The Chess Organiser's Handbook

Dedicated to:

Hylton, Suzie, Lauren, Nigel, Paula

The
Chess
Organiser's
Handbook

Third Edition
incorporating the 2005
FIDE
Laws of Chess

Stewart Reuben

HARDINGE SIMPOLE

Acknowledgements

Many players, arbiters and organisers have contributed to this book. An opportunity has been taken to correct errors and make other small changes in the text which first appeared. Geurt Gijssen was particularly helpful in pointing out errors. The errors remaining are all mine; much of what is good here is due to the help and advice of those listed below

They include:

Casto Abundo; David Anderton; Leonard Barden; Lara Barnes; Richard Beville; Les Blackstock; BCF Management Board; Mark Bryant; Almog Burstein; Paul Buswell; Caleta Hotel staff; Chess Arbiters Association; David Clayton; Tony Corfe; Eric Croker; Colin Crouch; Dirk De Ridder; John Donaldson; Edward Dubov; ECF Board; Dr Hesham Elgendi; Abdelhafid Elamri; Nick Faulks; John Fernandez; FIDE Organizers, Qualification Commission; Rules and Tournament Regulations, Swiss Pairings, Technical Commission, Titles and Ratings Committees; Dr Andrzej Filipowicz; Nigel Freeman; Tony Gaffney; Joe Gallagher; Israel Gelfer; Geurt Gijssen; Bill Goichberg; Neil Graham; Richard Haddrell; Phil Haley; Abd Majid Hamid; Willy Iclicki; Carol Jarecki; David Jarrett; Ray Keene; Christian Krause; Hans Lahlum; Ignatius Leong; David Levy; Gunther Löwenthal; London Chess Association; Sergio Mastropietro; Georgios Makropoulos; Mikko Markkula; Alex McFarlane; Rod McShane; Peter Morrish; Sevan Muradian; Viacheslav Neklyudov; Panagiotis Nikolopoulos; Richard O'Brien; Kevin O'Connell; Bill O'Rourke; Mehrdad Pahlevanzadeh; John Player; Eddie Price; Peter Purland; Miguel Quinteros; Adam Raoof; Cathy Rogers; John Saunders; Eric Schiller; David Sedgwick; Nigel Short; Jeff Sonas; Werner Stubenvoll; Colin Tribe; Viron Tsorbatzoglou; John Turnock; Günther van den Bergh; Ashot Vardapetian; Igor Vereschagin; Gerry Walsh; Manuel Weeks; David Welch; Pranesh Yadav.

The late: Professor Lim Kok Ann; Harry Baines; Steve Boniface; Florencio Campomanes; Vladimir Dvorkovich; Arpad Elo; Richard Furness; Harry Golombek; George Goodwin; Bozidar Kazic; George Koltanowski; John Robinson; George Smith; Peter Shaw; Jack Speigel; Frankie Torregrosa; Bob Wade; David Wallace.

Contents

Appendices

Bibliography

The Chess Competitor's Handbook *Bozidar Kazic* Federation International des Echecs Handbook British Chess Federation YearBook

US Chess Federation's Official Rules of Chess Ratings of Chessplayers, Past and Present *Arpad E. Elo Arbiting Matters*, Journal of the Chess Arbiters Association

8

Preface

A Year in the Life of a Chess Congress Organiser

1.   Determine your objectives
     (Chapter 1)
2.   Determine the format and prizes
     (Chapters 2 and 3)
3.   Prepare the budget
     (Chapter 4)
4.   Raise the funds
5.   Arrange the venue
     (Chapter 5)
6.   Arrange the dates
7.   Arrange accommodation for players
8.   Prepare an entry form
9.   Arrange Insurance
10. Print the entry form
11. Distribute the form
12. Issue invitations in good time
13. Arrange pre-publicity of the event
14. Receive entries
15. Arrange other controllers and stewards
     (Chapter 6)
16. Arrange security
17. Prepare non-cash prizes
18. Arrange concessions
19. Arrange bulletin production
     (Chapter 18)
20. Arrange equipment
     (Chapters 7 and 8)
21. Arrange accommodation for staff
22. Prepare for website
     (Chapter 19)
23. Arrange internet connections for all

(Chapter 19)
24. Prepare programme
25. Liaise with venue administrators
26. Finalise refreshments
27. Tournament charts
28. Pairings
(Chapter 9)
29. Prepare venue
30. Opening ceremony
31. Run the event
32. Display literature
33. Publicity during the event
34. Issue questionnaire
35. Control the event
(Chapters 6, 10, 11)
36. Attend to visiting dignitaries
37. Listen to tales of woe and might-have-been
38. Determine the prize list
(Chapter 13)
39. Arrange the prizegiving
40. Clear up venue
41. Return equipment
42. Post-tournament publicity
43. Send out prizes not collected
44. Send in norm certificates and results for rating
(Chapters 14, 15, 16)
45. Issue thank you notes
46. Pay bills
47. Send out bulletins, cross-tables
48. Do the accounts
49. Have the accounts audited
50. Evaluate questionnaire
51. Review the event
52. Start planning for next year

Chapter 1

The Organiser's Objectives

When designing up an event, it is extremely desirable to determine what you are setting out to achieve before finalising the arrangements. Otherwise you are likely to be left with a vague feeling of dissatisfaction after clearing up at the day's end. Below are some of the objectives that should be considered.

1. That the players should enjoy themselves.
2. That the event attracts publicity for chess.
3. That the event attracts publicity for the sponsors.
4. That at least some of the players have the opportunity to improve their playing strength.
5. That the event makes a surplus of income over expenditure.
6. That the organisers make a profit.
7. That the organisers enjoy themselves.
8. There will also be specialist objectives, specific to each event.

Everything pales into insignificance by comparison with the players being satisfied. This may be that they make money from the event. But few are in chess solely for the money.

