

CHESS FEDERATION OF CANADA GOVERNORS' LETTER THREE 1999-2000



**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**

**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 if interested.**

Deadline for next Governors' Letter is January 25, 2000

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In this G.L. I wish to talk about change. Specifically how it is affecting two areas of our chess world. In the Office of the financial organization where I have worked for many years is a sign that says "Change is a bend in the road, but it is not the end of the road, unless you fail to make the turn." Well, we have to put in a better effort in making the turn in two significant areas.

a) **Decision Making.** Gordon Taylor makes some excellent comments in the General Remarks section about the Executive making decisions that perhaps could have been made by the Governors through the G.L. I appreciate his remarks that these decisions were made with the best of intentions, and that his concern is with the decision making policy rather than with the Executive themselves. The main problem lies with the inordinate amount of time it takes for a decision to be made through the G.L. From the time a governor submits a motion to the time there is a vote on that motion can take up to eight months. In this age of instant information and computer technology this is inefficient and at times unworkable. The process was made longer when a second discussion period was added to motions appearing in the G.L. However, this was added so that Governors could reply to the first discussion and everyone could see both sides of issues such as Quebec, Rating Systems and other like items that although important had no real time constraints. Most of the items that come before the Executive are ones that need to be dealt with quickly as they affect the ongoing business and tournaments of the C.F.C. Delays that affect improvements and necessities should be avoided. Denis Allan has also provided useful comment on this matter. He agrees that decision making by the G.L. is inadequate and suggests publishing Governors comments on the web, and then eliminate one of the discussion periods. My concern is the roughly 10% of Governors who do not have Internet access. I really prefer policies that are equal to everyone if possible. I welcome any further comments on this subject. One thing to keep in mind is that as technology changes, so do we have to change our way of doing things in order to not only be successful, but sometimes just to survive.

b) **Chess Clubs.** There are three main sources of revenue for the C.F.C. They are membership fees, rating fees and the sale of chess supplies. There is a relationship between membership and rating fees in that many C.F.C. members are involved in playing in tournaments and contribute to rating fee revenue. Having cut expenses about as far as we can go, the next step has been to try and increase revenue. However, membership is virtually stalled. There are minor declines in some areas and minor increases in other areas. Where this is most significant is in Chess Clubs which are the back bone in providing new members. It is here where change is needed. Chess clubs have to market themselves and provide variety and entertainment. They must be more than a place to sit down and have a game of chess with someone. They can do that on the Internet. Actually that is what many people are doing. The clubs have to make use of this and use it to their own advantage by advertising on the net and making their clubs sound as attractive as possible. In other words they have to sell themselves. Horse racing faced with decreasing revenues have brought in slot machines, provide free parking and admission and have upgraded their food selection. I am not suggesting that chess clubs put in slot machines, but they can still upgrade their services. What was once considered o.k. years ago, is now behind the times. People have a wide variety of entertainment possibilities and when they go out they are looking for value, service and a good time in comfortable surroundings. Otherwise they might as well stay at home and watch t.v. or play on the Internet. Within the next two months, I will send out to all chess clubs information with suggestions on how to attract more members. The one thing that is needed today is change in the outlook of the whole function of a chess club. Change - It is inevitable and also desirable.

Maurice Smith
President
Chess Federation Of Canada

KEEPING GOVERNORS INFORMED

The President appointed Kevin Spraggett as the Masters Representative on the Board of Governors. This was after the recent Canadian Zonal where the players did not reach a decision.

Tim Knechtel resigned from the Kalev Pugi Fund Committee. Subsequently, the President appointed Fred McKim as a replacement.

Executive Motion - Smith/Stockhausen To accept the bid for the 2001 Canadian Open in New Brunswick as submitted by Dave Barrett (see Canadian Open 2001 for bid). Motion unanimously approved.

Executive Motion - Smith/Stockhausen That starting in the April issue of En Passant, organizers wishing to advertise in the Coming Events section must indicate that the prize fund is based on a minimum percentage of the entry fees. Specific guaranteed amounts are exempt from this ruling. Motion unanimously approved.

The Executive unanimously approved the new rules for the Canadian Junior and Canadian Women Ch. events as shown elsewhere in this G.L.

The Executive rejected a bid from the Montreal Chess League to hold the Canadian Junior on the long weekend in May. The Executive did approve a bid from the Montreal Chess League to hold the Canadian Junior on the first weekend in May.

Maurice Smith
President
Chess Federation Of Canada

MOTIONS

99-7 now becomes Motion 00-1

Motion 00-1 (Jaeger-Langen) “That as a matter of policy the CFC should make available to affiliated provincial associations En Passant space for communication to association members.

The aggregate of such space shall be decided annually by the CFC executive and its allocation among associations be proportionate to the square root of CFC provincial ordinary memberships equivalents. (Example: if Province A has 400 CFC ordinary members’ equivalents it shall be entitled to twice the space of a province that has 100 membership equivalents).

Where there is no affiliated provincial association the use of space shall be made available to an association in that province/territory from among associations applying for the use of the space”.

Motion 00-2 (Bunning-Cabanas) “That the tournament membership fee be increased to \$12 per tournament effective January 1, 2000.”

Les Bunning: At the annual meeting it was proposed to raise the tournament membership fee to \$15. This increase was opposed by Francisco Cabanas. After the meeting (where the motion was defeated) Cabanas agreed to second a motion to increase the tournament membership to \$12. The current tournament membership fee of \$6 gives little incentive for players to become full members. This resulted in a loss of income to the CFC last year.

Motion 00-3 (Allan-Hartman) “In any Canadian Championship tournament, including CYCC events, where one or more players will qualify for a FIDE event, the time control shall be the same as for the FIDE event.

Denis Allan: This issue arose at the Canadian Closed players' meeting and the majority reached the conclusion as in the motion. I am more immediately concerned with the 2000 CYCC event where it is proposed to use the normal time control for the U18 and U16 sections, but a faster time control for the other sections, presumably on the basis that the younger players usually play more quickly. No doubt this is generally so, especially since the Swiss format is intended to attract a high number of players, thereby reducing the average strength. In the World Youth Championship, most of our players needed their full time allotment. Even our two youngest girls, Alexandra Benggawan and Stacey Kazekevich, played most of their games close to four hours, and some into the second time control. Playing our national championship at a faster rate only encourages poor playing habits, and is no proper preparation for the World Championship. If some players do not want to use the full time available, so be it - that is no reason to penalize the more serious players. When Chess'n Math organized the CYCC, the only criticism I heard from the players was that the time control was too fast, the result of playing five rounds over a two day weekend. Now that three full days are available, and the intention is to use the normal time control for some age groups, it can and should be used for all sections.

Motion 00-4 (Allan-Hartman) “The 2000 CYCC shall have separate events in each group for girls. In each age group the format, including tie-break, shall be decided by a representative of the organizing committee in consultation with the Junior Coordinator and the Women’s Coordinator. If they are unable to agree, the final decision shall be made by the Junior Coordinator. This decision shall be made after the entry list has been finalized.

