

**CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA  
GOVERNORS' LETTER FIVE  
2006-2007**



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 is June 8, 2007**

**NOTICE TO GOVERNORS:**

The Annual General Meeting of the Chess Federation of Canada is scheduled for July 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> at 10 am through 4 pm at the Ottawa Marriott hotel home of the 2007 Canadian Open Chess Championship.

It is anticipated that July 9th will be the Assembly of Outgoing Governors while July 10th will be the Assembly of Incoming Governors.

**President's Message**

<<<not received by publication date >>>

**Vice-President's Message**

See my report in Appendix 3 to the President on the CFC / CYCC Financials.

**Message from the Secretary:**

It has been a long time since the last Governors' Letter and I have been regularly pestering the rest of the Executive and the Office for contributions. I apologize for the delay and for my inability to supply the Governors with what I consider a full Governors' Letter.

A full GL you say? This GL looks fairly full and indeed it is. But there is important information missing that I feel the Governors need to intelligently assess the situation of the CFC.

Firstly we need to see interim financials – given the financial situation of the CFC as presented at the last Annual General Meeting I feel the Governors' need for information concerning the Financial state of the CFC has never been greater.

Secondly concerning the Canada Revenue Agency's review of the CFC's charitable status: the Executive has been told that Les Bunning is quarterbacking this file on behalf of the Federation. I think he is an excellent choice and deserves our support – but by now we should be expecting either an update or to be told that things are at a sensitive stage and we must wait for the AGM for further details. Personally I would be content with either.

Special thanks to David Gordon in the Office for the membership statistics as of 1 May 2007. These are available at <http://www.chess.ca/MemStats.htm> and show the trends for the previous 5 years. I think it is high time the Governors discuss the overall trend and what it means for the CFC. My own view is that a lot of it is due to the "Tournament Membership" program – at the Vancouver Keres Memorial roughly 1/3 of the players (excluding CFC Life Members) who took part paid their "Membership" in this way. I would like to see statistics on how often these players play and also how their purchases of books and equipment compare to regular members.

By no means do I belittle the efforts of Messrs. Dénomée, Barron, Palsson, Doubleday, Mallon and McDonald or the others who contributed to this issue with their motions and in other ways. But I do feel strongly that given past information presented to the Assembly of Governors that we need far more information on whether we are succeeding in taking the steps required to put our financial house in order as discussed at the last Annual General Meeting.

As a procedural matter, it would be helpful if each member of the Executive declare their intentions for the coming year. For myself, I have very much enjoyed being Secretary and would be happy to continue through 2007-2008 though I appreciate some of the things I have said (particularly above) may influence the Governors' judgement. *As well they should both for myself and the entire board..*

There is no substitute for a well-governed and well-administered federation and the Governors and Membership deserve no less.

Here is my calculation of the number of CFC Governors to for each province for 2007-2008. This does not include Life Governors or members of the CFC Executive:

|       | Family | Honorary | Junior | LIFE | Adult | Part.Junior. | Total | Per Capita<br>Calculation | Calculated<br>Governors |
|-------|--------|----------|--------|------|-------|--------------|-------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Total | 9      | 53       | 180    | 350  | 1004  | 156          | 1763  | 1531.50                   | 37                      |
| AB    | 3      | 2        | 13     | 27   | 153   | 25           | 223   | 192.17                    | 4                       |
| BC    | 2      | 7        | 28     | 68   | 82    | 24           | 211   | 176.67                    | 4                       |
| MB    | 0      | 0        | 5      | 5    | 50    | 2            | 62    | 58.33                     | 2                       |
| NB    | 0      | 0        | 6      | 6    | 59    | 6            | 77    | 69.00                     | 2                       |
| NL    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 6    | 21    | 5            | 32    | 27.00                     | 1                       |
| NS    | 0      | 0        | 9      | 13   | 41    | 0            | 63    | 60.00                     | 2                       |
| NT    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 0    | 0     | 0            | 0     | 0.00                      | 0                       |
| NU    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 1    | 0     | 0            | 1     | 1.00                      | 1                       |
| ON    | 4      | 25       | 98     | 158  | 501   | 87           | 873   | 751.33                    | 16                      |
| PE    | 0      | 0        | 6      | 2    | 6     | 0            | 14    | 12.00                     | 1                       |
| QC    | 0      | 16       | 4      | 26   | 40    | 2            | 88    | 84.67                     | 2                       |
| SK    | 0      | 0        | 11     | 14   | 27    | 5            | 57    | 48.33                     | 1                       |
| YT    | 0      | 0        | 0      | 1    | 1     | 0            | 2     | 2.00                      | 1                       |
| US    | 0      | 3        | 0      | 23   | 24    | 0            | 50    | 50.00                     |                         |
| FO    | 0      | 3        | 0      | 6    | 1     | 0            | 10    | 10.00                     |                         |

Please note that there is a Straw Vote in this Governors' Letter concerning how the popular game / 60 time control should most appropriately be rated.

Lyle Craver,  
Secretary, Chess Federation of Canada

### Message from the Rating Auditor:

It has been brought to the attention of the Rating Auditor that there are serious problems with the administration of CFC Ratings.

The Kitchener AGM has already approved a solution to alleviate this problem: electronic submission. Authorized arbiters will be allowed to login in the CFC web site in order to enter the results. The Office will only need to check and approve the submissions. The software will rate tournaments in the proper order irrespective of the order of data entry. A lack of funds is impeding the delivery of the new software but given that timely rating calculations are of the uttermost importance to us, we should strive to find those funds.

### **RESULTS OF VOTING:**

None

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

#### **Motion for Straw Vote 1: (Pierre Dénomée / Michael Barron):**

The popular G/60 time control should be played using the rules of:

- 1) regular;
- 2) rapidplay;
- 3) either regular or rapidplay (but not both) at the organizer's choice;

**Pierre Dénomée:** The problem is that G/60 is considered rapidplay in B1 Section 5 but can be rated as regular according to Section 7 rule 711 . France has solved the issue by introducing G/61 tournaments which are clearly

regular games. It is my understanding that most G/60 played in Canada are played according to the rules of normal games and that they are rated regular. Also, nobody wants to move to G/61.

## **MOTIONS FOR SECOND DISCUSSION:** None

## **MOTIONS FOR FIRST DISCUSSION:**

**Motion 2007-05** Moved Palsson / Doubleday that the CYCC Section of the CFC Handbook be amended as follows:

(Editorial note: the proponents have asked this motion to be discussed with a view to a final vote at the Annual General Meeting)

### **CYCC AMENDED RULES**

1008 entries

Change entry fee to \$225. The Organisers may charge a late fee not exceeding \$50 for entry fees received after the deadline. The CFC executive may authorise an increase in entry fees after 2009 where it is considered appropriate because of inflation or other increases in expenses. Where there are 2 children in any one family, i.e. Brothers and sisters, the entry fee for the third family member shall be 50% and the 4<sup>th</sup> and subsequent members shall be free.

1014

The CFC shall retain 10% of all monies received for administrative expenses such as Visa charges, L.D. calls, office and all other expenses. \$75 of each paid entry shall go to the local organiser for their expenses in providing the playing site, tournament directors and all other expenses. The balance of the monies received shall go to the CYCC fund which shall be used to pay the travel expenses or a portion of the travel expenses of the participants in the WYCC.

Any surplus monies shall be retained by the CFC to cover any losses incurred in the CYCC program for prior years or to be held to fund travel for future CYCC events where there is a shortfall.

The winners of each of the CYCC tournament sections shall be eligible to compete in the world event provide that they meet the minimum rating requirement for their age group. The rating requirement will take effect after the CYCC event has been rated. The CFC executive may waive this rating requirement where the players recent tournament results indicate that the player should clearly have a higher rating than the minimum rating requirement.

Where the fund available to send winners to the WYCC is insufficient to fund 100% of the travel then the amount available shall be divided amongst the participants who will be responsible for making up the shortfall by forwarding the amount of the shortfall to the CFC business office before the airline ticket for that participant is purchased.

1015 Minimum rating requirements

To be eligible to be funded for the world event by the CYCC fund the participants must have a minimum rating as follows:-

Age 8&10 1400

Age 12 Boys 1600 Girls 1400

Age 14 Boys 1800 Girls 1700

Age 16 Boys 2000 Girls 1800

Age 18 Boys 2200 Girls 1900

Where the winner of a CYCC section is not eligible for funding to the world event then the winner shall be awarded a suitable chess education prize in order to encourage the participant to achieve a higher rating. The alternative prize shall be decided by the CFC president after consulting with the tournament organisers.

!002 Format.

Where there are less than eight players for any category then one or more categories shall be combined so

that there are no less than 8 players in the combined category. The combined category shall be decided by the tournament organisers unless directed otherwise by the CFC President who shall have the final authority to rule on this matter. Where the shortfall occurs in the Girls under 18 it is recommended that this section be combined with the girls under 16. If their insufficient numbers in this combined 16 & 18 girls section then the under 14 girls should be included with both these sections. The winner of a combined section who meets the minimum rating requirement shall be eligible for funding to the WYCC. Where there is a combined category then the highest finisher in any age category who did not win the section shall be regarded as the winner for that age category and shall receive any trophy that is available for that category and provided that the minimum rating requirement is met shall be eligible to participate in the WYCC but shall not receive funding for that purpose from the CYCC fund.

**Christopher Mallon:** Even if you are going to use minimum ratings, Iceland is a very strong chess federation and yet the proposal puts our requirements well ABOVE theirs... what was the reasoning with that?

I agree with Patrick though that there should be no limitations on what a participant can win.

**Patrick McDonald:** With Regard to proposed changes to the CYCC rules:  
At this point in time, I see this proposal as very much unnecessary.

The only point that makes sense in this "proposal" is the part that is already a passed addendum. The rates for siblings was voted in at either the Montreal AGM or perhaps the Sackville AGM. (First 2 at full rate, the 3rd sibling at half rate and 4th and more no cost to the family).

First, I would question that the CYCC operates at a loss. Over the past several years, taking the CYCC alone, the cost of the WYCC would only JUST be covered (by my calculations) but once the regionals (that pay a premium to be regionals) and the Provincials that also feed fees into the CYCC system are all taken into account, there should have been a surplus for 4 of the past 5 years.

I have asked repeatedly, every year that I have been Youth coordinator for a full accounting of all these events that feed into the CYCC budget, yet never once had such a full accounting. I can only deduce by that that these events have not really been accounted for and this is likely why you feel that there has been a loss. These numbers should be presented when making the statement that there has usually been a loss. As far as "currently operates in the red" I don't see it. The CFC will be receiving \$100 for each registrant in the CYCC. If we get approx. 150 - 200 kids at the CYCC (which by my information looks like will be at the high point of this) we will have approx. 15,000 to 20,000 out of it. If the plane tickets work out to be about \$1,100 each (when the team flew via Turkey to Georgia last year, the tickets were in the \$1200 range.) then we have an expense of \$14,300 max. (If all representatives attend, we have now 12 sections - the past several years have been only 10 sections - represented plus one coach to pay for flights for. - 13 people max) And this does not take into account any of the other events that lead up to the CYCC.

Why are we increasing the \$50 per player to \$75 per player when we are only having the first CYCC under these new rules this year? We only had this structure of \$50 per player in effect starting with this 2007 CYCC! This means that we have not yet seen what can be done under these rules before proposing changes to them already?

The minimum rating stipulation will only serve to DRASTICALLY reduce the number of kids that will even attend the CYCC in the first place. The WYCC is actually an open tournament. We can send any kids we want to the World event. Since kids are improving so fast the CFC has always held that ratings really don't reflect who our best players are and that is why we use the CYCC to create our team anyway. If we decide not to send a player in a given section some year, we are basically leaving money on the table as the organizers of any WYCC is responsible to pay for all accommodation and meal costs for one representative in each section from each Federation that participates. We should absolutely offer this opportunity to a kid from each section every year. Basically, I really don't see the point in blocking a kid's participation and growing/learning experience in the World event because they don't happen to meet with an arbitrary rating minimum?

When you state: "allow more funding to those that do go" ... does this mean that you are proposing that we may offer more to the kids that go than just their flight? I do not see this anywhere in your proposal.

As the National Federation for Chess in Canada, we have a duty to our kids. If kids do come to an event with the understanding that the first prize is the entry to the World event, then it should be awarded. We absolutely have a surplus in some sections which has always been there to pay for the sections that do have a deficit. We should treat the CYCC as a whole instead of each section separately. Once we start down this slope, we will no longer be fulfilling our mandate of promoting chess to all. We will be in effect killing off the sections such as the girls sections and the senior sections.