Many organisers fallaciously believe publicity matters little without sponsors. We are fighting for our place in a competitive market against other leisure activities. The steady drip of publicity can be extremely effective. In addition, the players will be happier if the event seems important and are thus likely to return. Gone are the days when sponsors were satisfied with a crumb of publicity. They are entitled to everything that can be wrung from the event. Then, they are more likely to repeat, making for happier players; also new sponsors will be encouraged.

Organising events to help develop players is a common objective.

If an event is budgeted to break even, inevitably over a

number of years it will sometimes lose money. Some think it is morally wrong to make a surplus. This is nonsense. If nothing else, that money can be used as a cushion against future calamities.

Again, there is nothing wrong with running an event as a business. However, care should be taken not to disguise this. In particular, donations should not be used for personal profit, nor should fellow well-meaning organisers be taken advantage of.

12

Chapter 2

What Type of Competition?

There are many different ways in which a chess event can be put together. The choice depends on the organiser's objectives. When dealing with a sponsor, it is important to listen to their agenda.

1. Matches

These head-to-head contests are the oldest type of chess event. A confrontation between two evenly-matched opponents can certainly stir the blood. Whoever wins will have unequivocally demonstrated his superiority in that particular series.

Most matches are played over a restricted number of games. For example, 24 in many World Championship matches. The winner is the first to have scored more that 50% of the total, 12½ points in our example. The match is usually terminated once the match has been won since the creative juices of the players are likely to be exhausted and the dead games will be uninspired.

Thus spectators won't buy tickets for the last games where the winner must achieve a certain number of wins, often six in various World Championship matches. This isn't realistic in modern society, it is impossible to know when the match will conclude. Disaster struck in 1984-5 when Karpov led Kasparov by five wins to three with 40 draws. Florencio Campomanes, then FIDE President, controversially stopped the match after five months. Such a match is unlikely to appeal to newspapers, or television companies with deadlines and budgets to consider.

Players alternate White and Black. Usually the first round draw is made the night before. This should be done by lot; there is no good reason to give one player the option of choosing the colour in the first game.

2. Team Matches

In Britain more than half of the competitive chess played is between teams. In America there is very little of this type of chess. It seems strange such a fiercely individualistic game as chess should inspire team loyalty but there is no doubt such events as the English Counties Championships, 4NCL, European Club Championship and the Olympiad are hugely popular.

It is normal to require the teams to be played in strict order of playing strength. If not, there may be a totally fallacious result. Consider two teams A and B which are evenly matched. A1 and B1 are rated 2800, A2 and B2 2550, A3 and B3 2300, A4 and B4 2050. The expected scores with various pairings are shown below for a ten game match. The probability tables of Page 167 has been used to determine the results.

Pairings Result Pairings Result Pairings Result Pairings Result

Pairings	Result	Pairings	Result	Pairings	Result	Pairings	Result
A1-B1	5-5	A1-B2	8-2	A1-B3	9½-½	A1-B4	10-0
A2-B2	5-5	A2-B3	8-2	A2-B4	9½-½	A2-B1	2-8
A3-B3	5-5	A3-B4	8-2	A3-B2	2 -8	A3-B3	5-5
A4-B4	5-5	A4-B1	0-10	A4-B1	0 -10	A4-B2	½-9½
TOTAL	*20-20*		*24-16*		*21 -19*		*17½-22½*

Naturally such strikingly different ratings are wildly improbable. They have been chosen to clarify the problem. With the growth of rating systems, captains are less likely to be able to get away with teams which are massively out of line. But what if a substitute is brought in after the round starts? It is claimed the Board 1 hasn't turned up unexpectedly. Naturally the replacement is the weakest. The fourth column shows how devastating this can be. The controller can only rely on the captain not cheating or demand an unpleasant walk-over.

Again the colours should be decided by lot. Otherwise match captains often place their players who fare better with Black on odd boards, not necessarily in strict playing strength, and then

14

take Black on odd if they win the toss. Many perfectly honorable people don't even realise they are cheating. The Scheveningen System (see later) overcomes these uncomfortable problems.

For round robin team tournaments (leagues) the initial score may be decided on team match points or on total points scored. In the former case, it matters little whether any matches are won at all. E.g. a team that loses 10 matches 5.5-6.5 (55 points) will score better than a team which wins 8 matches 6.5-5.5 and loses the other two 1-9 (54 points). European competitions and the London League use the former system and the Olympiad the latter. If there is a tie-break required, the other score is often used. Using team match points has the advantage of fostering team spirit, but then winning by 2½-1½ is nearly as good as 4-0. In the last European Team Championship but one, Russia coasted to the gold medal winning each match by the minimum score.

It seems to me the best solution may be combined team match points and total points scored. Thus, in a 4 board match, the winning team receives 2 points plus its score 2½ to 4; if drawn, they both receive 4 points. It would be more complex to outsiders, but probably would meet everybody's objectives.

3. Knock-out

An event resolved by a series of knock-out matches has several advantages. It is simple to understand, each round is vital to the contestants and the event builds up to a grand finale. Thus it is the best type when chess is being sold as a spectacle, particularly on television. In addition, there can be no collusion between opponents, eventually one must win. Both all-play-all and Swiss System tournaments suffer from the problem that one player may throw a game to his opponent. It was of this possibility that Fischer complained in the Candidates series for the World Championship. This led to that event being resolved by a series of knock-out matches. At the time of writing in 2005, the FIDE World Championship is being resolved by an 8 player double round all-play-all. I wish them luck, but very much doubt this system will survive for long.

One problem with a knockout is that people may travel long distances, only to be knocked out at an early stage. Also a player must be prepared to commit himself to the entire period of the event, but again may be knocked out in the first round. Attempts have been made to remedy this by the players transferring to a Swiss after failing (similar to a plate competition) and being given a score in the Swiss which depends on how far they advanced. This isn't entirely satisfactory as the players have a feeling of anti-climax and also it is difficult to assign a totally fair score.

Another solution is for players to play off for places after they are knocked out. The feeling of let-down usually makes this unsatisfactory.

A minor problem is that, unless there are precisely 2^n contestants, (e.g. 2, 4, 8, 16) some players will receive a bye in the first round or there be lucky-losers and this is patently inequitable.