Denis Allan: This is consistent with the announcement over Mr. Bunnings name in the last two issues of En Passant. However, it is now proposed to have a combined Swiss system in each age group, qualifying three boys and
1999-2000 C.F.C. Governor’s Letter #3

three girls. Qualifying three boys is problematic enough. The Swiss system is pretty good at picking a winner, and with enough rounds can even be accurate beyond first place. The middle of a Swiss, where the best girls would likely be, is hopeless. One half point there is meaningless. Our representatives to the World Championship could be decided by the luck of last round pairings. For example, one girl might play a boy with nothing to gain, and happy to make a quick draw, (especially if he likes the girl) while another girl plays someone who is out to win. I understand that there may be an intention to somehow manipulate the pairings to try to arrive at correct placements for the girls - that is simply not realistic. I expect the concern is that not enough girls will come to Edmonton to hold separate events. That judgment should not be based on the Vancouver event, which was not advertised as a qualification event for girls. The U18 section is the only one which may be problematic, as there are not many girls of this age playing at all to my knowledge. Further, if not many girls come in any particular age group, a round robin, or even double round robin, is better than a combined event, and would certainly produce a more fair result. Having attended the past three World Youth Championships, I know most of our top girls and their families. I do not know of any who do not want a separate event. I appreciate that some governors oppose any separate events for women or girls. That is surely irrelevant to this motion. Since we are presently committed to sending representatives to the girls sections of the World Youth Championship, it is only consistent to qualify them from their own events. This motion is somewhat related to the motion re time controls. Generally the girls tend to do less well at faster time controls: the present intention to have combined events, with faster time controls in U14, U12 and U10 is a recipe for disaster.

I might add that I do not agree with qualifying three representatives for either boys or girls from the CYCC final - I would like to see at least one place reserved for qualification by rating, in an attempt to mitigate the risk of the Swiss system by ensuring that our best players do not miss the World Championship because of one bad tournament \game\move. However, I will leave that issue for now to anyone who may feel more strongly about it than I do.

Motion 00-5 (Spraggett-Stockhausen) "Olympic Team Member Selection - Replace Section 1203(a) and (b) with:

1203 Selection of the National and Women's Team

a) The National Team shall be comprised of 5 or 6 players. One shall be the winner of the most recent Canadian Closed and Zonal, two players shall be chosen by a Selection Committee and the remaining players to be the highest rated chosen from the selection rating list as outlined in 1204. If a player declines after selection, the replacement player shall be filled from the selection rating list.

b) The Women's Team shall be comprised of 3 or 4 female players. One shall be the winner of the most recent Canadian Women's Closed and Zonal, one female player shall be chosen by a Selection Committee with the remaining player(s) to be the highest rated female players from the selection rating list as outlined in 1204. If a player declines after selection, the replacement female player shall be filled from the selection rating list.

Replace Section 1204 with:

1204 Selection Rating List

(a) Eligible Ratings Only Established CFC Ratings will be considered in determining the Initial Ratings and the Selection Ratings.

(b) Rating Lists: The Initial Rating List is the last published rating list on the CFC Internet site 16 calendar months before the announced date by FIDE for the start of the Olympics. The Final Rating List is the last published rating list on the CFC Internet site 4 calendar months before the announced date by FIDE for the start of the Olympics.

(c) Initial Rating: The initial rating is the "new" rating from the most recent regular tournament cross-table rated before and including the initial rating list, provided that 12 CFC rated games have been played in regular tournaments during the 12 calendar month period before and including the initial rating list. If the required 12 games above have not been played then the initial rating is the "new" rating from the earliest regular tournament cross-table, in which the required 12th game was played, provided this regular tournament is rated after the initial rating list but before and including the final rating list.

(d) Selection Rating: The Selection Rating is the highest of the Initial Rating and all the "new" ratings from the regular tournament cross-tables rated after the regular tournament cross-table that determines the initial rating for the player but before and including the final rating list.

(e) The Selection Rating List: The interim selection rating list shall be published on the CFC Internet Site after each rating update during the period between the initial rating list and the final rating list, provided the dates of the Olympiad are known. The final selection rating list shall be published on CFC Internet Site and in the Magazine.

The Selection Committee for 2000 shall comprise of the following individuals:
The Canadian Closed and Zonal Champion
Mr. Dennis Allan

Discussion:

Kevin Spraggett: I think the country needs the selection committee' approach to fielding the Olympic team. Please re-read my report on the Canadian Nation Team's participation in Kalmykia to fully understand my position.

The Selection Committee was done away with in '98. Probably not without some reason. The CFC had erred the year before in picking people who were too young and inexperienced to do the job that was expected of them. However, I think that the CFC's reaction was drastic and at best premature.

It is now time to reconsider our options, as the deadline for picking the 2000 Olympic Team approaches.

Under the rules now in place the next National Olympic Team will be picked by rating (plus the Canadian Champion, who happens to be rated number two at the present) If all 6 top rated players accepted to play on next years' National Team then we would have quite a good team...in fact we would probably have our best team ever fielded for the Olympics.

But experience, and years of it, has shown that our very best players aren't very interested in all coming out at the same time! The epidemic of last minute withdrawals and refusals says it all.

So, why should we be stuck with the 'rating criteria when it doesn't give us our best chances for putting up a really good team? As pointed out in my report, the level of our 'best' rated players drops very quickly after we pass 5th or 6th position on the rating list.

We need to incorporate our younger players on our team. Give them a chance to gain experience and develop as players. Most of our top young players aren't any where near high enough rated to qualify for the next National Team, yet some of them would be able to make real contributions if they had the chance. What I am arguing for is for us to give them that chance-via the selection committee.

In Canada the lack of strong tournaments means that the chances to improve the younger players' ratings in just a few years time is unlikely. The 'established' players with higher ratings (some of whom hardly play enough) have a big advantage over our younger, rapidly improving players when it comes time to picking the National Team...unless we have the selection committee.

But please note that I don't want to see the Selection Committee re-instated just to see it 'behave' as it has in the past. I want to see some positive changes. What I would like to see is a selection committee that stops picking 'established' players over 40 years old, and instead concentrates exclusively on our younger players! I think Canada has a number of 'non-established' players between the ages of 15 and 35 who just don't have the rating to qualify for our National Team, but who have a lot to give if they had the chance to play on that team!

If we re-instate the selection committee in time for the 2000' Olympics, we still won't have a really great team, but by allowing our younger players the experience and the opportunity to contribute to our National Team we will be building towards the day when we will have a really great team.

Support this motion.

Peter Stockhausen: This motion is intended to reverse 98-8 which abolished the Selection Committee. Going ONLY by rating does not provide the best possible team. Motivation, attitude, team spirit and a host of other "non chess" factors contribute to this.