Our efforts should be in increasing the CYCC and Youth participation not limiting it. Increasing fees and tightening restrictions to participate are completely opposite to where we should be focussing. Don't forget that our youth players are our future members! Instead of looking at these sorts of proposals, we should be looking for ongoing sponsorships and recognition from government agencies as to the benefits of chess for our youth and thereby having more funding for youth chess and be able to EXPAND our support of our youth. (I have to point here to the great work being done by the OCA with the support of the Trillium Fund)

**Motion 2007-06: Moved (*Pierre Dénomée / Lyle Craver*)** That the CFC Handbook Tournament Rules section be replaced as per Appendix 1 (see below)

(Editorial note: Given a version of this motion has already been defeated it is desired by the mover that this motion be broken into 10 sections to allow Governors to vote for the entire motion or whatever portion of the sub-motions as each Governor deems fit. These are as follows: )

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Motion 2007-06a: Article 1            | (Administrative Rules)                    |
| Motion 2007-06b: Article 2.1 to 2.26  | (Additional Rules for Tournament Play)    |
| Motion 2007-06c: Article 2.27 to 2.29 | (Regulations re Clocks and Time Controls) |
| Motion 2007-06d: Article 3            | (Exceptions to the Normal Rules)          |
| Motion 2007-06e: Article 4            | (Unsportsmanlike Conduct)                 |
| Motion 2007-06f: Article 5            | (Appeals)                                 |
| Motion 2007-06g: Article 6            | (Interior Rules)                          |
| Motion 2007-06h: Article 7            | (Players' Code of Conduct)                |
| Motion 2007-06i: Article 8            | (Penalties Imposed by the Arbiter)        |
| Motion 2007-06j: Article 9            | (FIDE Standards for Digital Chess Clocks) |

The motion has been defeated and those who voted against have requested that the motion be split and reintroduced.

The Tournament Rules used to be in Section 3 of the Handbook but they have been removed without authorisation when we have updated to the new FIDE Laws of Chess (fortunately, I still do have a copy of the original text). A 1977 text is no longer adapted to the 2007 rules, especially the digital clocks. There was a rule stating that if Black is absent, white can start Black's clock without making a move. By doing that on most digital clocks, the clock will believe that the player who is actually playing black has the white pieces because his clock has been started first. Consequently, the clock flag may fail to perform properly at move 40. Furthermore, Black is expected to start White's clock when he arrives without playing a move, the clock will have been pressed twice without playing a move, adding 30 seconds to each players and fooling the move counter that the clock is relying upon to determine if the player has played the required number of moves in the allotted time. The only way to keep White move secret that is compatible with digital clocks is to start White clock and for White to seal his move in an envelope, to start Black's clock and to give the envelope to the arbiter

***Pierre Dénomée*** : The motion is now in three colors. The color of Article 1 denote a text that *has been in the CFC Tournament Rules since at least 1977*. Red indicates either a change to makes the Tournament Rules complies with actual rules or a change to avoid something illogical such as setting a digital clock so that it register six o'clock at the end of the first time control. Yellow indicates useful changes that are less critical than those in red.

## Article 2.4

There was a rule stating that if Black is absent, white can start Black's clock without making a move. By doing that on most digital clocks, the clock will believe that the player who is actually playing black has the white pieces because his clock has been started first. Consequently, the clock flag may fail to perform properly at move 40. Furthermore, Black is expected to start White's clock when he arrives without playing a move, the clock will have been pressed twice without playing a move, adding 30 seconds to each player and fooling the move counter that the clock is relying upon to determine if the player has played the required number of moves in the allotted time. The only way to keep White move secret that is compatible with digital clocks is to start White clock and for White to seal his move in an envelope, to start Black's clock and to give the envelope to the arbiter .

FIDE considers that this is not critical and that White should always play its first move even if Black is absent. The possibility that the move could be transmitted outside of the playing venue to Black is considered to be a little practical signification. The CFC has always considered that this issue is significant so I propose that we continue to do the same.

2.7 The fine has been adjusted for inflation but has anybody ever been fined?

2.22 The Arbiter is often the first person to which newcomers ask questions concerning the CFC. European arbiters examination usually ask questions about the Federation in order to insure a minimal level of knowledge from all arbiters. The representative function is to answer questions about the CFC and to direct toward the appropriate CFC Officer questions that the Arbiter is unable properly handle.

2.25 is an adjustment to existing rules: the software is not always right!

2.26 A provision has been added to cover the unlikely case that nobody has any equipment. Another provision is added for forfeit for lack of equipment in Team tournaments.

2.27 1 is due to the existence of FIDE endorsed clocks. None were endorsed in 1977.

2.27 2 Some inexpensive clocks can only handle one period. It is best to avoid playing with those clocks if Black has a standard clock.

2.27 3 describe a clock that fails to comply with the Laws of Chess. Preventing double flag down means that the clock jams on both sides after the fall of one flag. Playing rapid or blitz with such a clock is extremely troublesome because there will never be a double flag down draw. It is problematic even at move forty. When 30 seconds or more are added, this behaviour is not a problem (it is the default behaviour of the DGT 2000 clock) because the players must record the game at all time so it is practically impossible for a flag fallen at move 36 to remain unnoticed until move 41.

2.27 4 describe a clock built for USCF rules. For FIDE rules, it is of the utmost importance to know which flag fell first (Article 6.12) .

2.27 5 Such a clock may run out of power during a game

2.27 6 A buzzer confer a competitive advantage to the player using it by ensuring that there will never be an unnoticed flag fall. Furthermore, it is noisy and disturbing.

2.28 1 Anybody using an clock should know how to operate it because the arbiter cannot possibly know all the models used in the universe.

2.28 2 Low battery indicator are set at the factory to allow that.

2.28 4 Players should be encouraged to properly set their clocks.

2.29 Is for tournament with a mix of both digital and mechanical clocks when the time control is set for digital clocks.

2.31 gives priority to incremented time controls. Such a time controls gives far less time scrambles, they eliminate the need for a subjective call on Article 10.2 and they also guarantee a much smoother competition because the game is always recorded.

Article 4 synchronises the rules with the CFC Code of Ethics. It also empowers the Arbiter to act on Ethical violations.

4.7 is special, hence the special color. The aim is to stop insidious draws: those games agreed draws without a real fight.

5.2 The actual text greatly encourages the Arbiter to stop the game pending the decision of the Appeal. Once a game is stopped, usually without properly adjourning, the player having the move gets a lot of free time to think on his next move. Groundless Appeal can be strategically made in order to deliberately stop the game. In order to avoid that, the new preferred method is to continue the game under protest unless the arbiter decides otherwise.

5.8 has been taken from Stewart Reuben book.

Article 6 is about the arbiter helping the organiser with the rules of the tournament. Not all organisers need this assistance but stupidity such as a round robin with a cumulative tie break, half a point bye in the last round or G/10 FIDE norm tournament have to be prevented.

The Code of conduct is based on the respect of the rules, the opponent. the arbiter and the organiser.

Article 9 is an addendum to the existing FIDE equipment standard in our Handbook.

**Motion 2007-07: (*Pierre Dénomée* / *Lyle Craver*)**

***That the CFC Handbook section dealing with the TDOCP be revised as per Appendix 2:***

***Lyle Craver:*** I will second this as I think it is worthy of discussion and would like to see this go to the Governors)

***Pierre Dénomée*** Have you noticed that except for IA, we are unable to provide a list of our arbiters. This is an highly abnormal situation. Certifying arbiters is one of the basic duties of an NSO recognised by the COC.

After checking with some fellow COC members, I have come to the conclusion that some changes should be made to the Handbook section 20. The intent of the motion is to replace the section 20 by the following attachment.

The national Federation should not be running the entire certification system. In fact, the contribution from the Provincial Association and the Leagues is fundamental. It is expected that those interested in becoming an arbiter will go to the local League first. Since they will be officiating at the local level, it is expected that the League is the best place to learn. When the arbiter becomes interested in provincial level officiating, the best place to go is likely the Provincial Association. The CFC should concentrate on running the national program as many NTD are still waiting for their certificate.

The motion is also flexible, removing from the Constitution details such as the passing grade, the certification and recertification fee. The TDOCP and Provincial Arbiters Committees will be able to adapt the system to changing needs without resorting to a Constitutional amendment.

Comments on the motion

1. Prerequisite



Non-CFC members can attend a clinic as an observer. As a matter of principle, we should not certify them.

## 2. Mandatory certification

Since the Provincial Associations will be in charge, they will be able to certify anybody who is deemed essential to Chess in the province because he is the only arbiter in a certain area.

## 4 Certification level

NTD requirements have been cut and pasted from the previous version.

## 5 Supervision and evaluation

This is not for policing arbiters but for helping them. The Canadian model of supervision exclude the act of modifying an arbiter's decision. Official conversations between an arbiter and a supervisor are to be conducted in private and away from the players.

## 7 Restrictions

Without restrictions, there will be far less desire to aim for a higher level. Restrictions are an integral part of any Certification program.

## 8 Uniform code of discipline

We have Ethics rules for players but no Ethic rules for those in charge of enforcing the Players' Ethic code. Provincial arbiters' committee

They are the engines pulling the train of Arbiters. The exists in all sports.

## 10 Assigantion

This is a sport Ethic issue. An arbiter should be willing to officiate in a League, choosing the exact match (such as Blue Jays vs Yankees) is an unethical conduct. Furthermore, there is no point in attending a Clinic if all the officiating is always done by the same person. We should ensure that anybody who want to officiate gets a chance to do so. Allowing the assignation rules to be circumvented without penalty is equivalent to no assignation rules at all.

## 11 Arbiters compensation

This by no means prevent volunteer work from arbiter, such a work should be entered as a donation in the tournament financial statements. Compensation is a required complement to assignation: the cost to the organiser, if any, should be the same regardless of the identity of the arbiter.

Requiring that all TD be hired through the Federation is already done by Quebec Billard.

## 12 Arbiters and Organisers duties

This will not only help to run smoother tournaments but it is also required for the administration of the Uniform Code of Discipline because both the arbiter and the organiser can be the cause of inefficiency.

13 is for the smooth integration into the CFC system if numerous competent arbiters already certified by the FQE.

## 14 Organiser certification

Definitively a provincial issue because of the need to know the provincial laws.

15 Cut and paste of the actual Handbook, except for the yellow section.

**Motion 2007-08: (Chris Mallon / Patrick McDonald) Replacement of Executive**

To add the following section to the CFC Handbook:

Under By-Law Two,

*22. Removal of Executive by Governors*

- a) In the event that the Board of Governors wishes to remove a member of the Executive Board from office, a petition by four Governors should be presented in writing to the Secretary requesting the removal.
- b) The Secretary will, within 72 hours, distribute a request to the Board of Governors for an immediate vote by the most expeditious means available. The time limit on the vote will be one week.
- c) The target of the removal motion may in no case vote on the removal motion. The President will not cast a vote except in the event of a tie. If the President is the target, they may not vote and the Vice-President will then vote only in the case of a tie.
- d) The motion is successful if either i) 50% +1 of all current governors other than the target vote in favour, or ii) three-quarters of votes cast are in favour with a minimum of ten votes cast.
- e) If the motion is successful, the Executive member in question immediately ceases to be a member of the Executive, losing any rights granted in the process. They are ineligible for appointment to the Executive for two full years but are eligible to be voted back into the Executive by the Governors at an AGM.
- f) If the motion is not successful, the four Governors who signed the petition are not permitted to petition for further removals before the next AGM.
- g) If the Secretary is the target of the motion, another member of the Executive may be petitioned instead.
- h) In the case of wishing to remove multiple members of the Executive at the same time, all cases must be voted on separately but may be petitioned together.

**Motion 2007-09: (Chris Mallon / Patrick McDonald) Governor Activity Rules**

To add the following section to the CFC Handbook:

Under By-Law Two,

*23. Governor Activity*

- a) Any Governor who does not vote or officially abstain in at least 75% of GL motions in any given year shall not be allowed to be a governor for the following two years.
- b) The President is excluded from this regulation since they may need to maintain impartiality by not voting, while reserving the right to vote should there be a tie.
- c) 1. Life Governors as well as any other Governor who has their status for some specific reason not related to being elected by the Assembly or by their Provincial Association (for example, the Canadian Champion) are excluded from a) but instead follow this rule.  
2. If one of these Governors does not vote in two consecutive series of votes (whether they be by Governor Letter or at the AGM), they are put on an Inactive List which is maintained by the Secretary.  
3. Governors on the Inactive List retain the right to vote, at which time they immediately are removed from the Inactive List.