The main difficulty lies in resolving tied matches. Exactly the same problem exists in the Football World Cup and the solution there of penalty shoot-outs is most unsatisfactory. Sometimes the tie is resolved in favour of a condition pre-existing the match, e.g. the player with the better score in the preliminaries. This is absolutely wrong as it gives one player draw odds. Ideally there should be a day between rounds of a knock-out and the tie resolved by two game mini-matches at an ever-increasing speed. But television schedules may interfere and how much agony can you put a player through? Thus eventually one game sudden-death is employed. This leads to the problem that one player has the advantage of the White pieces. Matches resolved by one player having White and five minutes against Black's four, but Black having draw odds are frankly absurd - albeit better than drawing lots. Better is to have the game four minutes for White, five minutes Black and every time a player moves, from the very first, he receives an extra 10 seconds thinking time. These sudden-death one game matches should then continue until one player wins. Wherever one game ties are played the draw should be made by lot. Neither player should have the right to decide whether he prefers White or Black.

16

For further material on tie-breaks see Chapter 13.

Another problem of the knock-out for purists is that the winner may beat, in the first round, the player who should have finished runner-up. Thus there can be no totally satisfactory ranking after the first.

Knock-outs have the advantage that, if a player is doing badly, he can go home, instead of having to battle through many more rounds, although uninspired.

Despite the problems, the knock-out has a great deal to recommend it and I expect to see a rise in this type of event.

Hastings System

I wrote most of the above in 1997. In 2004 Hastings was faced with a financial crisis, yet few wanted to solve the problem simply by simply having a big open Swiss with no round robin Premier. Several people contributed towards the system actually used. There were 10 rounds and 84 entries. The event was a one game knockout until there were only 8 players left standing. The remaining rounds were played as two game matches and this part of the event was called the Premier.

To bring the numbers back to 64 for the second round, all players who drew the first game, but lost the playoff were lucky losers. This still left 19 players to be found. They were first chosen to balance the colours. Then selection was made commencing with the highest pairing. Thus there was still some bias toward higher rated players, but nothing as great as in Germany where they simply select the highest rated.

There still remains the problem that, in a one game knockout, White has a substantial advantage. To overcome this, the rate of play used was 70 minutes for White, 90 for Black for the first 40 moves, followed by all the moves in 20 minutes, adding on one minute per move from the start. Several people were unhappy with this innovation, often simply because it was radical. I was disappointed that no critic thought to ask what the scores were for the two colours. White scored 197½ and Black 195½. One event proves nothing, but it does suggest the system fulfilled its objective here.

I believe the system would become quite popular if used for 5 years, however the funds are lacking for waiting for experimental systems to catch on. Hastings 2005-6 is to be a typical open master Swiss.

4. Repêchage

This variation on the knock-out is primarily used in Fencing and in blitz chess tournaments. When players have lost they are put into the draw with other players who have also lost. No player is eliminated until he has lost two matches. Thus it is still possible to come second even after having lost in Round 1. It is possible for two players to be paired together more than once but this should be avoided if possible.

5. Round Robin (Also known as all-play-all, American or League System.)

Most higher level international tournaments are run using this system. Players like to be able to prepare against their opponents in advance. I note Hans Lahlum in Norway even makes the pairings a week in advance in order to help with preparation. The pairings are not dependent on the vagaries of a system. The final rankings of all the players is absolute, if you score more points, you have the better result. Once the tournament is underway no arbiting work needs to be done regarding pairings.

In a single round tournament with an even number of contestants half the players will have one more White than the other half. This problem can be resolved with a double round tournament and, as Korchnoi said to me of one such Hastings Premier, "You've organised the type of tournament every player wants".

Tournaments with an odd numbe of players suffer from the disadvantage that one player is hanging around all the time. They are financially inefficient as 11 rounds are required for an 11 player tournament.

A round robin can only deal with a small number of contestants. The main disadvantage is that players often pre-

18

arrange draws in order to conserve their energy. Worse still, players faring badly may throw games to their friends. These problems can be ameliorated by a judiciously ordered prize fund and awarding win money. The selection of players can be a fine art; it is not desirable to have tournament bunnies in the event. The English Football League awards 3 points for a win, 1 for a draw and 0 for a loss. The Laws of Chess permit such variations.

Unfortunately the tournament may not build to a climax. The first round may prove to be the most important. Fixing the pairings so that the highest rated players meet in the last round might prove even worse. If tied for first and uncatchable they will probably agree a perfunctory draw.

6. Swiss System

As you will see from the chapter devoted to different methods of doing Swiss Pairings, it is difficult to define this method of organising tournaments. Let us define it as: **A system where each player's pairings depend on his previous results in the tournament.**

The basic Swiss usually has the following three rules:

1. No player may meet the same opponent twice.

2. In each round, players should meet opponents on as closely similar scores as possible.

3. At the end of each round, players should have had as close to an equal number of Whites and Blacks as possible.

It has been suggested that the system was used in Go Tournaments as long ago as the 14th century. In chess it was first devised and used by Dr. J. Muller of Brugg, Switzerland, in 1895. It was little seen until after the Second World War when it developed into a most popular way of dealing with a large number of competitors and few rounds.

As the tournament progresses players with high scores meet each other as do players with low scores. Thus the method has similarities to a knock-out, but all competitors play through to the end and players can recover from poor starts.

I suspect the Swiss System would be unsatisfactory for a game where only two results are possible, e.g. single frame snooker or a one set tennis match.

As games are drawn, a Swiss can cope with *more* players than a knock-out. Assuming approximately 20% of the games are drawn, 128 players would reduce to one with 100% after five or, at most, six rounds, whereas a knock-out requires seven.

With a sophisticated pairing system it is possible to find the correct winner from an enormous field. 260 players took part in the 1975 National Bank of Dubai Championship at the Evening Standard Congress in London where Accelerated Pairings were used. Grandmaster Bojan Kurajica won with 5½/6 and any analysis will show him to have been a well-deserved winner - he met the strongest opposition.