00-1 STRAW VOTE TOPIC (Martin Jaeger) "That for Closed [CYCC National] Events with no upper bound on entry numbers, Northwestern Ontario be allowed to name an entry."

00-2 STRAW VOTE TOPIC (Halldor Palsson) "That the rules for the Canadian Closed be amended to:
(1) Lower the rating limit to 2200;

- (2) Allow GMs free entry and then three classes of entry fees for 2200-2299 at \$300, 2300-2399 at \$200 and 2400+ at \$100;
- (3) Set a CFC contribution to the prize fund at a minimum of \$2000;
- (4) Make the event annual (taken from Phil Haley & Lyle Craver).

Halldor Palsson: I ask that items (1) - (4) be voted on separately. I view these changes as relatively minor amendments to the existing rules for the Canadian Closed. I propose (1) for housekeeping purposes. With (1) all masters are allowed to participate. The current limit of 2250 is arbitrary. If (1) is accepted it expands the pool of eligible players from 120-130 to just under 200. I would like to see close to 50 participants in this tournament.

With (2) I am trying to give stronger players an incentive to participate in the tournament. The proposed fee structure will also give stronger players a reason to encourage lower ranked masters into the field. This year some of our finest players did not participate and encouraged others who were eligible to do likewise.

I note that (3) is still in the handbook but was probably abolished at the AGM in Ottawa in 1998. The Canadian Closed is a tournament that the membership is interested in and this justifies spending some CFC funds on the event.

The rationale for (4) is to make the tournament annual. Now the rules say follow the FIDE cycle, which may lapse to once every 2 years. I think there are good Canadian chess development reasons for holding the tournament each year. We should offer our masters a good tournament each year.

MOTIONS UNDER DISCUSSION

Second Discussion of Motion 00-1:

Martin Jaeger: Two governors have raised the question as to whether this motion is in order. I discussed this with the president in August. He told me that in his view the motion was in order. In allowing the motion to go forward as is, he has so ruled, in the absence of a challenge to the ruling of the chair the motion should be voted on, on its merits.

Three years ago the OCA communicated to its members via a mail out financed by Chess and Math. Chess and Math used the mailing list without authorization and the governors have expressed their dissatisfaction over this. Clearly the OCA wanted to communicate to its members economically and 00-01 would provide this. Why in view of all this anyone would regard the motion as a solution is search of a problem is beyond understanding? In addition- do we change only when we have a problem? Do we not change in order to make improvements?

Do governors believe that members need only information on upcoming events. Do members not also benefit from information on policies, initiatives and programs? And if there is no inexpensive method of communication does this not contribute to information not being communicated? I urge governors to support the motion.

Lyle Craver: I stand by my previous comments that given that Troy, David and Knut have always seemed quite willing to run such material I see no need to force this issue. Vote NO.

Second Discussion of Motion 00-2:

Lyle Craver: I disagreed with the original tournament membership motion last year - however at that time Mr. Cabanas told me personally he felt it would be two years before the full effects of the tournament membership would be felt. At that time we were promised full statistics by region on how many ordinary and tournament members we had. This has not happened.

Now the same people who moved the original motion want us to massively raise the tournament fee. Give it another year - then we'll vote. In the meantime. Vote NO.

Martin Jaeger: At the annual meeting an analysis of this program was promised. It has not been published. How can we vote intelligently on the motion without this information

00-1 STRAW VOTE TOPIC

Lyle Craver: Assuming Northwest Ontario has the blessing of the OCA, vote YES. Even if they do not I do not see the harm given we are talking about an event with no upper limit on entries.

GENERAL REMARKS ON CFC BUSINESS

(i) Executive Motion on Regular Rating of Scholastic Tournaments.

Gordon Taylor: I have a concern with the Motion passed by the Executive concerning the rating of Junior and Scholastic tournaments under the regular rating system. While I share the concerns already voiced by Tom O'Donnell and others, the concern I have is different: I don't think the Executive had the authority to make this Motion. To briefly state my case, let me say that my understanding of the Constitution and By-Laws does empower the Executive to make decisions on matters which are either:

- urgent and pressing so that it would take too long to have the matter considered by the Board of Governors; or
- are delegated to the Executive by the Board, as per section 9 of By-Law Number Two.

A good example of the latter would be the new rules concerning the Canadian Closed. The Executive was given a mandate to formulate new rules at the Annual Meeting in Ottawa in 1998. So while I was not happy with the rules that came forth, there was a mandate given, and we should allow these rules to apply and see how well they function.

However, I do not think the Executive has the power to alter, willy-nilly, the Rules and By-Laws of the Federation. If the Executive could do this, then any number of arbitrary or capricious changes could be made during the year and the Executive could not be called to account until the Annual Meeting.

In this matter of rating Junior and Scholastic games under the regular rating system, I simply don't see the urgency, and I cannot find any indication in the Minutes of the Annual Meeting at Vancouver of this matter being delegated to the Executive.

I think this matter falls under item (d) of section 11 of these same By-Laws Number Two. That section 11 then goes on to state:

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

So, only when the matter has a quality of urgency does the Executive have the power to override the Board of Governors. It would seem that the Executive considered that there was insufficient time in this case--that the matter was urgent. I just can't see the urgency myself.

While I am persuaded that the Executive passed this motion with the best of intentions, and while I feel that the effect of this motion is mostly benign, I am most disturbed at the process. History is full of instances where scoundrels in power use some pretext to proclaim an emergency and then enact all sorts of new regulations. I do not believe our current Executive are scoundrels, but the next lot could be, and a ugly precedent has now been set.

But the most telling criticism is that a very similar motion was put to the Board of Governors just a few months ago. I refer to Motion 99-6 from GL#4 of 1998-99, moved by Francisco Cabanas, seconded by Joshua Keshet. Mr Cabanas was then a member of the Executive and could have put the same Motion to the Executive as he wanted. Was there not then the same urgency? Precisely what changed in the few months before the Annual Meeting? The fact that this Motion 99-6 met with some criticism and was allowed to die at the Annual Meeting (let us be clear -- it was not defeated, though it might well have been had there been a vote) can not create any added urgency. Why is that at the start of the year the matter is put before the Governors and then a few months later they are excluded? Arbitrary actions are troubling, but inconsistent actions terrify me.

Lyle Craver: I think Messrs. O'Donnell and Hergott are quite right to question the reviving of Motion 99-6. Despite what the President and Past-President say on this issue I am absolutely not convinced that there was an emergency situation which required the Executive to act without the Assembly and I think Mr. Ottosen is absolutely right.