4. Governors on the Inactive List do not count towards a quorum for as long as they remain on that list

d) Any Governor whose CFC Membership lapses will lose the right to vote, and will not count towards a quorum, until such time as their membership fees are paid.

**Motion 2007-10: (Chris Mallon / Patrick McDonald) Appointments**

Modify By-Law Number Two, section 18:

"... the President may fill the vacancy for the rest of the term by way of appointment, *but must do so within two weeks or send the matter to the Board of Governors for an election.*"

**General Comments from Governors:**

**Phil Haley:** I just forwarded a copy to you of an email from Bob Armstrong re CFC ratings...Could you please forward this to the executive and the governors. Bob is very conscientious and it is sad that the CFC does not have more ardent supporters like Bob. I have not received a reply to my email to you of last week...I am becoming increasingly concerned about the future of the CFC...it is bad enough what is happening but even worse is the total lack of communication, lack of governors letters and lack of response to email...what has happened to the present executive? surely someone on the executive must feel some responsibility to clarify matters...

From: Bob Armstrong [mailto:bobarm@sympatico.ca]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2007 10:13 AM  
To: Michael Barron  
Cc: Barry Thorvardson  
Subject: CFC Ratings Backlog  
Hi again Michael:

I am still concerned, and now as well disappointed, in the CFC's actions to clear up the " Ratings Backlog ". On Sunday, May 13, Les Bunning, CFC lawyer, posted on ChessTalk in response to my posting on the backlog issue, that the CFC would indeed hire " part-time staff " and that the ratings backlog would be cleared up in " a week ". That would have been Sunday May 20.

But on that date, only a very few of the tournaments outstanding that I am aware of in the " Ontario Ratings Backlog " had in fact been rated. There were still outstanding ( that I am aware of ):

1. St. Catherine's recent tournament
2. York Region April Open
3. Toronto April ( Easter ) Open
4. Bayview Games Club # 102
5. Scarborough Spring Swiss
6. a number of tournaments from Thunder Bay
7. a number of tournaments from Kapuskasing
8. the Queen's University Championship

As well I noted on the CFC Website Ratings page that the last update was on Thursday, May 17 - no update on Friday, May 18. And as well there are no scheduled updates now until the normal one on Wednesday, June 6, a full 2 weeks away.

This is not the result I or the CFC members expected, or accept, from the

hiring of part-time staff.

Are the part-time staff being given any hours?? Are the part-time staff doing other CFC tasks, rather than clearing up the " Ratings Backlog " ? What happened to Les Bunnings commitment to clear up the backlog? How many hours were the part-time staff given last week to work on the backlog ? If there are part-time staff, are they not being given any hours for the next 2 weeks? Is ED David Gordon doing nothing on the backlog for the next 2 weeks?

I strongly suggest the CFC:

1. Clarify the number of hours being given to the new part-time staff per week, and confirm whether those hours are currently being solely dedicated to clearing up the " Ratings Backlog ";
2. Assign sufficient hours of part-time staff work over the next 2 weeks to clear up the backlog, and indicate that they are only to work on the " Ratings Backlog ";
3. David Gordon should immediately schedule in over the next 2 weeks a number of rating update days, commensurate with the time he and the part-time staff will be spending on the backlog, so there will be continuous updating until June 6 ( surely they could by then clear up the backlog ).

Since members are to bring their CFC concerns to the CFC via their Governors, I am again asking your assistance in this matter. Would you please forward this to the CFC Executive ASAP? This time I would also appreciate it if you could also send it to the Governors ( I assume you have a group e-mail, and this would not be onerous ), since I believe the Governors need to take up this cause as well, and pressure the Executive to properly deal with this member priority. Anything you personally could do to support this initiative would be greatly appreciated.

Thanks for your help again.

Bob Armstrong, CFC Member

# CFC Tournament rules

## Article 1-Administrative rules

- 1.1 The organisation sponsoring the tournament may appoint a local committee to take charge of the arrangements and has the following powers and duties: to appoint the tournament Chief Arbiter unless assignation is mandatory; to make advance arrangements for the tournament, including playing quarters and any equipment to be supplied; to establish the date and time of each session; to establish the conditions of entry; and to be generally responsible for the observance of all CFC procedures and policies.
- 1.2 For the inclusive dates of his play, each player in the tournament must be a CFC member in good standing.
- 1.3 Play shall be governed by the Laws, by the FIDE interpretations of the Laws, by the CFC Tournament Rules and Pairing Rules, and by all CFC procedures and policies.

## Article 2-Additional rules for tournament play

- 2.1 All games must be played in the tournament rooms on the day and at the times specified by the tournament organisers, unless the Chief arbiter makes or accepts other arrangements (e.g., a first-round game may be arranged to be played in advance of the start of a tournament).
- 2.2 If a player wishes to adjust pieces on their squares when his opponent is absent and an arbiter is not available, he may ask a spectator or a player who is not on the move to witness the adjustment. It is only the player whose turn it is to move who may adjust pieces on their squares. If the other player adjusts his own or his opponent's pieces, he may be penalised at the discretion of the arbiter.
- 2.3 The Chief arbiter should stipulate at the beginning of the tournament the direction the clocks are to face, and the players should seat themselves so that the clocks are to the right of the players with the black pieces. For team tournaments, the Chief arbiter is free to place the clocks and the players as he see fit. Mechanical clocks should be set so that each unit will register six o'clock when the first time control expires, one minute being added to the time control when the clocks are set to compensate of any possible minor defects in the accuracy of the clocks of their flags. The players (and when possible, the arbiter) should inspect the clock and its flags for evident defects before and during play.
- 2.4 When the round begins, the clock of each player with the white pieces is started by his opponent, if the latter is present or by an official if both players are absent. If White is present and Black is absent, White must immediately start his own clock, but need not make his first move. White can write his move on his scoresheet, put the scoresheet in a sealed envelope and give it to the Arbiter. When Black arrives, he stops his own clock and summons the Arbiter; The Arbiter then makes the

sealed move on the chessboard. Although White is not required to do so, he may, after starting his own clock, make his first move before his opponent arrives.

- 2.5 When a clock is not available at the beginning of the round, but is brought or obtained later, the following rules apply:
- (a) If both players are present when the round begins, they start play immediately. If a clock becomes available later, the elapsed time of the round is divided equally between the two players.
  - (b) If one player is absent when the round begins, he is charged with the elapsed time of the round up to the moment of his arrival. The time from his arrival until a clock becomes available is divided equally between the two players.
  - (c) If both players are absent when the round begins, the player with the white men is charged with the elapsed time of the round up to the moment of his arrival. If his opponent arrives still later, he is charged with the difference between White's arrival time and his own. White makes his first move as soon as he arrives, and the time from then until a clock becomes available is divided equally between the two players.
- 2.6 With the exception of any games postponed by consent of the Chief arbiter, all the games of each round must start promptly at the time specified (CFC Tournament Rule Art. 2.1). If feasible, the arbiter should give five minutes warning, then announce that play must begin.
- 2.7 Any player who does not notify an arbiter in advance that he will be unable to play in any round and then defaults the game by not appearing within one hour after the starting time, unless the rules of the competition specify or the arbiter decides otherwise (FIDE Article 6.6) may be fined the sum of \$50 payable to the sponsoring organisation. The player should not be permitted to continue play in the tournament and may be barred by the sponsoring organisation from any of its tournaments until the fine is paid.
- 2.8 In any game without a clock at the beginning of the round, a player loses by default if he does not arrive within one hour after the time specified for the start of play (unless the rules of the competition specify or the arbiter decides otherwise). If neither player arrives within one hour the game is lost by both (FIDE Laws of Chess Article 6.6)
- 2.9 In a rated tournament, any participant who quits the tournament or who is absent for a round of the tournament without previously informing the arbiter is to be considered as having actually played and lost the game, the silence before the default is to be interpreted as giving consent to losing the appropriate number of rating points. The only exception to this rule is where two players who default in a particular round are paired against each other.
- 2.10 The name of every defaulting player will be removed from the pairing list for subsequent rounds. However, a player can, on request, be reinstated on the list after a single default so long as the request is made before the pairing of the round following the default have been made public
- 2.11 When a player's flag falls and it is not clear that he has made the prescribed number of moves, an arbiter, if not already present, is summoned; the arbiter stops both clocks, determines whether the prescribed number of moves has been made, and makes the appropriate ruling.
- 2.12 In the absence of an evident defect, the falling of a clock's flag and the time on the clock indicates the moment at which the player's time control period expires. As the players (and, when possible, the arbiter) should have inspected the clock and its flag for evident defects before and during play, and as one minute has been added (this addition is permitted for mechanical clocks only) to the time control to compensate for any possible minor defects in the accuracy of the clocks, a claim that a flag has fallen prematurely should be accepted only if there is a clear space between the minute hand and the left side of the hour marker when the flag falls.

- 2.13 If the end of a time control period will not be marked by a flag fall because of absence of a flag or a defective flag, the time control period is deemed to have expired when there is a clear space between the clockwise side of the appropriate dial marker and the minute hand.
- 2.14 **For mechanical clocks only:** when any secondary time-control period is less than one hour, both clocks should be reset by moving them forward one hour, less the secondary time control. If the players are allowed to reset the clock themselves at the end of each time control period or when both players have made the specified number of moves in each time control period, the Chief arbiter must specify the exact procedure to be used in a written and also, whenever possible, oral announcement in advance of the first round.
- 2.15 If the arbiter rules that no time is available to complete a game which must be reinstated or replayed under Article 7 of the FIDE Laws of Chess, he may take whatever action he deems appropriate.
- 2.16 Each player is required to record the moves of the game in a manner specified in Article 8.1 on the scoresheet provided or approved by the tournament organiser.
- 2.17 Except as provided the Laws of Chess no person may act as the deputy of the player in recording moves.
- 2.18 In general, the tournament arbiter may use his discretionary powers to accommodate the rules to the special needs of a handicapped player. However, he must inform each opponent of the handicapped player, before the start of the game, of any such accommodations of the rules he has granted and must ensure that such accommodations do not confer any undue advantage on the handicapped player with respect to his opponent, who must be granted similar accommodations if he requests them.
- 2.19 When a game is completed, the result must immediately be registered officially with the arbiter or his designee. The manner in which the official registration is accomplished (by signed scoresheets, entering the result on a pairing sheet, etc.) is at the arbiter's discretion.
- 2.20 Obvious intoxication from abuse of alcohol or drugs shall be considered to be a diminution of a good playing environment and shall be sufficient reason to declare the game forfeited or to eject the offending player from the event, or both.
- 2.21 During playing sessions players with games in progress should not leave the playing room for extended periods without first informing the arbiter.
- 2.22 **The Arbiter is a representative of the CFC on the tournament site.** He is responsible for the technical management of the tournament and is bound by the Laws of Chess, by the official interpretations of the Laws, by the CFC Tournament Rules and Pairing Rules, and by all CFC procedures and policies.
- 2.23 The Chief arbiter's duties and powers normally include the following: to appoint assistants of various types as required to perform his duties, to accept and list entries, to establish suitable conditions of play and to announce them to the participants, to collect scores and tabulate results, and to report results to the sponsoring organisation and the CFC for the official record.
- 2.24 The Chief arbiter may delegate any of his duties to assistants, but he is not thereby relieved of responsibility for their correct performance. An arbiter, as he must have absolute objectivity, and must be able to devote his full attention to his duties as arbiter, should not, in principle, be a player in any tournament he directs. At the lowest level of tournament, the arbiter may be a player if necessary, but an arbiter who is not a player in the tournament is recommended wherever possible. The chief arbiter is strictly prohibited from being a player in any tournament above the lowest level.
- 2.25 **Any pairing software used in a tournament is just an aid to pairing: the Chief Arbiter is always responsible for all pairings including those made by a computer or by any Deputy Arbiter which is part of his team.**

2.26 The standards of chess equipment of FIDE tournaments are applicable also to CFC tournaments. Unless the organisers have provided standard equipment or designated preferred equipment for all players, Black has his choice of any equipment conforming to these standards. If Black is absent when the round begins and White arrives first, White has the choice. The opponent may not challenge the choice as not conforming unless he can provide or obtain equipment which does conform, or conforms more nearly to these standards. *If neither player has standard equipment, the game shall be played using the one that is closest to the standard. A game not played because neither player has any equipment shall be scored as zero for both players and shall not be rated. In a Swiss tournament, the colour assigned for this game does not count and the players are not considered to have been paired together. Questionable cases are left to the discretion of the arbiter whose decision shall be final. In team competitions, forfeits by lack of equipment must occur on the highest numbered boards; for example, if in a team competition on six boards, only four complete equipment are available, the forfeits must be on board number 5 and 6. Furthermore, in Leagues in which there is a visiting team and a local team, the local team is responsible for providing all the equipment. The local team shall lose by forfeit all matches cancelled for lack of equipment.*

## 2.27 CFC Standards of Equipment for Chess Clock

The following rule states some exception from the general rules that Black has the choice of equipment.