It is unlikely it will be possible to attach much validity to lower places which are established by raw score. Where there is a large number of rounds, the earlier games are less vital that those at the later stages. If a player starts off well, he will meet stronger opposition than a player who starts off badly, but comes with a late burst. Grandmaster Jonathan Mestel has offered the opinion that there is nothing necessarily wrong with any Swiss Pairing System. The defect lies in establishing the merit of a performance based solely on raw score.

Another disadvantage of the system is that it is impossible after the first round to determine one's opponent well in advance. Thus it is difficult to prepare against his openings. On the other hand, it is possible this is one of the reasons there is a lower percentage of draws in Swisses than in round robins. Arguments may also arise over the pairings and the system is administratively more complex.

The next three systems all partly have the objective of organising round robin tournaments less expensively than the standard system. Such artificial methods exist partly because a player had to secure his international title over 30 games unless at

least one round robin or Olympiad was included. In such cases, only 24 games were required. That a Scheveningen is regarded as a round robin is purely a convention that has grown up in the regulations. This prejudice in favour of the round robin over the Swiss is nonsensical, but it was never challenged. It had the advantage of encouraging the financially less efficient all-play-all. That type of event has the advantage of encouraging pre-game preparation and generally most people prefer that *and* it is a widely held view that round robins help players develop their skills more than the rough and tumble of Swisses. Now 27 games are required irrespective of the type of tournament, the Swiss is becoming ubiquitous except in top level events and knockouts.

7. Scheveningen System

The ability of people to pronounce this place name correctly was used by the Dutch as a test for German spies in the Second World War. The system was first used for chess in 1923. A team of players meets all the members of the opposing team. Thus, if there are nine on each side, each player will meet nine opponents, none of them from his own team.

It used to be used solely for team matches. In particular the USSR and Yugoslavia played a whole series of such events. More recently the system has been used to enable people to achieve title norms. One team might consist of three GMs, six players one of whom is even an IM and include four non-English contestants. The other team might consist solely of international masters, including four non-English. Thus all nine IMs have a gm norm opportunity and the six untitled players can secure IM norms.

Naturally the total score achieved does not indicate the player's standing among all 18 contestants, only relative to his own team members. Comparisons can however be made using the rating system.

Scheveningen events in which unrated players participate are not rated by FIDE, nor can such events lead to title norms.

8. Wade System

This is another type of team tournament where the player meets not only the opponents but also his fellow team members in a round robin. E.g. 6 players on each side, a contestant meets 11 opponents. This has the advantage of providing another hook on which to hang publicity.

9. Schiller System

Yet another team tournament. Here there may be four teams each comprising three players. Each player meets everybody *except* his own team mates. This has the advantage that one team can consist solely of GMs and thus a nine round all-play-all can be achieved with twelve contestants instead of only ten.

10. Sonneborn-Berger System

This is most frequently used as a tie-break system. Each player's total is determined by summing the scores of the opponents he beats, plus half the sum of the scores of the opponents against whom he draws. In my opinion this system is less accurate than drawing lots and more laborious.

However it was used to good effect in the London Schools' League when I was a schoolboy. Each team played eight matches over six boards against teams chosen at the start of the season. Their score was determined by multiplying the total score of each of their opponents by their score against them in their individual match. The four leading teams were then brought together for a knock-out to decide the winner.

The advantage of this system is that some teams were able to stipulate in advance they wanted to meet strong opposition, others weak opposition and still others that they didn't want to travel far. In addition the opponents are known at the beginning of the season. The Controller could meet all these objectives. I have no knowledge of this elegant system being used elsewhere.

22

11. Ladder System

This is usually used in club tournaments. The players are placed in order on a ladder. Players are then entitled to challenge opponents higher than themselves on the ladder. If they win they move up a number of places and their opponent moves down. If the leader wins, he moves more and more points higher up the scale. Unusually for tournaments two people may meet more than once.

This system has the advantage that players can arrange to play on an *ad hoc* basis without complex schedules. People can enter the competition after play has started. Others can drop out without causing too much anguish.

12. Teamtalkingchess

This fun system was devised by Hans Lahlum.

There are four players in each team. They play six games against another team. The rate of play on each board is 12 minutes for each player. The players may change boards or discuss the positions with their team members as they wish.

Chapter 3

Deciding the Prize structure

The prize money distribution structure has a substantial effect on the whole tournament. The organiser may well be able to get away with spending less on prizes plus fees combined than solely on prizes. Yet it is better publicity to have prize money only.

If the first prize is much more than double the second, the chess is often extremely artificial. The players work together to thwart the organiser's desire for high drama in the last round. On occasion they will cheat by throwing games.

Round Robins

These often used to have prizes for the top half players only. Thus a player with 7/13 might receive something and another, with only half a point less, nothing. It is better to have prizes for all the players. This gives them something to fight for even in the last round and you won't want the bottom-marker to feel out of things at the prizegiving.

GLC London 1986 Prize fund for 14 players: £5000, 3000, 2000, 1500, 1000, 800, 700, 600, 500, 400, 300, 200. Best Game Prize £1000. Best score by a player relative to his rating £400. Total £18,000.

You will note, no matter how high the first prize, at the bottom one prize will differ little from that immediately above it. Best Game Prizes are valuable for publicity but provide a great deal of work. Thus I avoid them unless for a substantial sum; judging the winner must be above suspicion.

Win money is sometimes provided where players receive an amount per win. The danger is, if this is open-ended, you may go over the budget. To avoid this, a total pool can be provided and this divided among the wins.

24

Swisses

It is better not to tail off with tiny prizes. This will result in their being shared among many people, all of whom will collect a trivial sum. You won't be thanked for this work.

Smith & Williamson British Championship 2005 Prize Fund. £10,000, £5,000, £2,500, £1,500, £1200, £900, £700, £500, £300. Plus £250 for each of the following highest in their category: below 2150; 2151-2299; Under 18; Under-21. British Ladies' Champion £500.