(ii) Chesstalk

Denis Allan: Re: Chesstalk. I agree with Mr. Smith that Chesstalk is not the right forum for governors to discuss CFC matters. It is, however, very much the right technology. Our present system of making decision by Governors Letter, with two opportunities for discussion, and then a vote, is woefully inadequate. The Governors simply cannot do anything quickly, except at the annual meeting, which has its own flaws, as I have suggested before. Since the CFC has decided again to publish the Governors Letters on the website (as it once started to do, and then discontinued) surely it is possible to also publish Governors comments as they are received, and at least eliminate one of the discussion periods. I expect that most governors now have, or can get, access to the Internet.

Chesstalk has served a useful purpose in bringing to light matters which I think the Governors should be aware of. For example, I did not know that Chess'n Math offered to hold qualifying events and pay to send five boys to the Pan American Youth Championship, and that the CFC declined that offer. Or that Danny Goldenberg wanted to go to the World Junior Championship as an "extra player", at his own expense, and was refused permission to do so. If those statements are correct, I think the Governors are entitled to be informed of such decisions, who made them, and why. Was there not a "straw vote" discussion a few years ago about publishing executive decisions, following which some were reported in a few Governors Letters? And then no more? Perhaps someone would like to revive this as a motion? Is there any reason why any invitation the CFC receives to an international event cannot be published on the website so that any interested players can at least make their interest known? There is no doubt that Chesstalk is widely followed by CFC members. Those I know who have internet access are all familiar with it, and find it useful, but rarely contribute to it, unlike a few persons who have some valid points, but are painfully repetitious and seem to have little else to do with their time.

Lyle Craver: I think the President exaggerates the "threat" posed by the Chesstalk site. It is not just the CFC that has had its toes held to the fire - Mr. Bevand has also been challenged on key points as well. If the talk is constructive there's nothing to fear - and in my opinion there has been more constructive than destructive criticism.

(iii) Canadian Open 2001

This is the bid from Mount Allison University for the Canadian Open in 2001 that was accepted by the CFC Executive.

2001 Canadian Chess Festival, July 3 to July 15

October 27, 1999

David Barrett, Director Of Conferences
Mount Allison University
Sackville New Brunswick E4L 1G2

506-364-2247(bus) 506-364-2262(fax)
email: dbarrett@mta.ca

Dates: Tuesday July 3, 2001 to Sunday July 15, 2001

Director: Fred McKim - Tournament Director
Dave Barrett - On site coordinator

Location: Mount Allison University
82 York Street
Sackville, New Brunswick
E4L 1G2

Mount Allison University is located in Sackville, New Brunswick, approximately a 25 minute drive from the Moncton International Airport. Fredericton, St. John, Charlottetown and Halifax are all within a two hour drive of Mount Allison. Centrally located in the Maritimes, it provides an ideal location for this event. Visit the three web sites below to get detailed information about the University, the town of Sackville and the region of Tantramar.

<http://www.mta.ca/home.html>
<http://www.sackville.com/>
<http://www.tantramar.com/>

Events: CYCC Tuesday July 3, 2001 to Saturday July 7, 2001.
Canadian Open Friday July 6, 2001 to Sunday July 15, 2001.

Extra events will be organized throughout the tournament in the form of simul, quads, speed, siames, etc. Lectures may be available.

Format: CYCC- 6/7 round Swiss Time Control TBA.
Canadian Open - 10 round Swiss Time Control TBA.

Schedule: A tentative schedule has been drafted for both the CYCC and the Canadian Open. The CYCC is scheduled to commence on Tuesday July 3 with the opening ceremonies and will conclude with the closing ceremonies and awards presentation on Saturday July 7. The Canadian Open is scheduled to begin with an opening reception on Friday July 6, 1999 and play will commence on Saturday July 7 and end on Sunday July 15.. Closing ceremonies will be held on Sunday July 15 for those who wish to participate.

Entry Fees: CYCC entry fee to be determined after consultation with the CFC.
Canadian Open entry fee to be determined after consultation with the CFC. A minimum of \$99 is expected with higher rates for non CFC members and late registrants.

All entry fees will be collected by the CFC.

Prize Money: \$90 of all Canadian Open entry fees will be distributed back as prize money with a guaranteed minimum prize fund of \$10,000..
CYCC prizes and awards to be confirmed after consultation with the CFC.

Misc.: Accommodations will be made available at Mount Allison University at a rate of \$20 per night including all applicable taxes. A reduced 'sleeping bag' rate may be made available as well. A new \$4,500,000 dining facility has been built on campus (Dec 99) and will be made available for all you can eat meals during the event. All guests at the University have free use of all athletic facilities including indoor pool, fitness centre, gymnasium and indoor pool.

Accommodation and meal packages may be offered at a later date.

Online reservations can be made at www.mta.ca/conference/ or via email at conference@mta.ca.

Terms: Mount Allison University will provide a site for the CFC store at no charge.

Mount Allison University will provide a site for the CFC AGM meeting at no charge.

Mount Allison University will provide a site for the CFC Board of Directors meeting at no charge.

All boards, clocks, etc. will be provided by the players or the CFC.

Mount Allison University will contribute 3% of all entry fees to the CFC for use at their own discretion.

En Passant will provide Mount Allison University with 6 full page ads including a minimum of 3 inside and/or outside covers at no charge. En Passant will also provide Mount Allison University with a minimum of 2 pages of editorial ads at no charge.

The tournament will be CFC and FIDE rated.

Mount Allison University will have the exclusive advertising rights to these events. All proceeds from advertising and sponsorship of these events will be the property of Mount Allison University.

This proposal/bid shall expire on Friday January 7, 2000.

Grant Brown: Re.: Peter Stockhausen's response to my opposition to his bid for the 2001 Canadian Open:

1. As justification for holding the Canadian open twice in the same place within three years, Mr. Stockhausen maintains that "repeated 'hits' within a short time frame yield very positive results" - citing Winnipeg '94 and '97 as an example. The governors should be grateful to Mr. Stockhausen for suggesting an empirical test of his marketing hypothesis. I'll let the statistics speak for themselves: In October 1993, Manitoba had 95 CFC members; by October 1999, Manitoba had only 89 CFC members - a 6% decline. (Meanwhile, for comparison, Alberta saw its CFC membership go from 239 to 294 in the same time period - a 23% increase.)

2. With respect to requiring 20 months advance notice in order to organize a Canadian Open, Mr. Stockhausen makes two arguments: (a) He suggests it would be well-nigh impossible to find a suitable convention hotel in the greater Vancouver region which is prepared to book the event on less than 20 months notice; and (b) "Having been involved in a few Canadian Opens, my own guideline are [sic] actually 24 months advance certainty.... The USCF for example requires 36 months lead time for US Open bids." Claim (a) is difficult to credit, given that in the history of bidding for the Canadian Open, it seems that only Mr. Stockhausen has ever required more than 12 months advance notice, and even he has not always required such long advance notice. And claim (b) raises the obvious question why Mr. Stockhausen, if he prefers 24 months or even 36 months advance notice, didn't present his bid for the 2001 Canadian Open at the 1999 AGM, or even at the 1998 AGM, where it could have been properly discussed by the Governors, rather than waiting until just after the 1999 AGM to submit a bid for approval by the Executive only. Alternatively, he could bid for the 2002 Canadian Open at the 2000 AGM if he prefers so much advance notice.