1. Any Chess clock officially endorsed by FIDE is also recognised by the CFC. The game should be played with a FIDE endorsed clock if one is available.
2. A digital clock that can be used to play a game without being reprogrammed during the game has priority.
3. A digital clock that forbids the double fall of the flag when it is used without incrementation is not standard but tolerated in tournament. In order to avoid playing with such a clock, the player having the White piece can use any clock, even a mechanical one. In case of a claim of draw for double flag down, the arbiter shall use his best judgement to decide if the two flags would have been down if the clock have continued to run and doubtful cases shall be rule as drawn. Player using non standard clock should be aware of the risk they are taking.
4. A digital clock incapable of displaying which flag fell first is not standard but tolerated in competition. The player having the white pieces can refuse to play with such a clock if he can supply a digital clock having this capability.
5. A digital chess clock not equipped of a low battery indicator is not standard but tolerated in competition. In order to avoid playing with such a clock, the player having the White piece can use any clock, even a mechanical one.
6. Buzzer, if any, must be deactivated at all time. If the buzzer cannot be turned off, the clock cannot be used in competition (try to imagine 130 clocks rigging at move 40). The arbiter shall use his best judgement to deal with the problem of a rigging clock. Nevertheless, the opponent shall receive at least 2 minutes extra thinking time for the disturbance which means that he will not lose the game on time because of the buzzer.

## 2.28 Rules for playing with digital clocks

1. The player using a digital clock must know how to operate it. The arbiter can forfeit a player who tries to evade a time penalty by refusing to disclose his clock mode of operation.
2. If the low battery indicator is on, a game shall not begin with this clock but the game shall continue if the indicator become active after the game has begun.
3. Digital clock supplied by the organiser are programmed by an arbiter, other clock are programmed by the players unless the arbiter decides otherwise.
4. A player is responsible for all problems caused by his failure to properly program his clock.

## 2.29 Equivalence of time control



*For all CFC rated tournament the following time controls are considered equivalent. The intent of the rule is to standardise tournaments in which some players have digital clocks whereas other have mechanical and to enable players with mechanical clocks to register in tournaments with incremental time control.*

Eventually, only digital clocks will be used in all tournaments but a transition period is required. Any tournament may choose to use another equivalence if it is announced in advance in all tournament publicity. It is also perfectly acceptable to organise a tournament requiring digital clocks on all boards.

| <b><i>Traditional time control</i></b>                              | <b><i>equivalent time control</i></b>   |
|---|---|
| 40 moves/2h followed by<br>20 moves/1h followed by<br>1 hour SD     | 40 moves/ 100 minutes<br>20 moves/50 minutes<br>40 minutes +30 seconds per move |
| 40 moves/2h followed by<br>20 moves/1h followed by<br>30 minutes SD | 40 moves/ 100 minutes<br>20 moves/50 minutes<br>10 minutes +30 seconds per move |
| 40 moves/2h followed by<br>1 hour SD                                | 40 moves/100 minutes<br>40 minutes +30 seconds per move                         |
| 30 moves/1h30 followed by<br>1 hour SD                              | 30 moves/1h15 minutes<br>40 minutes +30 seconds per move                        |
| 61 minutes SD (standard game)                                       | 51 minutes SD+10 seconds per move   |
| 60 minutes SD (rapidplay)   | 50 minutes SD+10 seconds per move   |
| 30 minutes SD (rapidplay)   | 20 minutes SD+10 seconds per move   |
| 25 minutes SD (rapidplay)   | 15 minutes SD+10 seconds per move   |

**2.30** If the traditional time control is not in this table proceed as follow

- 1) For any non sudden death time control, subtract the whole extra time given by the increment. Example: 20 move en 1:00h becomes: 20 moves in 50 minutes with the addition of 30 seconds after each move ( $1:00h - 20 \times 30s = 50 \text{ minutes}$ ).
- 2) For a sudden death time control in a regular game, assume that the game will last 80 moves. Example: 40 moves in 2 hours followed by one hour sudden death. This will give 40 moves in 100 minutes ( $100 \text{ minutes} + 40 \times 30s = 120 \text{ minutes} = 2 \text{ hours}$ ). If we assume that the game will last 80 moves, the players will need to play 40 moves in the last time control.  $40 \times 30 \text{ seconds}$  is 20 minutes. 1 hours-20 minutes is 40 minutes. The final time control will be 40 moves in 100 minutes followed by the entire game in 40 minutes with the addition of 30 seconds from move one. If this formula lead to non-sense, the organiser is free to use his best judgement to establish an equivalent time control.
- 3) For rapidplay, subtract 10 minutes from the total and add 10 seconds per move.

**2.31** Time control to be used

*If any of the players has a standard chess clock capable of incrementation, the use of the equivalent time control is mandatory. The players are not permitted to dispense themselves from this*

*requirement; the increment must be used if the clock has the capability even if both players prefer traditional timing. The TDOCP may permit a tournament to ban incrementation, but the permission must be asked at least one month in advance and the fact must be mentioned in all tournament publicity.*

### Article 3-Exceptions to the normal rules

- 3.1 The following exception to normal procedure applies only to large tournaments in which it is impossible to supervise play in all games: infringements of Articles 4.3 and 4.4 must be claimed by the opponent unless an arbiter witnesses a violation.
- 3.2 VARIATION. In a tournament with a large number of players, if the arbiter believes that the Tournament Rules of article 2.5 cannot be applied, the following procedure may be substituted for 2.5. However, written, and also, whenever possible, oral announcement must be made in advance of the first round and the same procedure must be used for all games.
- No player may subtract time from a late opponent without starting a clock. If a clock becomes available after the beginning of the round, the arbiter may require that the elapsed time of the round be divided equally between the two players.
- (a) If both players are present when the round begins, they start play immediately.
  - (b) If one player is absent when the round begins, play starts when the player who is present starts the clock he has brought or obtained. If he has not brought a clock and is unable to obtain one, play does not start until the opponent arrives.
  - (c) If both players are absent when the round begins, play starts when the first player arrives and starts the clock he has brought or obtained. If he has not brought a clock and is unable to obtain one, play does not start until the opponent arrives.
- 3.3 In a large tournament, if it is impractical for the arbiter to announce the beginning of a round, players should be urged, in advance, to begin their games promptly by starting their opponents' clocks. The players should also be informed that no permission is needed to start games at the specified time if the pairings have been posted.
- 3.4 The following exception to normal procedure applies only to large tournaments in which it is impossible to supervise play in all games: infringements of the Laws on Recording of Games (FIDE Laws of Chess Article 8.1) must be claimed by the opponent unless the arbiter witnesses a violation.
- 3.5 The following exception to normal procedure applies only to large tournaments in which it is impossible to supervise play in all games; completion of scoresheets after the time control when a player, extremely pressed for time, has obviously been unable to meet the requirements of the FIDE Laws of Chess Article 8.1, is optional at the discretion of the arbiter.
- 3.6 A player who does not conform to the specifications of the FIDE Laws of Chess Article 9.1 when proposing a draw by agreement (FIDE Laws of Chess Article 9.1) is breaking the Laws of Chess and should be penalised or warned at the discretion of the arbiter.

## Article 4-Unsportsmanlike conduct

- 4.1 It is *unethical and unsportsmanlike* to agree to a draw before a serious contest has begun. The same is true of all agreements to prearrange game results. In cases of clear violations of the *moral principles of the game*, an arbiter should impose penalties at his discretion.
- 4.2 It is *unethical and unsportsmanlike* to deliberately loose a game to lower your rating.
- 4.3 It is *unethical and unsportsmanlike* to deliberately loose a game for payment.
- 4.4 It is *unethical and unsportsmanlike* to lie on your rating in order to register in a tournament or a section of a tournament reserved to players of lower rating or for any other reason.
- 4.5 It is *unethical and unsportsmanlike* to cheat in a game of chess by illegally giving, receiving, offering, or soliciting advice; or by consulting written sources; or by tampering with clocks; or by using a computer or in any other manner.
- 4.6 The player who does not wish to continue a lost game and leaves without being courteous enough to resign or to notify the arbiter may be severely penalised, at the discretion of a arbiter, for poor sportsmanship.
- 4.7 With the permission of the Chief Arbiter and with prior approval from the CFC, in order to prevent insidious draws, the organiser may uses any of the following or a combination of them
- (a) require a minimum number of moves to be played before a draw can be proposed by the players;
  - (b) require a minimum time of play before a draw can be proposed by a player;
  - (c) require that all proposition of a draw be approved by the Chief Arbiter. If the Chief Arbiter refuses the draw, the game must continue.

## Article 5-Appeals

- 5.1 A player may appeal any ruling made by the chief arbiter or one of his assistants, provided that the appeal is promptly made after the ruling before the appellant completes another move.
- 5.2 The players must continue the game according to the arbiter's instructions. Usually, the chief arbiter will directs that play continue before the appeal is heard, the appellant must continue play "under protest", i.e. without prejudice to his appeal regardless of the outcome of further play. If the appellant wins the game, the appeal is moot. A game will be interrupted pending the result of an Appeal only in exceptional circumstances left to the appreciation of the arbiter.
- 5.3 All appeals must be put in writing within 1/2 hour of the end of the game through the chief arbiter. Any appeal not meeting these requirements is void.
- 5.4 If the chief arbiter believes that the appeal is justified, he may reverse or modify any previous decision made by himself or one of his assistants. If he does not believe that the appeal is justified and so advises the appellant, who nevertheless wishes to pursue the appeal further:
- 5.5 When an appeals committee cannot meet without disturbing the orderly progress of the tournament or when the interior rule does not mandate a local appeal committee, the chief arbiter hears and rules upon the appeal.

- 5.6 Otherwise, the arbiter must appoint a committee of three persons (preferably including at least two CFC Certified Arbiters) to which to refer the appeal, as specified in 5.7. The committee must consist of disinterested persons and be selected in consultation with the appellant and his opponent. If the committee finds that the appeal is clearly groundless, it may authorise the arbiter to penalise the player for that reason. The committee may either specify the penalty or leave it to the arbiter's final determination.
- 5.7 When an appeals committee hears an appeal, all persons except the members of that committee, the chief arbiter, the appellant, his opponent, and the testifying witnesses should be excluded from the hearing. When the committee hears an appeal it must give pre-eminent weight to the arbiter's testimony as to anything said or done in this presence. The appeals committee's decision should be transmitted in writing to the arbiter and signed by the committee members.
- 5.8 An Appeal Committee has great powers that can certainly go beyond the letters of the Laws of Chess in seeking a fair solution.

## Article 6-Interior rules

- 6.1 Interior rules are all the extra regulations applying to a single tournament such as time control, playing schedule, availability of byes...
- 6.2 The responsibility for producing the interior rules rest with the Organiser, the Chief Arbiter is acting as a technical assistant.

## Article 7-Player's Code of Conduct

### **Respect of the rules**

- Games shall be played according to the FIDE Laws of Chess and the CFC Tournament Rules and all CFC procedures and policies. Rules must be applied in good faith.
- The result of a game must be acquired loyally without breaking the sport ethics and cannot be the result of any negotiation. Any behaviour that is harmful to the opponent or that could bring the sport of Chess into disrepute is strictly prohibited.
- The offer of a draw is always unconditional. Draw by agreement cannot occur for reasons outside of the sport context and must occur after a real fight on the chessboard.

### **Respect of the opponent**

- Respect of the opponent implies that a player must refrain from playing using illegal means, outside sources of information or cheating.
- It is forbidden to distract or annoy the opponent in any manner whatsoever.
- It is mandatory to speak to the opponent in a courteous and polite manner.

