizing the CPSCA as the group which will handle this area of chess. Structurally, the Chair of the CPSCA will report to the CFC's Youth Coordinator; the final vote for this motion was completed in GL#6. I have navigated these two motions through the Governors' Letters during the past year, and wish to thank Governors for their support. There had been previous post-secondary team

tournaments in Canada, dating from the 1960s, but until this latest initiative, there was no formal structure to develop interest and growth on an annual basis; participation depended too much on variable efforts, which often showed promise but always petered out eventually.

I was already a CFC Governor when I took on the additional role of Coordinator / Liaison for the CPSCA with the CFC in January 2004, after the founding of the CPSCA in Kingston. I am stepping down as Governor for Kingston, effective June 30, 2005, having served three years in that role. Now that the CFC and CPSCA are linked, there is no longer any need for my Coordinator / Liaison position; I have legislated myself out of existence! This was the plan all along. I feel that I have achieved my goals with this portfolio, and wish to turn it over to new hands who will guide it to greater heights. I retain my interest in this area, and will continue to serve as an informal resource for this group, to be called upon as needed.

I am nominating Alex Lambruschini to take over the combined roles which he and I have performed; Alex, who agrees, should he be accepted, will be both CPSCA Chair as well as CFC Coordinator for Post-Secondary chess. Alex, who is going into his fourth year at Queen's, is an ideal candidate, whom I have spent some time and effort training to be an effective TD and organizer during the last three years. Alex, whom I consider to be the outstanding young organizer in Canada under age 25, is hard-working, honest, keen, knowledgeable, and has terrific people skills. Alex shows great potential as a future leader in Canadian chess.

However, there is one problem, in that Alex has been a bit reluctant to take over as CFC Governor for Kingston, since there is a very serious situation in Kingston (which I have briefed him on). This is understandable; I would not wish this problem on anyone. The problem is that if Alex is not Governor for Kingston, then he should be a CFC Governor-at-large, so he can represent the CPSCA with the CFC, as I did. The CFC and OCA Youth Coordinator Patrick McDonald has been reluctant to see the CPSCA Chair / Coordinator also serve as a CFC Governor (unless he already was one, as I was); but I can see no other way to solve this issue effectively. I am hoping that Patrick will see this issue my way now.

Issues for the future for the CPSCA are:

- 1) the continued growth of the championship tournament by broadening its appeal to more teams,
- 2) the potential for on-line competition from geographically remote post-secondary sites,
- 3) funding challenges. To date, the CPSCA has not asked for nor received any money from the CFC, despite generating some revenue for the CFC in the form of new memberships and rating fees.

With the CFC and CPSCA now linked together, it is time for the CFC to play a greater direct role in the growth and development of post-secondary chess in Canada, through increased input from other Governors, through directed funding, and through greater post-secondary chess involvement with provincial organizations, such as the OCA.

**Tony Ficzere:** Motion 2005-33 Ruled out of order. We wouldn't want to be progressive now would we.

Motion 2005-34 Ruled out of order. There was a lot in this motion that was good. Shame.

I am very discouraged with the way the President deals with presented motions, simply ruling them "Out of Order" at his whim. I can't recall a President in the past ruling so many motions out of order. I find it counter-productive. Many good ideas have been swept aside. I find the President himself "Out of Order".

The President should be a leader. He should at the very least, inspire those around him/her to be productive. What we have here is a President who undermines the Governors at every chance. Many Governors will not bother to present motions with the current President. As a result, some good ideas will

go to waste. I am embarrassed.

**Peter Stockhausen:** The financial update is appreciated. It is still unclear how accurate these numbers are and I do not understand why the numbers are rounded off if Pat from the Accounting company has verified these numbers. Also the super large amounts of Donations and Other Programs should be broken down, otherwise we really have no understanding of what is going on.

Again, the President rules a motion out of order. This time, it is a motion of the Vice President, no less. If a cap on the cost was the hang up, both Chris and I would have readily inserted it, but Halldor chose to act without contacting either the author or the seconder of the motion. What a farce!

**Bruce Harper:** I leave it to others to comment on the CFC's financial picture. I note only that the CFC Treasurer and the CCE Editor have both quit. It is difficult to be optimistic about the CFC.

**Re: 2005-33 (broadcast the CFC AGM)** I don't think the ratings of such a broadcast would be very high, but I support this motion. I noticed that the President ruled it "out of order" (perhaps just to keep in practice). Of course it should be done, if it is practical. One would have expected a simple inquiry to Chris as to the cost, as opposed to the usual "0-0-0".

## **Deadline for Submissions to GL #8: Thursday June 30th, 2005**

### **Motions For Vote:**

#### **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."

Vote YES NO ABSTAIN

#### **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.

Vote YES NO ABSTAIN

**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.

Vote YES NO ABSTAIN

#### **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.

Vote YES NO ABSTAIN

**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.

Vote YES NO ABSTAIN

**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) R<sub>1</sub> is 24 points for 4 rounds and 2 points higher for each additional round.
- ii) R<sub>t</sub> = (R<sub>n</sub> - R<sub>0</sub>) - R<sub>1</sub>
- iii) deleted.
- iv) R<sub>p</sub> is the performance rating determined by Equation 714a.

The number of bonus points R<sub>b</sub> is calculated as follows:

- i) R<sub>b</sub> = 0 if R<sub>n</sub> is greater than or equal to 1999
- ii) R<sub>b</sub> = the lesser of: R<sub>t</sub>, 1999 - R<sub>n</sub>, R<sub>p</sub> - R<sub>n</sub>.

Vote YES NO ABSTAIN

**Motion for Second Discussion:**

**Motion 2005-31** Numbers of Governors per province

**Motion 2005-32** CFC Olympiad Regulations

**Motion 2005-34** National Chess Week. October 3rd-9th, 2005

**Motion 2005-35** Reporting Date extension for Motion 2005-12

**Motion 2005-36** Ratings System Review Committee

**Motion 2005-37:** Online magazine committee

**Motions for First Discussion:**

**Motion 2005-38:** Recreative Membership

**Deadline for Submissions to GL #8: Thursday June 30th, 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**