3. With respect to pre-empting discussion of the bid by imposing the October 31 deadline, Mr. Stockhausen points out that the details of the bid were published in GL#1, which gives governors an opportunity to ask questions and raise concerns about the bid in GL#2. Unfortunately, it does not give governors a timely answer to their questions and concerns, it does not give governors a chance to respond to the answers, and it does not give governors a chance to make and vote on any motion regarding this bid. I have heard some rather horrific reports from other governors who were in attendance at the 1999 Canadian Open regarding rounds beginning late, pairings being done wrong and not corrected, and other problems. These concerns surely need to be addressed before any further bid from Mr. Stockhausen is entertained. Mr. Stockhausen goes on to assure us, "No doubt, the Executive will take guidance from those comments." Since all of the comments on the 2001 bid that were received from the governors for GL#2 were negative, it would seem that Mr. Stockhausen is implying that the Executive is bound to reject his bid. I suspect, rather, that the Executive will take about as much notice of governor's comments on a Canadian Open bid as they did on the issue of the rating of junior and scholastic events - i.e. none whatsoever.

4. Mr. Stockhausen defends as a "very prudent investment" the \$1,000 subsidy from the CFC included in the terms of his bid. Given how mistaken Mr. Stockhausen is in his claims about the benefits to the CFC of his tournaments in Winnipeg, and how wrong he was in his claims about how many chess players from the Pacific Northwest would be coming to play in the 1999 Canadian Open, I find it difficult to take seriously his speculations about the benefits to the CFC of his 2001 bid. But even if he were roughly correct in his projections, the \$1000 expenditure would still not be a prudent investment on the part of the CFC if another bid were forthcoming which provided the same benefits to the CFC without the \$1,000 subsidy (or even with it). After all, the CFC will make money on its retail sales no matter where the 2001 Canadian Open is held.

5. Mr. Stockhausen wonders why I am opposed to the CFC "investing 0.3% of it's [sic] annual revenue into the Canadian Open when at the same time [I] support to have [sic] a provincial federation expend 20% or even more of it's [sic] annual revenue on the same event." The explanation is rather obvious, I would have thought: The CFC doesn't have the \$1,000 to waste in this manner, while the Alberta Chess Association and the Edmonton Chess Club have more cash in the bank than they would otherwise know what to do with. Furthermore, comparing percentages of annual revenue is completely irrelevant. Because of its lack of cash, every program the CFC runs is supposed to be run on a self-financing basis; in fact, Stockhausen-organized Canadian Opens are virtually the only programs which demand a subsidy from the CFC these days. Mr. Stockhausen's request could very well amount to 100% of CFC program spending in a given year, whereas the periodic outlays for Canadian Opens from the Alberta associations amount to a much smaller percentage of our total program spending. The financial thinking (if you can call it that) on the part of the Treasurer of the CFC, revealed here and in items 4 and 1 above, goes some considerable way toward explaining how the CFC got into the financial mess it is currently in.

6. (a) Mr. Stockhausen accuses me of defaming him when I point out that requesting a subsidy from the CFC, of which he is Treasurer, for an event at a hotel of which he is general manager puts him in a conflict of interest. He claims to have asked me to rescind this statement but in fact no such request was ever received by me.

(b) Someone is in a conflict of interest when he is in the position of serving two distinct interests at the same time. Being in a conflict of interest does not in itself normally involve moral or legal wrongdoing; but there is a danger in such a situation, namely the POTENTIAL to short-change one interest for the sake of the other. There is also the risk of creating a perception among those affected that their interests are not properly being attended to. A highly ethical person will therefore attempt to avoid conflicts of interest in the first place, for example by not intermingling his personal and his business interests so closely. In any case, nothing in my earlier remarks in any way impugned Mr. Stockhausen's "integrity, honesty, or decency." The implication I wished to make was simply this: In view of the conflict of interest, the most honourable thing for Mr. Stockhausen to do would be to abandon the demand for a \$1,000 subsidy from the CFC.

(c) In short, the essential element of defamation - publicly discrediting another - is clearly absent here. The inference Mr. Stockhausen drew was neither intended nor logical. But even if my comment had had the effect of publicly discrediting him, truth is an absolute defence to defamation. It is so plainly true that his bid puts him in a conflict of interest that, although Mr. Stockhausen gainsays every other statement I made in my comments on the 2001 Canadian Open bid, he does not actually deny that he is in a conflict of interest - he just indicates that he resents my having pointed it out. Furthermore, my comments were not intended to be public; they were arguably made in the context of "qualified privilege." (Qualified privilege obtains, for example, when directors of a corporation discuss issues concerning the functioning of the corporation among themselves.) That they ended up being broadcast on the Internet is a result of a decision made without prior warning by the CFC Executive. Since broadcasting defamatory remarks is itself defamatory, it follows that if I am guilty of defamation then by the same token so is the CFC Executive, of which Mr. Stockhausen is a member. Thus Mr. Stockhausen is in the peculiar situation of accusing himself of committing defamation against himself!

(d) Falsely accusing another of defamation is also be defamatory. Indeed, I find Mr. Stockhausen's comments in this regard to be highly offensive and a public assault upon my reputation, and in the spirit of Mr. Stockhausen himself, hereby request that he:

1. instruct the Secretary of the CFC to strike his accusations of defamation from GL #2 by October 31, 1999, and copy me on the instruction; and
2. write an unequivocal letter of apology and retraction of this accusation to me no later than October 31, 1999, with copies to all CFC Governors via e-mail, or regular postal service, as may be applicable. I would also ask the Secretary to publish these two items in full in GL#3. I would appreciate it if Mr. Stockhausen would attend to this matter by the time indicated. Please rest assured that I do not wish this issue to escalate any further than absolutely necessary.

Sincerely,

-gb.

Grant A. Brown, D.Phil.(Oxford)

Student-at-Law

Peter Stockhausen: The "Tempest in the tea pot" Stockhausen/Brown

1, CFC Membership

Below you will find a table showing CFC membership as of October 31st each year. The numbers in bold represent the province in which the Canadian Open was held in the preceding July.

CFC Membership As of October 31.

	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Alberta	239	237	308	366	350	340	294
B.C.	431	442	425	507	469	477	599
SK	84	87	108	110	89	77	64
MB	95	136	123	125	122	100	89
ON	1534	1680	1750	1786	1686	1587	1522
QC	169	190	177	159	178	163	158
NB	134	154	146	126	144	119	116
NS	103	124	111	100	116	124	114
PE	16	18	13	20	22	38	24
NF	57	54	79	37	46	68	69
YK	9	11	12	12	7	17	11
NW	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Foreign	66	67	73	40	44	41	42
USA	68	87	104	101	83	103	101

Total	3,006	3,288	3,429	3,489	3,356	3,254	3,203
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

In four out of six cases (1993 is the base year) membership increased, in some cases substantially. In two cases, membership actually declined.