### **Respect or the arbiter**

- By participating in a CFC rated event, the players accept to play under the authority of an arbiter having all the necessary authority to enforce the rules.
- The arbiter is an official representative of the CFC of the tournament site. He is responsible for the enforcement of the rules and for ensuring good sportsmanship of the participants.
- Faced with an arbiter's ruling during play, a player must obey. He may appeal the ruling orally but should put the appeal in writing as soon as possible. The details on how to appeal shall be given by an arbiter.
- Each player must concur to the application of the rules.

## Respect of the organiser

- Each player must concur to the good organisation of the competition.
- The registration in a tournament implies the acceptance of the internal rules of this tournament that must be posted in the playing area.
- A claim against the organiser will be accepted only if it is formulated in a correct manner.

## Penalties

Any player who fails to abide by this Code of conduct may receive penalties from the arbiter and disciplinary penalties from the CFC, or one of its provincial affiliates.

### Article 8-Penalties imposed by an arbiter

8.1 In case of a dispute, the arbiter should make every effort to reach a resolution of the matter by informal, conciliatory means before he resorts to the exercise of his formal discretionary power to penalize. If such means fail, where penalties are not specifically defined by the FIDE Laws of Chess or the Tournament Rules, the director has discretionary power to impose penalties as follows for infractions and maintenance of discipline:

- a) issue a formal warning;
- b) issue a formal written warning;
- c) fine a player any amount not to exceed \$100.00 payable to the sponsoring organization (the player should not be permitted to continue play in the tournament and may be barred by the sponsoring organization from any of its tournaments until the fine is paid);
- d) advance the time on a player's clock or give his opponent additional time;
- e) cancel a game and rule that a new game be played in its stead;
- f) declare a game lost by a player and won by his opponent;
- g) declare a game lost by both players;
- h) expel a player from the tournament.

### Article 9-FIDE Standards for digital Chess clocks

The requirements for electronic clocks are given below.

1. Clocks must function in full accordance with the FIDE laws of chess.
2. Clocks must function in a way that the use of different clock types (analogue and digital) can be combined in one tournament.
3. Special attention should be given to the correct implementation of passing time controls.
- a. Both players should have the same amount of time for the same amount of moves.
- b. In display should at all times be visible the time that is available to complete a player's next move.
4. Clocks must be well designed according to modern electronic standards.
5. Clocks must contain a short user manual on the clock.
6. For battery powered clocks, a low-battery indication is required.
7. In case of a low-battery indication, a clock must continue to function flawlessly for at least 10 hours.
8. Displays must be legible from a distance of at least 3.5. meters (Formula: display height x 300, taking in account a straight line of vision towards the display).
9. From at least a 10 meter distance a player must have a clearly visible indication which clock is running.

10. In case of passing a time control, a “flag” must give clear signal which player passed the time limit first.
11. In case of accumulative or delay timing systems, the clock should not add any additional time if a player passed the last time control.
12. It must be impossible to erase or change the data in display with a simple manipulation.
13. In case of e.g. time penalties, it must be possible that time and move counter corrections are executed within 60 seconds.

## **Appendix 2:**

# ***CFC Arbiters and Organisers Certification program***

## ***1 Prerequisite***

Only CFC members in good standing can be certified as arbiter. Level one candidates shall be at least 16 years old and for the higher levels, a minimum age of 18 year old is required. Only CFC members in good standing can act as arbiters in CFC rated tournaments. A Youth Arbiter title can be created in each province but as a rule, the Youth Arbiter must be working under the supervision of a certified arbiter for rated tournaments. There is no age restriction for Youth Arbiter.

## ***2 Mandatory certification***

Certification at the Provincial level or higher is required for the Chief arbiter of any FIDE rated tournament. Any CFC member acting as an arbiter without being certified will be referred to the ethic Committee or the PAC for further actions.

Beginning July 1<sup>st</sup> 2010, certification will be required of all arbiters of CFC rated events. Provincial Associations are free to impose mandatory certification as soon as they are ready.

All arbiters are required to be CFC members in good standing. If an arbiter's membership is expired, he can no longer act as an arbiter in CFC rated events. Such arbiter becomes inactive and can become active again by joining the CFC.

## ***3 Financial rules***

The TDOCP shall be run from the income made from clinics, certification and recertification cost; no CFC money shall be used for the program.

## ***4 Certification level***

The CFC shall run a national program for national Arbiters. The Provincial Association shall run a provincial program for provincial arbiters, The regional association (usually called a League) shall be responsible for all lower arbiters. The number of levels under the provincial level is left to the appreciation of the Provincial Association.

A National Arbiter an arbiter who has directed at least one major National or International tournament or several minor National tournaments. The title is also granted to Canadian FA and IA.

## ***5 Supervision and evaluation***

It is the responsibility if the TDOCP to ensure the improvement of abilities of the arbiters and to discipline incompetent arbiters.

Supervision is a process by which an arbiter is evaluated and receives feedback on its performance with the intent of improvement of the supervised arbiter.

Evaluation is a process by which the performance of an arbiter is evaluated, starting from a 100% score and accumulating demerits. Evaluation is used to justify promotion in level, demotion in level and temporary or permanent decertification. An evaluator may censure an arbiter; any such censure is to be forwarded to the TDOCP. Each censure will be analysed by the TDOCP and if it is considered serious, it could lead to penalties imposed under the uniform code of discipline.

Supervision and evaluation can be done at the request of the chair of the TDOCP, or the Provincial or Regional Supervisor on their territory only. Any cost is to be bare by the organisation that has requested the supervision or the evaluation. No arbiter can refused to be supervised or evaluated. While discharging his their duties, a supervisor can access all tournament and arbiter's rooms. A supervisor who witness a gross violation of FIDE Rules, of any CFC Tournament Rules or of any CFC Rules can take whatever action he deems necessary to ensure that this violation will cease swiftly.

## ***6 Clinics***

The PAC in each province is responsible for the organisation of the Clinics in the province. The CFC shall organise at least

one clinic per year at the Canadian Open.

## 7 Restrictions

The level of certification of the arbiter determine in which tournaments he is allowed to act as the Chief Arbiter. Forbidden and permitted are cumulative: if something is forbidden to a level it is automatically forbidden to all inferior levels and if something is permitted to a level, it is automatically permitted to all superior levels. Those restrictions pertain only to the Chief Arbiter, the other arbiters of the team, if any, can be of any level.

| Level                 | Permitted  | Forbidden                                      | Evaluation <sup>1</sup> | Supervision <sup>2</sup>           |
|-----------------------|--|--|-------------------------|------------------------------------|
| International Arbiter | All Chess competitions                               | Nothing  | International arbiter   | International arbiter              |
| FIDE Arbiter          | All national chess and minor FIDE rated competitions | Nothing  | National arbiter        | FIDE arbiters                      |
| National Arbiter      | Same as FIDE arbiter                                 | Tournaments with norm possibility <sup>3</sup> | Provincial arbiters     | National arbiters                  |
| Provincial Arbiter    | All provincial events                                | National events.                               | Regional arbiter        | Provincial arbiter                 |
| Other Arbiters        | As chosen by the Provincial Association.             | National events, provincial events             | None                    | Lower level as set by the Province |

## 8 Uniform code of discipline

This applies to all arbiters and lists the acts that could lead to sanctions by the TDOCP or the Provincial Association for the lower levels.

Suspension and revocation of an Arbiter's certification is the sole responsibility of the TDOCP. Complaints filed with the ethic commission and asking for such a suspension or revocation shall be transferred to the TDOCP, a complaint filed with a Provincial Affiliate or a League is null and void.

Interdiction to act as an arbiter or an organiser can be pronounced by the Provincial Affiliates and by any of its subdivision (usually called Leagues). The interdiction shall be limited to the territory of aforementioned organisations. Furthermore, such an interdiction is not equivalent to a suspension or a revocation of the arbiter's certification.

Here follows a description of the four primary causes for arbiter's certification suspension and revocation.

### Technical Incompetence

In cases in which technical incompetence on the part of the arbiter has been demonstrated, the TDOCP will normally impose additional testing requirements for the arbiter to maintain his or her level of certification. In extreme cases the TDOCP may demote the arbiter's level of certification or suspend his or her certification until greater competence is demonstrated. *Technical incompetence is typically demonstrated by gross misapplication of FIDE and CFC rules.*

### Partiality

In cases in which partiality on the part of the arbiter has been demonstrated, the TDOCP will normally impose a suspension of directing privileges for a period not less than three months and not greater than three years. In extreme cases the TDOCP

<sup>1</sup> The highest level of arbiter that can be evaluated.

<sup>2</sup> The highest level of arbiter that can be supervised.

<sup>3</sup> Such a tournament can be done under the supervision of an International arbiter only. The CFC will permit Provincial, National and FIDE Arbiters to officiate under supervision in this kind of events. "Supervised by an international arbiter" means that an IA must at least be available to answer questions over the phone for the entire duration of the tournament.



may pronounce the permanent decertification.

Examples of partiality include bribery, fraudulent reports, deliberately unfair pairing or scoring practices, deliberately inconsistent rules enforcement, and even minor irregularities that benefit the arbiter as a player in an event in which he or she is eligible for a prize typically demonstrates partiality.

### **Professional Misconduct**

In cases in which professional misconduct on the part of the arbiter has been demonstrated and reconciliation between the complainant and the arbiter cannot be achieved, the TDOCP will normally issue a warning to the arbiter. Extreme cases of professional misconduct, especially when representing the CFC at a national tournament, may warrant certification demotion or suspension. *Professional misconduct is typically demonstrated by denigration of a player, arrogance, rude behaviour, and failure to respond to official inquiries by the executive director, his or her designee, or the TDOCP.*

### **Inefficiency**

In cases in which inefficiency has been demonstrated as the cause of a poorly directed tournament, the TDOCP will normally issue a warning to the arbiter. In extreme cases certification may be suspended until the arbiter demonstrates improved procedural techniques. *Inefficiency is typically demonstrated by lack of adherence to an announced tournament schedule, untimely or inaccurate posting of pairings and results, and untimely or inaccurate calculation of tournament-prize distributions.*

## **9 Provincial arbiters' committee (PAC)**

In each affiliated province a provincial arbiters' committee shall be instituted. It should be placed under the authority of the Provincial Association or under the authority of the TDOCP where no affiliated Provincial Association exists. The chair of the PAC shall be known as the Provincial Supervisor. Members of the PAC shall be named by the Provincial Association according to their Constitution and bylaws. The provinces are free to delegate PAC duties to an association representing the arbiters of the province. Once this delegation has occurred, the organisations representing the arbiters can continue to act as the PAC even if the Provincial Association is no longer affiliated.

The PAC must act in accordance with all TDOCP rules. The powers and responsibilities of the PAC are the following

- ❖ Promote arbitration in the province
- ❖ Define all the levels under provincial, write and mark examinations for them.
- ❖ Organise arbiters' clinics in the province
- ❖ Organise examination session in the province and grade examinations
- ❖ Assign arbiters to events in the province
- ❖ File with the CFC a formal request of opposition of rating for events in which anybody has circumvented the provincial or national assignment rules.
- ❖ File with the CFC a formal request of opposition of rating for events in which anybody has failed to comply with any provincial rule pertaining to the arbitration of rated Chess tournaments.
- ❖ Supervise and evaluate arbiters in the province. All negative reports are to be sent to the TDOCP for further actions.

The provincial Supervisor can issue a derogation enabling an arbiter assisted by a computer program to act as higher level arbiter for a local Swiss tournament. The Provincial Supervisor is the only person that can issue this derogation and this issuance is done under his sole responsibility.

The PAC may create Regional Arbiters' Committees (RAC) as it sees fit and it can delegate to them some of his powers. If there is no RAC in a region, the Provincial Supervisor shall act as the Regional Supervisor in this region.

## **10 Assignment**

As a general rule, arbiters should be assigned to competitions (as it is already the case in all other sports) by a suitable person. It is not only unethical for an arbiter to choose its competitions, it is also unfair because it results in a situation in which only a small number of persons have the chance to act as arbiters. *Competitions in which the assignment rules have been circumvented will not be rated. Furthermore, any arbiter accepting to officiate in a competition for which assignment is mandatory without being properly assigned shall receive an official censure. On the second offence, the arbiter shall be*

*prosecuted for professional misconduct by the TDOCP.*

**10.1      *International events***

International events are any events that are FIDE rated and which are opened to foreign players. If they do not fall in any other category, the arbiters shall be assigned by the TDOCP committee after consultation with the relevant Provincial Supervisor

For minor International events mostly restricted to the players of a single province, the PAC shall assign the arbiter.