The structure has been modified slightly since I introduced it in 1997, but the gradient is still steeper than I would have wished. I chose a £10,000 first prize, causing such a steep decline in the prize structure, because it is attractive to the media. In retrospect, it would probably have been better to have £6000, £4000 and the rest as above, holding back £5000 for start money. Professional players prefer to be certain of at least breaking even.

Special Prizes

No prize is offered in the British Championship for unrated players. If they qualify good luck to them, but there is no special reason to encourage their participation. In the above there is no stipulation that no player may win more than one prize. Such a rule leads to headaches, especially if the special prizes are comparable in size to the main ones. In the British above, an under-21 female rated under 2300 could win first prize and collect £1000 extra.

Consider the following prize list: £4000, £2000, £1000, £600, £400, £300, £200, £150, £100. Highest rated 2300-2395 £500. Highest rated under 2300 £350.

Players 1, 2 and 3 win their prizes alone and their ratings are irrelevant. Players 4-8 tie for places 4-8. Players 6 and 7 are rated 2300-2395. Player 8 is rated 2250.

Players 4-8 share £1650 in place money, each receiving £330. Had players 6 and 7 chosen their rating prize, each would have received only £250. Naturally player 8 chooses his rating prize of £350. This now leaves 4-7 sharing £1500 and each receives

£375. But this is unfair, poor 8 suddenly receives less than the others. One solution is for all of 4-8 to receive £370. Effectively what has happened is that 4-7 have received a portion of an Under 2300 rating prize.

Many players tied for 8th place, splitting £250, none of them rated 2300-2395. Player 9 is on the next score group down and is the only one rated 2300-2395. Thus he receives £500. But paradoxically his reward is greater for achieving a whole point less than either player 6 or 7. O.K. we'll put players 6 and 7 up to £413.33 and player 9 down to the same sum. Wait a minute, players 6 and 7 received a small fraction of the under 2300 prize. That can't be fair.

Some organisers say, "the prize fund will be decided by the arbiter". But the solutions offered above are subjective; you may well have chosen a different and better answer. People who use this rider are often the ones most indignant about not using a precise pairing system. You can't be faced with such decisions in the hurly-burly of the end of a congress. I was Chief Arbiter of the Commonwealth Championship in Mumbai in 2003. There was a rule decided on by the organiser that nobody could win more than one cash prize and the effect was it took about four hours to work out the prize fund. What's more, there is no possibility we got it right; that nobody complained is hardly the point.

The only sensible solution is to permit a player to win more that one prize and/or keep the special prizes tiny. Don't fall into the other trap of announcing the rating prizes as Under-2400, Under 2300, Under 2200. Then an Under 2200 might receive half the Under 2200 prize, all the Under-2300 and one-third of the Under 2400. The purpose of these special prizes is to encourage weaker players, thus causing them to pay the entry fee and also keeping the tournament competitive. Another interesting choice is a first round loser's prize. Multiple prizes are unlikely in the British Championship because it is so strong.

Rating prizes are highly popular. Using relative rating performance is easy to organise in a Swiss using a computer, provided most players are rated. In our above example the

2300-2395 prize goes to the player who achieves the best rating performance, relative to his own rating.

Relative Rating Performance = Score achieved - Score expected

Now players are most unlikely to tie. In our scenario above, Player 6 wins £500, Players 4, 5, 7 and 8 receive £375 and the £350 under 2300 prize cascades down the system to Player 9. This also has the advantage of ironing out the inequities in the Swiss System. The player with the better performance receives the prize. He may even have a lower score.

Where some players are unrated, this Relative Rating Performance system cannot be used. If the money is small or a trophy, the tie can be resolved in favour of the lowest rated, youngest, oldest, etc., depending on the nature of the prize. This must be announced in advance. *For further discussion of tie-breaks in a Swiss, see Chapter 13.*

Even mature players frequently prefer a small trophy to a small cash prize. Naturally it is desirable to have an extremely large number of prizes for a children's event. Ideally every child should go home bearing something.

Knock-out

The standard formula for the prize money distribution for a match is 62.5:37.5. The problem for a knock-out tournament is that, when the match initially tied, the winner by speed games gains enormously. This is unfair since there is a substantial random element. It would be better if such losers received an extra 20% of the differential, as in the World Knockout Championship.

Skins

This system can be introduced to add further tension to a knock-out match and encourage positive play. A proportion of the prize money is set aside as win money. The total prize fund might be $1 million with $50,000 for each win. However the money collects as each game is drawn. In the Brain Games Network 2000 Garry Kasparov v Vladimir Kramnik Match they

played 15 games, with only two wins.

Kramnik would have won $100,000 because he won the second game. He would then have won a further $400,000 for winning game 10. Kasparov would have collected none of this. Then the $500,000 remaining would have been split $333,333 to $166,667. Kramnik would have gone home with $833,333 and Kasparov only $166,667.

Ironically such a system was suggested by Garry, but only after the contracts had been signed. Vladimir was uninterested in diverting his attention from the matter at hand so they stuck to the original agreement. Once terms have been decided, it is nearly always unwise to try to negotiate variations. These matters should be considered right at the beginning.

You will note they only played 15 games. Originally it had been announced that all 16 would take place, even if the match was over. As in 1993 this never happened. Clearly the organisers did not take my advice on Page 13.

28

Chapter 4

Preparing the Budget

Inevitably chess events cost money to run. How do you intend to pay for yours? This list was drawn up basically from the British Championships, Hastings, the Ron Banwell Mind Sports Olympiad Masters, Gibraltar Congress and a number of international tournaments. The items are listed roughly in order of magnitude, from biggest to smallest. You will note that the list for items of expenditure is substantially longer than the list of items under the next heading.