In the case of Manitoba and Alberta we see the “revolving door” syndrome in the sense that we have not so much trouble attracting new members, but we cannot keep them. Hopefully the 2000 Canadian Open in Edmonton will reverse the declining trend in Alberta and obviously we hope that 2001 will prove to be a real “shot in the arm” for New Brunswick. It will also be interesting to see if BC can build on it’s peak of 1999 and buck the trend observed in Alberta and Manitoba.

Obviously a number of other events can have a substantial impact on membership. To mind come:

- An increase/decrease in activity by local organizers.
- An increase/decrease in local junior events.
- Price increases/decreases.
- Local Chess publications.

I have read through Mr. Brown’s comments for GL#3 regarding the potential “conflict of interest” in my 2001 Canadian Open bid. I consider his comments in this respect a sufficiently eloquent clarification that no further apology is required. In any case, I trust the judgment of my fellow governors. Since the Executive of the CFC has since unanimously decided to award the 2001 Canadian Open to a competing bid in New Brunswick, I consider the subject matter closed.

Robert Webb: There have been some emotional comments made on the issue of where, and under what circumstances, the 2001 Open would be held. Here is my perspective on the matter:

Geographically, Chess has a problem in Canada. We are 30 million, give or take, spread out over a huge land mass. In order for Provinces to be assured of not being left out, we try to change the location of the Open. Statistically, we have done a reasonable job, a grade B-, I guess. But, when income-earning players looks at an upcoming Open they want to be assured of some variety -- a place to which he/she may take a Significant Other and the proverbial 2.4 children. The family needs have to be balanced. Going back again and again is what Walt Disney World is all about, but there is more to be considered here. Therefore, to have the Open in Vancouver in 1999 and in 2001 just doesn’t cut it for me.

While those people to whom I have spoken were pleased with the Hotel facilities, there is no doubt that the main benefactors of the 1999 Open were the BC players -- as it has to be. In 1998 I was able to enter the Open In Ottawa. No hotel expense, be at home with family and get ten games of Chess Nirvana!
But, I also attended the 1977 Open, in Fredericton, New Brunswick. I was young and single, with the affluence that goes along, and there were other factors that made the decision to go an easy one: UNB Residences were cheap and Air Canada got subsidies on the Easterly routes I would like to think that there are Organizers in other parts of our country who can put on an excellent event like that

There is no reason that I can think of that Newfoundland, Saskatchewan, any area, should be pushed into the background, simply because a recent host wants another shot at it. The repeat performance in Winnipeg a few years ago was not popular in this household, I know.

I would be in favour of a first refusal system that would cover the whole country in a dozen years. For example: 2000 - *Alberta* 2001 - *BC* [assuming theirs is now accepted] and lets say *Quebec* in 2002 [I am an optimist] 2003 - *Nova Scotia*. Should Quebec decline, Alberta and BC would not be eligible to take over. I think this would answer Mr Stockhausen’s timing concerns, with which I sympathize. Adequate time would have to be allocated for the process.

In summary: I am not in favour of the 2001 Open going to BC., but is anyone else interested in hosting it? Therein lies the next hurdle.

Lyle Craver: It is good to hear that Messrs. Brown and Stockhausen have "buried the hatchet". It is manifestly obvious that in matters concerning a Canadian Open bid to be hosted in Peter's hotel that there is bound to be a

conflict of interest. Having said that I know Peter well enough to know that both on the Executive and before the Assembly Peter will conduct himself to be above reproach. In other words, he knows well when to take part in discussions and votes and when not to without us having to tell him.

(iv) The Ruling by the Rating Auditor on the Regular Rating of Certain Junior Events Played Under Active Time Controls.

Gordon Taylor: To let you all know where I stand, I think this is an appalling decision. To my mind the organizers made mistakes, the CFC Business Office compounded their mistakes, and now the Rating Auditor is trying to justify the sorry affair by a very poor reading of the rules.

To begin, the games were played at a time control of Game/30. Well that's Active chess. We all know this and it says so clearly at section 711 of the Handbook, paragraph 1. Were the events not advertised as Active ? Well, if not the organizers, and maybe the CFC Business Office, are in violation of 711, para 3.

The events were rated Regular. Were the events misrepresented to the Business Office when submitted ? If yes, then the organizer is again at fault. If the Business Office knew the time control, then the Office is at fault.

The only apology is the so-called discretionary power given the Executive Director at 711, para 4. I shall now address myself to this item. To begin, I was the Executive Director in 1990 and was present at the Annual Meeting when Motion 90-11 was passed. So you may give credence to what I say. Section 711 begins by clearly distinguishing two rates of play. If we disregard Fischer time controls (still not recognized by the CFC), every game can fit only one category. But to be rated under either system, three additional conditions must be met:

"all games must fit the same category";

"non sudden death controls shall not have a rate of play exceeding one move per minute"; and

"all secondary time controls must be a minimum of 5 minutes long."

Thus, a time control of say 200 moves / five minutes, then Game / 55 min., which is effectively speed chess, can not be rated under either system.

Imagine time controls of X moves in Y minutes, followed by Game in Z minutes. If $Y + Z = 60$, can we rate it Regular ? No it depends on X, and Z must be at least 5 minutes. What if $Y + Z = 30$, can we rate it Active ? No, it depends again on X, Y and Z. This is what was meant when the Executive Director was given the discretionary power. He can clearly reject an event for rating in either system. There may be some marginal cases where he may accept for rating an event that violates one of the three conditions above (e.g 30 moves in 25 minutes followed by Game in 5 minutes should probably be rated Active despite violating the second condition). But to move an Active event to Regular ? No! Never! That would stand the rating system on its ear and completely contradict the intent of the old Motion 90-11 as enunciated in the first two paragraphs of section 711.

Let's not confuse the issue by introducing the new Executive Motion. That Motion was not in effect when these events were played and there is no indication that the new Executive Motion can be applied retroactively.

While some parents and organizers may be happy to see these events rated Regular, most are not. If events are submitted to the CFC for rating, it should be understood that they will be rated according to our rules, not theirs. These events were Active -- they should only have been rated as such.

To take clearly Active events and rate them Regular is wrong. No clever arguments can change that. Indeed, arguments in support of an error are certain to rebound on those that make them. It may be too late to undo this error but I pray I never see another like it !

(v) Other Matters

Lyle Craver: I am not satisfied with the response to my query concerning updates to the CFC Handbook. I'm aware it's available on the CFC web site - I am not satisfied being told I must do 22 separate downloads to get the new text. As a bare minimum a "zipped" copy of the handbook ought to be available although even there I'm not happy being told I have to go through a 100+ page document to see where the differences are between the revised version and the copy I take to every tournament I direct.