**10.2      *National events***

A National event is any event that the CFC Executive has decided to consider as such, currently they are the Canadian Open, the Canadian Closed, The Canadian Woman Closed, the CYCC and the Canadian Junior. The Chief Arbiter of a national tournament shall be appointed by the CFC president after a recommendation by the TDOCP. Other arbiters shall be selected from a list prepared by the Provincial Supervisor of the province in which the tournament is going to be played. If the number of arbiters would be insufficient, the Provincial Supervisors of the neighbouring provinces shall be asked to supply a list of arbiters.

**10.3      *Provincial events***

A Provincial event is any event that awards a provincial Championship recognised by the CFC<sup>4</sup>. Any open provincial Championship is also considered to be a Provincial event. The Provincial Association may decide that any non-National event is a Provincial event.

The Chief Arbiter of a provincial event shall be appointed by the person designated for assignation by the PAC. Other arbiters shall be selected from a list prepared by the Regional Supervisor of the region in which the tournament is going to be played. If the number of arbiters would be insufficient, the Regional Supervisors of the neighbouring regions shall be asked to supply a list of arbiters.

**10.4      *Regional events*<sup>5</sup>**

A regional event is any event that awards a regional Championship recognised by the relevant Provincial Association and leading to a qualification for the relevant Provincial Championship.

All the arbiters of a regional tournament shall be appointed by the Regional Supervisor of the region in which the tournament is going to be played. If the number of arbiters would be insufficient, the Regional Supervisors of the neighbouring regions shall be asked to supply a list of Arbiters.

**10.5      *Other events***

For all other events, there is no compelling reason to assign unless the Provoncial Association decides otherwise.

## ***11 Arbiter's compensation***

*Each Provincial Association shall regulate the compensation given to the arbiters officiating in the province.*<sup>6</sup> As a general rule, arbiter's compensation is mandatory<sup>7</sup>. The TDOCP committee shall establish a default compensation that is to be used in any province which has not adopted a provincial plan. An arbiter shall not send the tournament report to the CFC until he has been fully paid. It is not permitted for an arbiter to ask more then the approved official compensation.

---

<sup>4</sup> This means that the provincial champion is qualified for a national championship.

<sup>5</sup> Some regions have no League assigned to them.

<sup>6</sup> It has already been said in the past that it would be better that this be left to the provinces because the cost of living varies greatly across Canada.

<sup>7</sup> Each arbiter is free to give back his honorarium, but this shall be entered in the tournament budget as a donation. The more donations to the cause of Chess, the better we look.

A Provincial Association may require that all arbiters be hired through the Provincial Association. In this case, the organiser pays the Provincial Association which pays the arbiter.

### **11.1      *Arbiters and Organisers duties***

#### **Obligations of the arbiter**

- To respect and to ensure that everyone respect the **FIDE Laws of Chess the CFC Tournament rules** and all the CFC procedures and policies.
- To assume a **pedagogical role** whenever necessary.
- In cooperation with the organiser, create a **Local Appeal Committee** if one is going to be used. This committee shall have an odd number of members and shall have regular members as well as alternate members.
- Officiate with calm in a spirit of **moderation, opening and conciliation** in conformity to FIDE principles.
- Act as a **technical advisor** before the beginning of the tournament, for example for the writing of any tournament specific supplementary rules.
- Insure **material and moral comfort of the players** by bringing to the attention of the organiser any anomaly that could disturb the competitor. Help the organiser to solve the aforementioned problems.
- Make sure that the price list is posted in the first half of the tournament.
- Insure proper posting of the mandatory technical information: pairings, crosstable and standings after each round; any extra rules for this tournament and members of the Local Appeal Committee, if any.
- Refuse to breach the pairing rules to enable a player to achieve a performance or a norm.
- If the pairings are accelerated, indicate it in the tournament specific regulations.
- Be punctual and available to the players. Be present in the tournament room (one of the Chief Arbiter and of the Deputy Chief Arbiter must always be present in the tournament room). Be vigilant, ensure that the players are not speaking of their current game, take any actions necessary to avoid unsportsmanlike conducts and penalised the faulty players if necessary.
- After the tournament, **assume his administrative responsibility**: write and transmit the tournament report in the manner prescribed by the TDOCP.
- Before the end of the tournament, **bill the organiser** for the rating fees. Mail a check covering the rating fee with the tournament report otherwise the tournament will not be rated.
- Consider that the organiser is the **tournament director**. Work with him and his team in a constructive spirit, never forget that most organisers are volunteer. Do your best effort to ensure that his tournament will be a success.
- Represent the CFC with dignity on the tournament premises.

#### ***Obligations of the organiser***

- Consider that the arbiter is a **representative of the CFC**.
- Offer to the **players good playing conditions**: appropriate material, playing area, skittle room, rest rooms, lighting, heating, noise level...
- Setup the equipment; prepare the room according to the arbiter's advice.
- Give good working conditions to the arbiters team: separate room or failing that a clearly identified special zone off limit to the public and off limit to the players, except by special permission.
- Be present or be represented on the tournament site in order to timely fix any material problem.
- Do not pressurise the arbiter into any form of rules violation, especially the pairing rules. **Never intervene in problems that are the sole responsibility of the arbiter**<sup>8</sup>.
- Respect the arbiters' compensation rules and pay the arbiter before the beginning of the last round. Refuse to pay any arbiter more than the required compensation and reports to the TDOCP committee any such arbiter.
- Respect a ratio of one arbiter for 80 players.
- On the tournament site, **collect the CFC memberships paid by the players and remit them timely to the CFC Office**.
- Before the end of the tournament, give to the Chief arbiter a check covering the rating fees.

### **12 *Disciplinary powers of the arbiter on a competition site***

An arbiter may give all the penalties described at the article 13.4 of the Laws of Chess and in the CFC Tournament Rules. Furthermore, he may recommend a disciplinary action against a player.

Written warnings given by arbiters are kept on file for two years. The written warning is to be given to the player or mailed to the player in a manner that permits to prove that it has been received. The player may Appeal the written warning to the NAC.

---

<sup>8</sup> This includes all problems related to the determination of the score of a game (one, one half, or zero), the computation of tiebreak and the distribution of prizes.

- Every written warning given to a player is kept on file for two years. Upon receiving his third written warning a player shall be automatically suspended for 4 months for a third written warning during a two years period and for 8 months for a third written warning during a single year. As soon as the second warning becomes official (it has not been appealed or the appeal has been dismissed) the player name shall be added to the suspension list.
- Written warnings are to be given for very serious offences only.

### ***13 Situation in Quebec***

The arbiters that have attended an FQE endorsed Clinic may directly pass the examinations for the Local Arbiter level without attending a clinic<sup>9</sup>. They have until July first 2008 to pass the FQSÉ examinations, after that, those arbiters will be considered uncertified and they will have to qualify as new arbiters.

### ***14 Organisers Certification***

For all levels except international and national, organisers' certification shall be arranged by each Provincial Association using the same levels that are used for arbiters certification. The TDOCP committee shall grant the level upon recommendation of the Provincial Association and after reception of the appropriate fee which is equivalent to the arbiter's certification fee. The Chief Arbiter of a competition is responsible for the evaluation of the organiser.

The TDOCP committee is responsible for granting the title of National Organiser and for recommending organisers to FIDE for the award of the International Organiser title. There is an application fee of 10\$ per three year terms to get certified as an organiser.

### ***15 TDOCP Committee Powers and Responsibilities***

The TDOCP Committee has the power to change the CFC Handbook in order to reflect changes in FIDE rules and interpretations.

The Executive, upon recommendation of the TDOCP Committee, is empowered to change the CFC Tournament Rules and Pairing Rules (Sec 6). [see Motion 82-5; GL, September 1982, p. 1-5]

The TDOCP Committee hears complaints related to Guaranteed Prize Funds (see Sec 1650).

The TDOCP Committee determines whether bids for National events have been honoured (see Sec 980).

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

Maintain a database of all Certified Arbiters in Canada.

The TDOCP committee has the power to write national examinations<sup>10</sup>, to administer them and to grant arbiters' title.

The TDOCP committee has the power to administer sanctions under the Uniform Code of Discipline, the PAC has the same power in his province

### ***16 TDOCP Committee Members***

The TDOCP can count a maximum of 7 members, all of whom shall be arbiters. The members shall be elected at the AGM or failing that, appointed by the executive.

The following duties shall be assigned to the TDOCP members

- Chairperson (responsible to the Assembly of Governors for the smooth operation of the certification program)

<sup>9</sup> Already approved by FQSÉ arbiter's co-ordinator in order to reduce tension with the FQE.

<sup>10</sup> Even for levels under Provincial control

- Rules director (keeps the CFC Handbook synchronised with the FIDE texts)
- Translation Director (can be assumed by the Quebec PAC)
- Communication director (newsletter for arbiters)
- Director of Examinations: prepare examinations with answer sheet
- Two members at large that can help in any department

### Appendix 3:

## **Report to CFC President William Doubleday on the CFC Financial Records Regarding the 2006 Canadian Youth Chess Championship (CYCC).**

By Halldor P. Palsson, Vice President  
May 27, 2007

## **Introduction**

You asked me April 28, 2007 to review and report on the financial records that the CFC has with respect to the 2006 CYCC and events leading to it. This is my report pursuant to that request.

## **Conclusion**

The

## **How I Conducted the Review**

The CFC bookkeeper, Ms. Twyla McEwen, directly reviewed the accounting records of the CFC with respect to the 2006 CYCC. I use her summary tables with some corrections.

Ms. Twyla McEwen divided CYCC entrants for which the CFC had no tracking into 1) billed to Patrick McDonald (unpaid) \$3000 and 2) Unpaid \$4,572.50 corrected to \$4,277.50. Patrick McDonald as per his March 1, 2007 e-mail list of CYCC fees collected moved another nine 2006 CYCC participants from Unpaid to Patrick McDonald (Unpaid).

I was left with 22 Unpaid. I contacted a number of 2006 CYCC players in the Unpaid category for which the CFC had no record of receiving entry fees for and for which the Kitchener organizers had no records of receiving payments from at the tournament.

Mr. Les Bunning the CFC legal advisor also dealt with the expense claims submitted by the 2006 CYCC organizers on behalf of the CFC.

## **Local Qualifiers and Provincial Championships**

According to the review by Ms. McEwen:

| Organizer                   | Paid      | Unpaid   |
|-----------------------------|-----------|----------|
|                             |           |          |
| Patrick McDonald 67*7       |           | \$469    |
| Patrick McDonald 46*10      |           | \$460    |
| Chris Field                 | \$571     |          |
| Central Canada Chess League | \$476     |          |
| Cheryl Weaver, N.S.         | \$258     |          |
| Mike Rawding, GLPS          | \$198     |          |
| Alan Kaufman Donation       | \$850     |          |
| Ghislaine Johnson           | \$340     |          |
| Kathrine Davis, B.C.        | \$411     |          |
|                             |           |          |
| Total                       | \$3104.00 | \$929.00 |

## **The CYCC 2006**

The CFC Office according to usual practice sent a list of approximately 70 paid entries to the Kitchener Organizers days prior to the start of the tournament. At that point the responsibility for the collection of entry fees passed from the CFC Office to the local organizers.

According to the review by Ms. McEwen the CFC collected \$15,052 in entry fees.

According to the crosstables CFC rated as submitted by the Kitchener CYCC Organizers these are the total number of participants. Boys U10 34, U12 29, U14 35, U16 23 and U18 12 for a total of 133.

For the Girls U10 8, U12 6 and U16 and U14 8 for a total of 22.

The 2006 CYCC had 155 participants according to the 2006 CYCC crosstables.

No entry fees collected at the 2006 CYCC in Kitchener were ever forwarded to the CFC.