Expenditure

Prizes
Venue hire
Strong players:
  expenses
  appearance fees
Staff expenses:
  fees
  accommodation
  food
  travel
  sundries
Entry form printing
Entry form distribution
Postage
Scoresheets
Stationery
Equipment:
  purchase
  hire
  carriage
Computers
FIDE fees

National fees
Photocopying
Bulletin production
Bulletin distribution
Cross-tables
Web site
e mail
Telephone and fax
Answerphone service
Bank charges
Preliminary venue visits
Furniture
  tables
  cloths
  carpeting
Insurance:
  public liability
  equipment
Security
Demonstrations board
  operators
Move runners

Electronic display screens Transport
Commentator Refreshments during play
Mementoes, possibly for Recreational facilities
resale: Trophies:
    sweat-shirts   purchase
    first-day covers   repair
    button badges   engraving
    pennants Bursaries, grants
    pens Special chess events
    posters Special non-chess events
Branding, including banners Web site maintenance
Street signs Programme:
Advertising   printing
Seeking sponsorship or   distribution
donations Entertainment
Coaching Hospitality
Publicity Opening ceremony
    staffing Closing Ceremony
    expenses Entry fee refunds
Committee Meetings Auditor
Administration Sundries*
Medical and first aid Contingencies#
Visiting dignitaries

*Sundries are expected expenses which are too small to have a single heading and which may vary from year to year.

#Contingencies are a sum which should be set aside against the possibility that something may go wrong or in case there is an emergency. When the final accounts are prepared these should be itemised specifically. Examples have included: purchasing fans due to the heat; table lamps to compensate for poor lighting; fees for unexpected GMs; helping players in straitened circumstances; replacing stolen equipment; special travel arrangements; bringing in extra control staff; compensating players for poor service. Naturally the unexpected is more likely to happen in a new event and thus the contingency provision should be higher.

30

Income:

Sponsorship

Entry fees

Donations

Admissions

Programme sales

Memento sales

Bulletin sales

Video, TV rights

Web rights

Concessions:

    Bookstall

    Computers

    Other games

Refreshment sales

Advertising

Investment Income

It is recommended that the budget be drawn up nett of tax.

Chapter 5

Venues for Chess Events

Players generally prefer to play in one large hall rather than several separate ones. This also reduces the number of controllers required. However, extra noise may be introduced if several events on a different schedule are going on at the same time. Roughly 2 square metres are required per player. This can reduce to 1.7 square metres for a very large event or rise to 3 for a small one. The available space is affected by pillars in the room, the number of fire exits and the shape of the area. Naturally top level events require more room and the FIDE Technical Commission recommends 4.5 square metres per player. Never be misled by brochures for venues, when they refer to capacity, they are thinking of banqueting. Twice that space is need for chess events and classroom or examination capacity is a much better guide.

Team events require more space because of the need to separate out matches. The Chess Olympiad requires even more. There are approximately 700 players but match captains, fellow team members and many spectators want to have access to all the games. Such milling crowds can be reduced by demonstrating the games. It is probably impossible to satisfy everybody, but about 6000 square metres might be adequate.

It is important not to place games too close to doors. Even if there is no noise created by people going in and out, there will be constant movement across the field of vision of the player trying to concentrate.

It is best not to set tables in long unbroken lines as then it may be difficult for players to move in and out. Thus breaks in each direction are preferable with the occasional wide avenue. It helps in setting up the venue to think of what would happen if there were to be a fire. There should be a minimum of 2.5 metres between rows of players. Where possible players should play on individual tables, even a small gap helps. This is because some players vibrate and won't, if on separate tables, irritate players in other games.

When numbering the boards it is usually best, when coming to the end of a row, to continue the next row when turning back. The players will not then, when seeking say Board 21, reach Board 20 at the end of the row and find that they have to walk all the way back.

If possible, top games should be demonstrated. This adds to the status of the event and reduces crowding around the higher boards. However, putting these games on a stage is not always effective; the spectators may not be able to see everything. I dislike placing the arbiters on the stage; this makes them the focus of attention. Others disagree with me because it makes it easier to observe what is going on. Often it is best to have the leading games at standard level and only the display boards on the stage. Spectator seating may be also desirable. The spectators should be a minimum of one metre from the games. In Britain we don't find it necessary to provide a barrier, this may well differ in other countries.

The lighting should be of similar quality to that required for examinations. Approximately 800 lumens is satisfactory. White table-cloths help improve the impression of brightness if required. Lighting should not throw shadows or cause points of light to be reflected from the chess pieces. Beware of direct daylight. If the sun shines into the playing hall, it can make it almost impossible to play due to glare on the board. Then blinds will have to be drawn with a consequence loss in ambient light. Thus, when inspecting a hall which has natural daylight, you should make certain of its effect throughout the playing schedule.

The ventilation, air-conditioning, heating and the noise they create need to be assessed. Players emit heat. A full venue will be warmer than empty one. It is important to inspect the premises at a similar time to when the event is due to take place. A venue may be O.K. in the winter, but become an oven in the summer, etc.

The floor covering is important. Carpeting is usually best, but sometimes may be expensive or impractical. A sprung ballroom floor can be the very worst and should be treated with

great suspicion. It is very difficult to observe the effect of a large number of people playing chess prior to the event. It is important to observe how noisy it will be when a player leaves his seat.

Conditions will be less noisy if the doors do not lead directly into the rest of the building. Where this happens, it is better to put 'lesser' games near the exits, although such players will be indignant if publicly classified in this way.

A separate analysis room should be provided which is close to the playing hall. If two or more such rooms are available then different ones can be designated for quiet analysis or smoking. If you do not ensure the sets are put out in the analysis room, nobody else will.

Again, the refreshment area should not lead off immediately from the playing area, yet should be close at hand. If far distant, it may be helpful to put some boards and sets in the area to lure people there, especially where the venue administrators are seeking income from sale of refreshments. The cost, type and availability of refreshments must be determined prior to the event, otherwise there can be unexpectedly high bills.

The bookstall and other concessions should be obvious to the players and be on their route from the outside to their boards. It is better for security reasons if the bookstall can be locked up separately from play. Nobody who is selling goods will ever be satisfied with the space provided.

A lounge area may be highly desirable. Where many small children are involved in an event, something in the nature of a crèche should be considered.

The administrators of the venue may believe they have adequate restroom facilities, but most chess events have a very high proportion of male players. It is essential to check this part of the building and ensure their regular servicing.