Alan Whitman: I am resigning from my positions on the executive of the British Columbia Chess Federation effective November 10, 1999. The positions are Southern Interior Vice-President and CFC Governor. If ANY of Mr. Deline's predecessors as BCCF President over the past 20 years were still in office I would remain on the executive. That is, my resignation should be seen as an expression of non-confidence in Mr. Deline because of his actions since July, 1999. His actions include:

a/ repeatedly strongly criticizing two long-serving B.C. chess organizers in e-mails sent to many of their colleagues, rather than politely in private.

b/ proposing the elimination of the regional qualifying tournaments for the BC Closed which I believe will cripple the few strong tournaments now held outside of Greater Vancouver and further limit opportunities for players to develop their skills if they don't happen to live in Greater Vancouver.

c/ proposing that various BCCF programs be changed or eliminated so that their funding can instead be used for the grandiose plans which he has for a single tournament, the 25th Paul Keres Memorial Tournament.

I wish to state that I have not been involved in the planning of the 25th Paul Keres Memorial Tournament, have not been given a chance to vote on any decisions taken about this tournament, and bear no financial responsibility for the financial commitments made by Mr. Deline to date or any which may be made in future in relation to this tournament.

Tim Knechtel: As I have decided to quit the CFC, I must also resign my position on the board of the Kalle Pugi Fund. Hope you can find a suitable replacement.

Lyle Craver: I hope to see a discussion concerning the desirability of bringing the Canadian Championship regulations into line with what the current practice actually is (e.g. concerning the rating of matches etc.)

I would welcome a straw vote on whether in these days of FIDE Knockouts for the "World Championship", the Governors favour an annual Canadian Closed (as advocated by Mr. Haley)

Halldor Palsson: I have included this as a straw vote topic.

Rules of procedure for The Canadian Junior Championship Tournament

1051. Frequency:

A Tournament known as the Canadian Junior Championship Tournament hereinafter referred to as the Junior Tournament shall normally be held each year to determine the Canadian representative to the World Junior Chess Championship.

1052. Format:

The tournament shall be an eight round tournament held over four days with pairings to be in accordance with the swiss system of pairing.

1053. Players:

The following players shall be eligible to participate in the Junior Tournament provided they comply with the formal entry requirements of Article 1057:

(a) The Provincial Champion ordinary resident in each Province.

(b) The highest rated player resident in the Territories {The Yukon, N.W.T. and Nunavut} who is willing to play upon the request of an affiliated territorial chess association. The board of directors may authorize a tournament to select a representative in place of the highest rated player resident in the Territories.

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

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

1054. Provincial Champion:

Except where clause 1054(c) applies each Province as specified in Clause 1053 shall have the right to determine who shall be their Provincial Champion by choosing as their champion either the winner of a Provincial Championship Tournament who meets the requirements of 1054(a) or the highest rated player who meets the requirements of 1054(b).

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

The Province has the discretion to decide the qualification rules and format for the Provincial Championship Tournament provided they otherwise comply with the rules herein. Should the winner of the Provincial Championship Tournament not compete in the Junior Tournament, the runner up shall be the Provincial Champion for the purposes of qualifying pursuant to 1053(b).

Should both the Champion and runner-up not compete in the Junior Tournament the Provincial Champion for qualifying pursuant to 1053(b) shall be the highest rated Junior player in the Province as defined in 1054(b) who is willing to play.

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

(c) Where a Province does not have a provincial association affiliated to the Chess Federation of Canada then the Highest Rated Junior Player as defined in 1054(b) shall be the Provincial Champion.

1055. Rating Requirements:

In determining the rating for qualification pursuant to Clause 1053(d) or 1054(b), the following shall apply:

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

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

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

1056. Additional Places:

When a player who has qualified to play in the Junior Tournament has qualified under more than one clause of section 1053, then the extra place will be filled from the rating list pursuant to clause 1053(d).

1057. Age, Citizenship, and Residency for Canadian Championship:

Each contestant in the Junior Tournament must fulfill the age and residency requirements specified by FIDE for the World Junior event. Each player shall be a member of the CFC in good standing and shall be either (i) a Canadian citizen or (ii) a landed immigrant and be a resident of Canada for the twelve-month period immediately preceding the tournament. Persons who are not citizens or landed immigrants but who have been a resident of Canada for a twelve-month period immediately preceding the tournament may be admitted to the Tournament provided they can clearly demonstrate to the CFC Board of Directors that they have a settled intention to continue to reside in Canada.

The admittance to the Tournament of such exceptions shall be entirely at the discretion of the CFC Board of Directors.

1058. Entries:

All eligible players who may qualify pursuant to Clause 1053 and who wish to participate in the Junior Tournament shall notify the CFC Business Office no later than 45 days before the start of the Championship of their intention to participate, enclosing their entry fee of \$150.00. The CFC Board of Directors may delegate this function to the tournament organizers. Entries which cannot be accepted because the number exceeds the number of players allowed shall be advised thereof and their entry fee returned to them.

Players qualifying pursuant to Clause 1053(b) shall send in their entries as soon as is practical after the Provincial Champion is known but in any case no later than three weeks prior to the start of the Junior Tournament. In exceptional circumstances, the CFC Board of Directors can vary the time limits in this Clause.

1059. Time Control:

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

1060. Tie Break:

Should two or more players finish the tournament with the same number of points then in order to determine an outright winner, a tie-break based on the result of a shorter game using a sudden death time control of 30 minutes per player shall be used. If a Fischer clock is available it shall be used with a per move bonus of 10 seconds.

In the case of two players tying, there will be a single game tie-break with colours being chosen by lot. If the game is a draw colours will be reversed. If both of the first two games are drawn then the time control shall be shortened to 15 minutes per player with a per move bonus of 10 seconds per move, if a Fischer clock is available. Games will continue at this time control with alternation of colours until one game is won.

In the case of 3, 4 or 5 players tying, there will be a single round robin using a time control of 30 minutes per player with a per move bonus of 10 seconds per move, if a Fischer clock is available. There will be a further playoff by the winners of the round robin in the case of a further tie except the time control for this subsequent play-off shall be 15 minutes per player with a per move bonus of 10 seconds per move, if a Fischer clock is available. In all other cases the CFC President shall decide upon the format for breaking the tie.

1061. Players Expenses:

Each player will be responsible for paying his own travel expenses, accommodation and meal expenses. The sum of \$100.00 of each entry fee shall go to the tournament organizers to assist with the cost of running the event and to provide trophies and/or prizes where appropriate.

1062. Participation in the World Event:

The winner of the event shall be eligible to participate in the World Junior event. If the winner is unable to participate, the second place finisher shall be invited to go in his place. If the second place finisher also declines, the highest finisher in the tournament who is willing to participate in the world event, shall be selected. The CFC Board of Directors shall use an appropriate tie breaking method to break ties if required to determine the order of finish. The sum of \$50.00 of each entry fee shall go to the CFC business office to help defray the cost of sending Canada's representative to the appropriate world event.