Mr Patrick McDonald submitted a list of entries he collected March 1, 2007. This list is:

|                        |      |
|------------------------|------|
| CYCC Collected on-site |      |
| Jasia Carroll-Woolery  | 150  |
| Katerina Choumskaiai   | 150  |
| Cristian Dragan        | 75   |
| Nathan Farrant-Diaz    | 150  |
| Thomas Gibbons         | 150  |
| Conrad Ho              | 75   |
| Michael Humphreys      | 150  |
| Dalia Kagramanov       | 150  |
| Agastya Kalra          | 150  |
| Christopher Knox       | 150  |
| Cedric Lepine          | 150  |
| Brale Levesque         | 150  |
| Mason Levesque         | 150  |
| Alexander Martchenko   | 150  |
| Justin McDonald        | 150  |
| Kevin Me               | 150  |
| Masha Mehdiyeva        | 150  |
| Athavan Mylvannan      | 150  |
| Emmanuel Nadeau        | 150  |
| Gabrielle Nadeau       | 150  |
| Jérémie Nadeau         | 75   |
| Yelizaveta Orlova      | 150  |
| Brendan Osmann-Deyman  |      |
| Raja Panjwani          | 150  |
| Mark Plotkin           | 150  |
| Rina Plotkin           | 150  |
| Roman Sapozhnikov      | 150  |
| David Wang             | 150  |
| Michael Yang           | 75   |
| Jerry Xiong            | 75   |
| Sonja Xiong            | 75   |
| Total for CYCC:        | 4050 |

This left a list of 22 kids which according to the review by Ms. McEwen the CFC had no records to indicate that entry fees had been collected.

The CFC provided me with addresses for some of these kids. On May 10, 2007 I e-mailed the parents of the following participants to ask how they paid the entry fee to the 2006 CYCC.

Dumais, Pascale  
Dumais, Jean-Phillipe  
Saravanabava, P  
Chan, Alex  
Milner, Arie

Lu, David  
Hambleton, A  
Chung, Kevin  
Kleinman, Robert  
Yan, John  
Kazmaier, Dan  
Wan, Karen

Missing – No Address on File

Bunting, Justin  
Sirithar, Bohishan  
Sirithar, Danah  
Osman-Deyman, Brendon  
Jankiewicz, Sklyer

OYCC  
Leu, Richard \$72.50  
Lai, Jonathan \$75  
Kaufmann, Harris \$75

The following replies were received:

### **Possibly Not Paid / Not Collected**

1) [Good morning Halldor.](#)

[I had been dealing with Patrick MacDonald on this issue. I had told him that I thought I had paid but could not remember when and how. My last email to him was requesting what the outstanding amount was. I had said that I would simply pay it. Please confirm the amount for both Pascale and Jean-Philippe Dumais and advise what is your preferred mode of payment and it shall be made promptly.](#)

[Pierre \[Dumais, Pascale and Dumais, Jean-Phillipe\]](#)

2) Dear Sir,

My son, Aman Hambleton, placed third in the OYCC in Kitchener Ont, 2006, and was awarded \$120.00 toward the CYCC entry fee. We paid \$30 to complete the total of the CYCC fee of \$150.

If you need to confirm further, you have two options; Patrick MacDonald can verify that Aman was awarded this sum, secondly, that we go back in our credit card transactions to find the \$30.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wallace [Aman Hambleton]

Patrick McDonald never paid for any OYCC winners to enter the 2006 CYCC.

3) [Mr. Palsson,](#)

[This is John Yan. Before the CYCC 2006, the Alberta Chess Association promised to pay my entry fee for the tournament because I was the first place in the U-16 group of Alberta Youth Chess Championship. You can check last year's Alberta Chess Tournament History at \[www.albertachess.org\]\(http://www.albertachess.org\) to see the detailed information. Also, you can contact the President of ACA, Mr. Ford Wong, to confirm, because he was the one who sent me an email last year saying the ACA going to pay the fees. His email address is: \[fordie@shaw.ca\]\(mailto:fordie@shaw.ca\)](#)

[I hope we can solve this problem soon; if you need more information, please email me.](#)

[Best Regards,](#)

[John Yan](#)



## **Possibly Paid in Kitchener / Paid in Kitchener**

4) Dear Halldor,

The registration fee for Arie Milner was paid either directly by myself or by Katherine Davies, who was taking care of all BC players sponsored by the BC chess federation. I know that Katherine was dealing with Patrick, so you might want to contact Patrick or Katherine directly. Naturally, I don't have any supporting documents from an event which was a year ago, sorry...

Best regards,

Valery. [Arie Milner]

Paid by Ms. Davies – CFC shows she paid \$300.

5) Dear Mr. Palsson,

I'm happy I paid in cheque. Royal Bank of Canada has found the payment record for David Lu for CYCC 2006. And I have just faxed you a copy of the payment.

1. The cheque was paid to Patrick McDonald at July 10, 2006;
2. The cheque was cashed at July 12, 2006;
3. The title of Patrick McDonald is a hand writing by Eva McDonald.

Please email me back to confirm you have received my email and fax.

Thank you,

Michelle H. Shen (David's mother)

## **Conclusion on the Collection of 2006 CYCC Entry Fees**

The collection of late or last minute entry fees at the site of 2006 CYCC in Kitchener broke down. Entry fees were collected without proper record keeping. Some entry fees were made by cheque payable to Patrick McDonald and or cash. Other participants may not have paid at all or been given the option of allowing the Provincial Chess Association to pay after the fact. I have no records whereby the CFC was asked to bill for these entries by the Kitchener Organizers after the event.

It is clear that over \$7,000-\$7,300 in entry fees for the 2006 CYCC were never submitted to the CFC.

No entry fees from Ontario Chess Association for participants they qualified from the 2006 OYCC to the 2006 CYCC were ever sent to or received by the CFC. Mr. Patrick McDonald was the organizer for the OYCC and he is also the OCA Youth Coordinator.

The CFC may be able to collect some entry fees because of errors or omissions in record keeping by the Kitchener Organizers. The rest of the entry fees have to be credited to the Kitchener Organizers.

## **2006 CYCC Expenses Billed to the CFC**

The Kitchener Organizers submitted a bill of \$12,088.45 to the CFC dated October 6, 2006. The Kitchener Organizers submitted this bill as per their bid whereby there would be 200 participants and the CFC was to receive \$20,800 toward the WYCC.

Their position is that the bid that they submitted was approved under the regime proposed by Peter Stockhausen. Nothing was done by these organizers or the CFC to follow through on that motion – the CFC had nothing to do with local arrangements in Kitchener. Everything was negotiated and handled by the Kitchener Organizers.

The CFC rule in force is by Motion 2005-19 published in 2004/5 GL # 6 specifies that \$50 per player goes to the local organizers to cover expenses and \$100 goes to the CFC to cover the cost of sending players to the WYCC. The motion passed easily with Hal Bond abstaining and Patrick McDonald voting against.

I can also refer Governors to e-mails from Mr. Hal Bond with respect to this subject. Governors were copied his exchange with Mr. Bruce Harper, April 9, 2005, which I have appended to my report. Hal Bond refers to the rule under which his bid was accepted.

The effect of Motion 2005-19 published in 2004/5 GL # 6 is that the Organizers were to receive \$7,750 not the \$12,088 they are now claiming. The CFC offered to settle the matter for \$9,200 and toward that effort remitted \$2,000 to the Kitchener Organizers March 1, 2007.

I am advised by Mr. Les Bunning that Hal Bond has accepted the CFC Offer of \$9,200. I therefore abandon my discussion of whether \$9,200 is correct.

A brief review overview of revenue and expenses is in order:

|                    |         |
|--------------------|---------|
| 2006 CYCC expenses | \$9,200 |
|--------------------|---------|

Revenues not received by CFC:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| 2006 CYCC Entry fees not collected by the CFC | \$7,000 |
| Alan Kaufman 2006 CYCC Donation               | 850     |
| Payment to Kitchener Organizers March 1, 2007 | 2,000   |

In my opinion no monies are owed by the CFC to the Kitchener organizers from the 2006 CYCC. CFC has paid or not received revenues that exceed \$9,200.

I find it particularly troubling that the CFC has never been given any credit for the donation by Mr. Kaufman to the 2006 CYCC – these funds were sent directly to Mr. Patrick McDonald.

In the original 2006 CYCC bid budget sponsor identified only as 1) Government \$500; 2) Business 500; 3) Private \$500 and 4) Chess Sponsors \$500 are identified on the revenue side. No sponsorship is applied to the 2006 CYCC expenses by these organizers.

I understand that the City of Kitchener was a substantial sponsored the Kitchener Chess Festival. I have contacted the City of Kitchener to ask whether they intended any of their support to go to the 2006 CYCC and why the CFC is getting a bill for all the expenses flowing from the event. I have no official answers to report at this time.

Mr. Patrick McDonald owes the CFC \$929 for the 2006 OYCC. This was a direct qualification event for the 2006 CYCC.

I expect to finalize my report depending on how quickly responses come in.

Halldor P. Palsson  
Vice President  
Chess Federation of Canada

Appendix

-----Original Message-----

From: Hal Bond [<mailto:halbond@rogers.com>]

Sent: April 9, 2005 6:05 PM

To: P Stockhausen; Hebert, Rodrigue (ED06); Chess Federation of Canada; Yves Farges; Wolfgang(Wilf) Ferner; Waldemar Friesen; Stijn De Kerpel; Steve Killi; Ronald Hinds; Richard Keep; pierre denomee; Phil Haley; Peter Bos; Patrick McDonald; Pascal Charbonneau; Neil Sutherland; Neil James Frarey; Nava Starr; Michael Dougherty; Michael Barron; Micah Hughey; Mavros Whissell; Maurice Smith; Martin Jaeger; Mark S. Dutton; Marco Greco; Lynn Stringer (E-mail); Lyle Craver; Les Bunning; Kevin Pacey; Ken Duff; John Niksic; Jim Ferguson; Jason Feng; Ilia Bluvshstein; Halldor P. Palsson; greg churchill; Fred McKim; Frank Dixon; Francisco Cabanas; Eric Van Dusen; Eric Lawson; Ellen Nadeau; Eddie Urquhart; Douglas Hoch; David Cohen; Christopher Mallon; Caroline McMaster; Caesar Posylek; Bruce Harper; Bruce D. Thomas; Bill Doubleday; Bela Kosoian; Barry Thorvardson; Ari Mendrinos; Andrew Plunkett; Alick Tsui; Alan McGowan; Adrien Regimbald; Joshua Henson; Alexandre Nikouline; Tony Ficzero; Shivaharan Thuraiarasah; Russ Aegard; Ken Craft; Fred Henderson; Ford Wong; Ed Rohanchuk  
Subject: Re: Governors' Letter #5

Dear Peter;

Thank you for your response to my concern.

Your explanation is not clear, but time marches on and we have much bigger issues at hand.

Onward ho

Hal Bond

----- Original Message -----

From: "P Stockhausen" <pstockhausen@shaw.ca>

To: "Hal Bond" <halbond@rogers.com>; "Hebert, Rodrigue (ED06)" <rodrigue.hebert@nbed.nb.ca>; "Chess Federation of Canada" <info@chess.ca>; "Yves Farges" <yvesmfarges@hotmail.com>; "Wolfgang(Wilf) Ferner" <weferner@pathcom.com>; "Waldemar Friesen" <wfriesen@regina.ca>; "Stijn De Kerpel" <stijn.dekerpel@hrdc-drhc.gc.ca>; "Steve Killi" <skilli2119@rogers.com>; "Ronald Hinds" <ronald.hinds@shaw.ca>; "Richard Keep" <rkeep@lino.com>; "pierre denomee" <denommee@microtec.net>; "Phil Haley" <philghaley@cs.com>; "Peter Bos" <cheapoking@yahoo.ca>; "Patrick McDonald" <patrick@psmcd.net>; "Pascal Charbonneau" <charbl@umbc.edu>; "Neil Sutherland" <nssutherland@hotmail.com>; "Neil James Frarey" <neiljamesfrarey@ottawachessclub.com>; "Nava Starr" <starrnava@yahoo.com>; "Michael Dougherty" <Michael.Dougherty@mczcr.gov.on.ca>; "Michael Barron" <barron045@yahoo.com>; "Micah Hughey" <mhughey@hotmail.com>; "Mavros Whissell" <mavros.w@hotmail.com>; "Maurice Smith" <m-smith@sympatico.ca>; "Martin Jaeger" <m\_jaeger@look.ca>; "Mark S. Dutton" <mdutton@idirect.com>; "Marco Greco" <chesshamilton@gmail.com>; "Lynn Stringer (E-mail)" <lynnstringer@shaw.ca>; "Lyle Craver" <lcraver@shaw.ca>; "Les Bunning" <lesbunning@travel-net.com>; "Kevin Pacey" <gordon@iosphere.net>; "Ken Duff" <kduff@rogers.com>; "John Niksic" <jniksic@citytel.net>; "Jim Ferguson" <jcf@uvic.ca>; "Jason Feng" <jason.feng@shaw.ca>; "Ilia Bluvshstein" <ibluvshst@uniongas.com>; "Halldor P. Palsson" <palsson@mondenet.com>; "greg churchill" <spitball@shaw.ca>; "Fred McKim" <fred\_mckim@hotmail.com>; "Frank Dixon" <frankd\_chess@hotmail.com>; "Francisco Cabanas" <cabanas@finee.com>; "Eric Van Dusen" <Eric.VanDusen@pwgsc.gc.ca>; "Eric Lawson" <nemol@videotron.ca>; "Ellen Nadeau" <ellennadeau@yahoo.ca>; "Eddie Urquhart" <ueddie@hotmail.com>; "Douglas Hoch" <rainbow@golden.net>; "David Cohen" <bw998@freenet.carleton.ca>; "Christopher Mallon" <dcmallon@rogers.com>; "Caroline McMaster" <cmcmaster@chaosafilmcompany.com>; "Caesar Posylek" <ckr@rogers.com>; "Bruce