Offices need to be close to the play. Organisers differ as to whether they like to do part of their job in the playing hall. Control tables will be needed where people can contact staff and for handing in the results.

The following should also be investigated: access to the venue

34

by car, public transport and walking: ease of finding the venue: parking spaces; method of delivery of goods; access for the disabled; cost and method of installation of dedicated telephone lines; if the venue's own lines are to be used, the cost of this; accessible electrical points; closed circuit television; arrangements for first aid; suitable places to stay or eat. The hours of access to the venue must be determined in advance. Also the times at which clearing up can be done; removing rubbish such as dirty cups is noisy so this should only be carried out when there is no play. Hanging notices on walls may not be permitted and display boards will then be required. The time of access for setting up needs to be determined and the number of helpers required. Similarly the time at which the venue will be vacated each day must be discussed. When the venue must be ready for the next occupant must also be determined.

Where and how you can erect banners or put up signs advertising the event must be investigated. I have been to many chess events where it seemed as if the organisers are trying to keep secret the fact that a chess event is taking place.

Chapter 6

Arbiters

Regulations for the Titles of Arbiter

1.1.3 The titles for award are International Arbiter (IA) and FIDE Arbiter (FA).

1.1.4 The titles are valid for life from the date awarded or registered.

2.1 General Regulations for Arbiter norms

Format	Level of event	Type	Max. no. norm certificates	Max. no. norms for title application
	World		No limit (but depending on no. of rounds if KO)	No limit
	Continental		No limit	Max. 1
Swiss	International		2 + 1 more for every 50 players over 50	
Swiss	Nat. Champ.	Individual (adult)	2 + 1 more for every 50 players over 50	Max. 2
RR	Nat. Champ.	Individual (adult)	Max. 2	Max. 2
Swiss/RR	Nat. Champ.	Team *	No limit (depending on number teams)	Max. 1
Rapidplay	World or Continental		No limit (depending on no. rounds if KO)	Max. 1

36

2.1.2 An FA or IA norm can only be accepted if (a) the arbiter has worked in the highest division (b) there is a minimum of 4 boards per team (c) there is a minimum of 10 teams (d) at least 60% of the players are FIDE rated.

2.1.3 Applicants for the title of IA/FA must be at least 21 years old. Norms can be achieved only after the age of 18.

3. Requirements for the title of International Arbiter (IA).

All of the following:

3.1 Thorough knowledge of the Laws of Chess, the FIDE Regulations for chess competitions, the Swiss Pairing Systems, the FIDE Regulations regarding achievement of title norms and the FIDE Rating System.

3.2 Absolute objectivity, demonstrated at all times during his activity as an arbiter.

3.3 Obligatory knowledge of English language, minimum at conversation level, and of chess terms in other official FIDE languages.

3.4 Minimum skills at user level to work on a personal computer. Knowledge of pairing programs endorsed by the FIDE Swiss Pairing Committee, Text editing and Spreadsheets programs and usage of E-mail.

3.5 Skills to operate electronic chess clocks of different types and for different systems.

3.6 Experience as chief or deputy arbiter in at least four FIDE rated events such as the following:

(a) The final of the National Individual (adult) Championship (max. 2 norms)

(b) All official FIDE tournaments and matches.

(c) International title tournaments and matches.

(d) International chess events with at least 100 players.

(e) All official World and Continental Rapid Championships (max. 1 norm).

3.7 The title of the International Arbiter for each of the IBCA, ICSC, IPCA shall each be equivalent to one IA norm.

3.8. Being a match arbiter in an Olympiad is equivalent to one IA norm. No more than one such norm will be considered for the title.

3.9 The title of International Arbiter can be awarded only to applicants who have already been awarded the title of FIDE Arbiter.

4. Requirements for the title of FIDE Arbiter (FA). All of the following:

4.1 Thorough knowledge of the Laws of Chess, the FIDE Regulations for chess competitions, the Swiss Pairing Systems.

4.2 Absolute objectivity, demonstrated at all times during his activity as an arbiter.

4.3 Sufficient knowledge of at least one official FIDE language.

4.4 Experience as chief or deputy arbiter in at least four FIDE Rated events. These can be either national or international

4.5 The title of FIDE Arbiter for each of the IBCA, ICSC, IPCA shall each be equivalent to one FA norm.

4.6 For a candidate, being a match arbiter in an Olympiad is equivalent to one FA norm. No more than one such norm will be considered for the title.

4.7 Applicants from federations which are unable to organize any tournaments valid for titles or rating, may be awarded the title on passing an examination set by the Arbiters' Council.

4.8 A title applicant, having used a norm from one event for the FA title, may not again use that event for the IA title.

5. Application Procedure

5.1 The norm reports supporting a title application must be for at least two different types of tournament, or at least one international rated event according to 3.6(d), and achieved in events with starting dates that fall within a six-year period. The application must be submitted not later than the second FIDE Congress after the date of the latest event listed.

5.2 Applications must be submitted to the FIDE Secretariat by the federation of the applicant. The national federation is responsible for the fee.

5.3 All title applications together with full details must be posted on the FIDE website for a minimum of 60 days prior to finalisation. This is in order for any objections to be lodged.

The Role of the Arbiter

Basically this is to ensure the games are played according to The Laws of Chess under the best conditions possible. Often the greatest compliment the arbiter can be paid is that the players are not conscious of his being around. However, his very presence is often enough to discourage disputes.

I strongly believe where possible there should be an Appeals Committee. This protects the players from the poor decisions I have occasionally made. It is difficult to appoint this in advance. A large number of alternates are needed. Players appointed to an Appeals Panel often leave hurriedly if they realise a dispute is possible. It is better to appoint the Committee on the spot and secure the players' agreement to the members in writing. Appeals should be in writing, made not more than an hour after the original decision and accompanied by a suitable deposit. This is returnable if the appeal is successful or if it is thought the appeal was sensible, although it failed. An Appeals Committee has very great powers and can certainly go beyond the letter of the Laws of Chess in seeking a fair solution. For example, I have twice been a member of such a committee where the decision was made to revert to a position earlier in the game. I dislike the tendency of FIDE to appoint specialist Appeals Committees. These are very expensive and have little to do.