1063. Authority of the Board of Directors:

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

Rules of procedure for The Canadian Women's Championship Tournament

1101. Frequency of Canadian Women Championship Tournament:

A Women's Championship Tournament shall normally be held in Canada to coincide with the FIDE World Championship cycle.

1102. Format:

The tournament shall be a not less than six rounds with pairings to be determined in accordance with the Swiss system of pairing.

1103. Players:

The following players shall be eligible to participate in the Women's Championship Tournament provided they comply with the formal entry requirements of Article 907:

- (a) The Canadian Women's Champion.
- (b) The runner-up to the Canadian Women's Champion.
- (c) The Provincial Women's Champion ordinarily resident in each Province.
- (4) The highest rated woman player resident in the territories (the Yukon, N.W.T. Nunuvut) who is willing to play provided she has a rating of not less than 1900. Upon the request of an affiliated territorial chess association the board of directors may authorize a tournament to select a representative in place of the highest rated player resident in the territories.
- (e) The highest rated women players in the sequence of the Canadian Rating List (see Article 905) until a total of no more than 25 players is reached. The final number of players shall be determined by the CFC Board of Directors.

1104. Provincial Women's Champion:

Except where clause 904(d) applies each Province as specified in Clause 903(c) shall have the right to determine who shall be their Provincial Women's Champion by choosing as their champion either the winner of a Provincial Women's Championship Tournament who meets the requirements of 904(a) or the highest rated player who meets the requirements of 904(b).

(a) To qualify a Provincial Women's Championship Tournament must be held no earlier than two years or later than 4 weeks prior to the start of the Canadian Women's Championship. It must be a CFC rated tournament restricted to players ordinarily resident in the Province at least six months prior to the start of the Canadian Women's Chess Championship and each player must meet at least one of the following requirements:

- (i) have an established published rating of not less than 1700 when they qualified to play in or at the start of the Provincial Women's Championship Tournament; or
- (ii) is the winner of a tournament which qualified the winner to participate in the Provincial Women's Championship Tournament.

The Province has the discretion to decide the qualification rules and format for the Provincial Women's Championship Tournament provided they otherwise comply with the rules herein. Should the winner of the Provincial Women's Championship Tournament not compete in the Canadian Women's Championship, the runner up shall be the Provincial Women's Champion for the purposes of qualifying pursuant to 903(c). Should both the Champion and runner-up not compete in the Canadian Women's Championship the Provincial Women's Champion for qualifying pursuant to 903(c) shall be the highest rated player in the Province as defined in 904(b) who is willing to play.

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

(c) Where a Province does not have a provincial association affiliated to the Chess Federation of Canada then the Highest Rated player as defined in 904(b) shall be the Provincial Women's Champion.

1105. Rating Requirements:

In determining the rating for qualification pursuant to Clause 903(e) or 904(b), the following shall apply:

- (a) The players rating shall be from the rating list designated by the CFC Board of Directors and published

approximately eight weeks prior to the Championship Tournament.

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

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

1106. Additional Places:

When a player who has qualified to play in the Championship Tournament has qualified under more than one clause of section 903, then the extra place will be filled from the rating list pursuant to clause 903(e).

1107. Citizenship and Residency for Canadian Women's Championship:

Each contestant in the Canadian Women's Championship Tournament shall be a member of the CFC in good standing and shall be either (i) a Canadian citizen or (ii) a landed immigrant and be a resident of Canada for the twelve-month period immediately preceding the tournament. Persons who are not citizens or landed immigrants but who have been a resident of Canada for a twelve-month period immediately preceding the tournament and are not living in Canada solely as a student or in a work learning program may be admitted to the Tournament provided they can clearly demonstrate to the CFC Board of Directors that they have a settled intention to continue to reside in Canada. The admittance to the Tournament of such exceptions shall be entirely at the discretion of the CFC Board of Directors.

1108. Entries:

All eligible players who qualify pursuant to Clauses 903(a), (b) and (e), and all other players with an Established Rating of not less than 1900 who may qualify and who wish to participate in the Canadian Women's Championship Tournament shall notify the CFC Business Office not later than 45 days before the start of the Championship of their intention to participate, enclosing their entry fee of \$150.00. Entries which cannot be accepted because the number exceeds the allowed number shall be advised thereof and their entry fee returned to them. Mandatory inclusions under Clause 903(c) shall send in their entries as soon as is practical after the Provincial Women's Champion is known but in any case not later than three weeks prior to the start of the Canadian Women's Championship Tournament. In exceptional circumstances, the CFC Board of Directors can vary the time limits in this Clause.

1109. Time Control:

Time control shall be determined prior to the tournament by the CFC Board of Directors.

1110. Tie Break:

Should two or more players finish the tournament with the same number of points then in order to determine an outright winner, a tie-break based on the result of a shorter game using a sudden death time control of 30 minutes per player shall be used. If a Fischer clock is available it shall be used with a per move bonus of 10 seconds.

In the case of two players tying, there will be a single game tie-break with colours being chosen by lot. If the game is a draw colours will be reversed. If both of the first two games are drawn then the time control shall be shortened to 15 minutes per player with a per move bonus of 10 seconds per move, if a Fischer clock is available. Games will continue at this time control with alternation of colours until one game is won.

In the case of 3, 4 or 5 players tying, there will be a single round robin using a time control of 30 minutes per player with a per move bonus of 10 seconds per move, if a Fischer clock is available. There will be a further playoff by the winners of the round robin in the case of a further tie except the time control for this subsequent play-off shall be 15 minutes per player with a per move bonus of 10 seconds per move, if a Fischer clock is available.

In all other cases the CFC President shall decide upon the format for breaking the tie.

1111. Player Expense and Prize Fund:

Each player will be responsible for paying her own accommodation and meal expenses with the exception of the Canadian Champion who shall have her accommodation paid by the tournament organizer. The sum of \$100.00 of

each entry fee shall go to the tournament organizers to assist with the cost of running the event. The sum of \$50.00 of each entry fee should go to the CFC to help defray the cost of sending Canada's representative to the World event. Other prizes will depend on the tournament finances and shall be at the discretion of the organizer.

1112. Travel:

The CFC shall pay the cost of travel for the champion to the world event. Should the Canadian Women's Champion not be able to participate in the next round of the world championship cycle the highest finisher in the tournament who is willing to participate in the world event shall be selected. The travel prize shall be used by the player who actually attends at the next world championship round.

1113. Authority of the Board of Directors:

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

MOTIONS FOR VOTE

00-1 YES{ } NO { } ABSTAIN { }

00-2 YES{ } NO { } ABSTAIN { }

MOTIONS FOR DISCUSSION

00-3

00-4

00-5

[illegible]