Harper" <bruce54321@shaw.ca>; "Bruce D. Thomas" <scopepub@shaw.ca>; "Bill Doubleday" <wdoubleday@rogers.com>; "Bela Kosoian" <bkosoian@sympatico.ca>; "Barry Thorvardson" <barry@cybersolutions.net>; "Ari Mendrin" <arimen64@hotmail.com>; "Andrew Plunkett" <andrewplunkett@northwestel.net>; "Alick Tsui" <alick@nl.rogers.com>; "Alan McGowan" <amcgowan@golden.net>; "Adrien Regimbald" <adrien@ee.ualberta.ca>; "Joshua Henson" <hensoj@gmail.com>; "Alexandre Nikouline" <nikulin@mts.net>; "Tony Ficzero" <tficzero@telus.net>; "Shivaharan Thurai" <thurai@idirect.com>; "Russ Aegard" <mraegard@hotmail.com>; "Ken Craft" <kcraft@unbsj.ca>; "Fred Henderson" <fredh@sympatico.ca>; "Ford Wong" <fordie@shaw.ca>; "Ed Rohanchuk" <chessforall@shaw.ca>

Sent: Wednesday, April 06, 2005 5:47 PM

Subject: Re: Governors' Letter #5

> Dear Hal,

>

> I'm not sure why you characterize my comments as "mean spirited", "off  
> point" or as "attacking your integrity", or anybody else's for that  
> matter. None of this is stated, implied or meant.

>

> The hand over of CYCC money was always done with Executive and  
> Governor's approval, defeating the original purpose for the extra  
> funds generated. Organizers of whatever stripe got "their hands on"  
> that money by simply using the system. I merely re-stated some of my  
> objections to this.

>

> Hopefully your event will realize what is projected in the budget and  
> clearly you will have a good chance doing so as you are an experienced  
> and successful organizer.

>

> Maybe the Governors will pass our 50/100 motion and, more importantly,  
> stick  
> with it.

>

> Cheers

> Peter

>

>

>

> pstockhausen@pacificcoast.net OR pstockhausen@shaw.ca

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: "Hal Bond" <halbond@rogers.com>

> To: "Hebert, Rodrigue (ED06)" <rodrigue.hebert@nbed.nb.ca>; "Chess

> Federation of Canada" <info@chess.ca>; "Yves Farges"

> <yvesmfarges@hotmail.com>; "Wolfgang(Wilf) Ferner" <weferner@pathcom.com>;

> "Waldemar Friesen" <wfriesen@regina.ca>; "Stijn De Kerpel"

> <stijn.dekerpel@hrdc-drhc.gc.ca>; "Steve Killi" <skilli2119@rogers.com>;

> "Ronald Hinds" <ronald.hinds@shaw.ca>; "Richard Keep" <rkeep@lino.com>;

> "pierre denomee" <denomme@microtec.net>; "Phil Haley"

> <philghaley@cs.com>;

> "Peter Stockhausen" <pstockhausen@pacificcoast.net>; "Peter Bos"

> <cheapoking@yahoo.ca>; "Patrick McDonald" <patrick@psmcd.net>; "Pascal

> Charbonneau" <charbl@umbc.edu>; "Neil Sutherland"

> <nssutherland@hotmail.com>; "Neil James Fraey"

> <neiljamesfraey@ottawachessclub.com>; "Nava Starr" <starrnava@yahoo.com>;

> "Michael Dougherty" <Michael.Dougherty@mczcr.gov.on.ca>; "Michael Barron"

> <barron045@yahoo.com>; "Micah Hughey" <mhughey@hotmail.com>; "Mavros

> Whissell" <mavros.w@hotmail.com>; "Maurice Smith" <m-smith@sympatico.ca>;

> "Martin Jaeger" <m\_jaeger@look.ca>; "Mark S. Dutton"

> <mdutton@idirect.com>;

> "Marco Greco" <chesshamilton@gmail.com>; "Lynn Stringer (E-mail)"

> <lynnstringer@shaw.ca>; "Lyle Craver" <lcraver@shaw.ca>; "Les Bunning"

```

> <lesbunning@travel-net.com>; "Kevin Pacey" <gordon@iosphere.net>; "Ken
> Duff"
> <kduff@rogers.com>; "John Niksic" <jniksic@citytel.net>; "Jim Ferguson"
> <jcf@uvic.ca>; "Jason Feng" <jason.feng@shaw.ca>; "Ilia Bluvshstein"
> <ibluvsh@uniongas.com>; "Halldor P. Palsson" <palsson@mondenet.com>;
> "greg
>
> churchill" <spitball@shaw.ca>; "Fred McKim" <fred_mckim@hotmail.com>;
> "Frank
> Dixon" <frankd_chess@hotmail.com>; "Francisco Cabanas"
> <cabanas@finee.com>;
> "Eric Van Dusen" <Eric.VanDusen@pwgsc.gc.ca>; "Eric Lawson"
> <nemol@videotron.ca>; "Ellen Nadeau" <ellennadeau@yahoo.ca>; "Eddie
> Urquhart" <ueddie@hotmail.com>; "Douglas Hoch" <rainbow@golden.net>;
> "David
> Cohen" <bw998@freenet.carleton.ca>; "Christopher Mallon"
> <dcmallon@rogers.com>; "Caroline McMaster"
> <cmcmaster@chaosafilmcompany.com>; "Caesar Posylek" <ckr@rogers.com>;
> "Bruce
> Harper" <bruce54321@shaw.ca>; "Bruce D. Thomas" <scopepub@shaw.ca>; "Bill
> Doubleday" <wdoubleday@rogers.com>; "Bela Kosoian"
> <bkosioian@sympatico.ca>;
> "Barry Thorvardson" <barry@cybersolutions.net>; "Ari Mendrin"
> <arimen64@hotmail.com>; "Andrew Plunkett"
> <andrewplunkett@northwestel.net>;
> "Alick Tsui" <alick@nl.rogers.com>; "Alan McGowan" <amcgowan@golden.net>;
> "Adrien Regimbald" <adrien@ee.ualberta.ca>; "Joshua Henson"
> <hensoj@gmail.com>; "Alexandre Nikouline" <nikulin@mts.net>; "Tony
> Ficzero"
> <tficzero@telus.net>; "Shivaharan Thurai" <thurai@idirect.com>; "Russ
> Aegard" <mraegard@hotmail.com>; "Ken Craft" <kcraft@unbsj.ca>; "Fred
> Henderson" <fredh@sympatico.ca>; "Ford Wong" <fordie@shaw.ca>; "Ed
> Rohanchuk" <chessforall@shaw.ca>
> Sent: Tuesday, March 15, 2005 5:30 AM
> Subject: Re: Governors' Letter #5
>
>
>> Dear Governors:
>>
>> Governor Stockhausen's comments regarding this motion in GL # 5 were
>> mean spirited and off point. He wrote "I understand that some
>> organizers, particularly the for profit variety, like to get their
>> hands on CYCC
>> money.
>> We should resist this. In 2006, for example, the CYCC will pay
>> $2,000
>> rent
>> for facilities for parents!"
>>
>> This is an attack on my personal integrity and I will not tolerate
>> it. I bid on the 2006 event under the existing rules, which pay $5
>> per player to the organizer off the top. It would be improper for me
>> to bid under one
>> set
>> of rules and then participate in a rule change where I stand to
>> benefit. (the new proposal would pay up to $50 to the organizer for
>> expenses) Hence my comments in GL 4:
>>
>> The existing CYCC rules are simple, clean and presumably in force
>> until after the 2006 event.
>>
>> Regarding the $2,000 rental space for the parents, I am not
>> affiliated with the playing site, so how does this "get my hands on the CYCC

```

money?"  
>> As  
>> I  
>> reminded everyone at the AGM in Kapuskasing, the CFC must satisfy itself  
>> that any CYCC rental payment was scrutinized and proper. After doing a  
> few  
>> hundred kids' tournaments I have grown sensitive to the needs of  
>> parents. Windsor's John Coleman and I each rented extra space at last  
>> year's  
> Ontario  
>> Chess Challenge for this purpose and it was much appreciated. The  
>> extra space contingency was part of my budget because I was not sure  
>> which conference hall we would have. This question has recently been  
>> clarified. The Grand Ballroom will be used for both events at a cost  
>> of \$ 606.33 per day. Plenty of room for everyone.  
>>  
>> Governor Stockhausen's comments also failed to address my remarks  
>> about  
> the  
>> new motion itself. Again, from GL #4:  
>>  
>> I like most of the wording of this new motion. But rather than get  
> involved  
>> in the organizers books, why not just pay \$50.00 per player? Perhaps  
>> a  
>> 10%  
>> hold back until a statutory declaration is issued by the organizer  
> relative  
>> to payment of all expenses. The CFC wishes to ensure that corners  
>> are  
>> not  
>> cut, and that the tournament runs consistent with the bid. If \$50 per  
>> player does not cover costs the organizer is liable. As the new  
> underwriter  
>> the organizer is due some proprietary slack.  
>>  
>> I realize that the GL's have more issues and motions swirling around  
>> than  
> we  
>> can all track, so the lack of discussion about motion 2005-19 is  
>> understandable. Governor Stockhausen's remarks were not worthwhile  
>> at  
> all.  
>> I expected more from him and I still do.  
>>  
>> ~~~~~  
>> Hal Bond  
>> halbond@rogers.com

### **Motions for Final Vote:**

Straw Vote 1:

The popular G/60 time control should be played using the rules of:

- 1) regular;
- 2) rapidplay;
- 3) either regular or rapidplay (but not both) at the organizer's choice;

Please vote #1, #2 or #3. As per the rules for straw votes, the results are non-binding but indicative of Governor opinions.

### **Motions for Second Discussion:**

None

### **Motions for First Discussion:**

**Motion 2007-05** (Palsson / Doubleday) re CYCC

**Motion 2007-06:** (Dénomée / Craver) re CFC tournament rules. This can be discussed as a package or individually as follows:

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Motion 2007-06a: Article 1            | (Administrative Rules)                    |
| Motion 2007-06b: Article 2.1 to 2.26  | (Additional Rules for Tournament Play)    |
| Motion 2007-06c: Article 2.27 to 2.29 | (Regulations re Clocks and Time Controls) |
| Motion 2007-06d: Article 3            | (Exceptions to the Normal Rules)          |
| Motion 2007-06e: Article 4            | (Unsportsmanlike Conduct)                 |
| Motion 2007-06f: Article 5            | (Appeals)                                 |
| Motion 2007-06g: Article 6            | (Interior Rules)                          |
| Motion 2007-06h: Article 7            | (Players' Code of Conduct)                |
| Motion 2007-06i: Article 8            | (Penalties Imposed by the Arbiter)        |
| Motion 2007-06j: Article 9            | (FIDE Standards for Digital Chess Clocks) |

**Motion 2007-07:** (Dénomée / Craver) Revisions to Tournament Director Certification Program

**Motion 2007-08:** (Mallon / McDonald) Replacement of Executive

**Motion 2007-09:** (Mallon / McDonald) Governor Activity Rules

**Motion 2007-10:** (Mallon / McDonald) Appointments

**Deadline for submissions to GL#6 is Friday June 8, 2007**

**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)**