Geurt Gijssen and I were very disappointed that the FIDE Laws of chess were amended to that the arbiter's decision is final relating to quickplay finishes (see Article 10 of the Laws of Chess.) We both believe that players should be protected from our rare, but possible, errors.

Whenever there is a dispute it is impossible to satisfy both players. This is why the arbiter is such a senior official. Conduct discussions about disputes in private. Then other players aren't disturbed and things said in the heat of the moment are less likely to return to haunt the players. Sometimes players are rude to arbiters in the heat of battle. Don't worry about this, although it is nice when you receive an apology later.

Where a confrontation becomes inevitable, then it should rest squarely on the shoulders of the senior official. Certain players are famous as whingers (constant and professional complainers) and I have consoled myself by carrying a list of World Champion whingers in my head. Children usually provide no problems. But their parents can be appalling. This is true of all sports. It is common practice in children's events to bar parents from the playing area.

Sometimes an arbiter will make a decision with which both players disagree. In one Lloyds Bank Masters I saw a player touch a bishop with the clear intention of moving it; the move lost immediately. He released the piece and made a better move with a different one. I told him he must move the bishop, but he claimed he never touched it. The second time I told him to move the bishop, his opponent agreed he never touched the piece. This was a game being played on a lower board, not in the glare of publicity, so I left the players to get on with their own game. I was relieved when later two spectators told me I was correct. For a moment I had doubted my own sanity. Leaving the players to sort out their own problems is correct, but what if the game had been played in front of a large gallery? I was rather pleased when the opponent eventually won the game.

I was Chief Arbiter in Mumbai at the Commonwealth Championship in 2003. Despite my protests, the last round started in the morning. Sunlight was streaming in on the boards before play started. I arranged for blinds to be drawn before the start of play. This meant there was no possibility of one player wanting the blinds drawn and the other preferring more ambient light. Thus no conflict was possible and I think this small action was probably my most valuable contribution to the whole event.

For very large events I work to one arbiter for every 50 players and one steward for every 100. Clearly each time scramble cannot then necessarily be followed. It is perfectly satisfactory to appoint an observer in such circumstances. Round robins are more likely to have one arbiter and one assistant for 10-20 players. In 1986

for the World Championship in London we had about 50 staff for two players. Admittedly only three of these were actual arbiters and three were members of the Appeals Committee. Presumably, if ever I organise an event for no players at all, that will require the entire population of Britain to service it!

It is useless to read out a number of regulations prior to start of play. No player ever listens, instead they will become irritable. I prefer to start off each day's play in the same, calm manner. Yes, a joke may break the ice. However, it is more likely to break a player's concentration. Information should be presented in writing beforehand to the players. If there is a change in the schedule, every player should be informed individually. He should attest his acceptance and knowledge of the change in writing.

Thus seeking out problems and solving them prior to play is essential. Most of an arbiter's work should be done *prior* to the start of play and *after* its conclusion, especially if the event is a Swiss.

Treat a player's complaints with respect, even if unwarranted. Show him the relevant regulations. Often the complaint is that the player does not like the rule. Enabling him to read it in black and white may transfer the complaint from you to the rules.

Newcomers (adult or child) to competitive chess may not know the following, which are obvious to us: the first-named player takes White; Swisses are not knock-outs; touch-move is a strict Law; a player must arrive within a certain time after the start of the game; how the clock works; how to keep score; how to hand in the result; how to find their name on a non-alphabetical list; that there is only one game per round. Any good arbiter should be able to explain titles and ratings to the novice.

A player is entitled to ask an arbiter about The Laws of Chess. However information should not normally be volunteered prior to being asked. There may be exceptions. Games in the British Under-11 Championship used to be adjourned. The arbiters would inspect the sealed move for correctness before the envelope was sealed. When Afghanistan first played in the Olympiad, they

had no experience of international chess. One of their players forgot to press the clock in the early stages of his first game. I interfered and did this for him, then leaving him to the game once he understood the process. The opponent questioned this, but was content with my explanation.

Some arbiters believe they are only responsible for the playing conditions, the game on the board, the pairings and the tournament chart. I disagree with this view. The Chief Arbiter should always determine the distribution of the prize money at the end. However this may not be his final responsibility; that may rest with the person who signs the cheques, probably the treasurer. If the website or bulletin is defective in displaying the information or games, then the arbiter should contribute to identifying the problems and solving them. Sometimes the health of a player should be considered. The Chief Arbiter should have inspected the venue *before* its use has been agreed. Organisers should consult the arbiter on matters such as the prize fund structure, format of the event and rate of play.

Remember there is only one way to avoid ever making a mistake and that is to do nothing - which is the biggest mistake of all. Be prepared to admit when something has gone wrong. If nothing else, it takes the wind out of the sails of any critic. If you do not know what action to take, don't be shy, ask for help. Finally, be careful, it is easy to fall into the trap of being too bossy or interfering too much.

Qualities of a good Arbiter
1. Common-sense.
2. A liking for chessplayers and chess.
3. Absolute objectivity even when not an arbiter.
4. A good sense of humour.
5. An excellent understanding of and ability to apply all the rules.
6. A good understanding of chess.
7. A willingness to take pains to find solutions to problems.

There is nothing mystical about being a good arbiter. I have had people do good work who knew nothing about chess or the Swiss System. My youngest assistant ever was Nathanael Lutton who was six years old at the Mind Sports Olympiad. Under suitable direction, he did a good job. The players didn't even seem to notice when he collected results.

Chapter 7

Equipment

The list below seeks to be exhaustive. Naturally no single event will require everything included.

1. Playing equipment

Sets, boards and clocks

About 10% extra should be allowed for defects and early promotions. Don't forget those for the analysis room (Usually the only way this will be set out satisfactorily is to do it yourself.) Top level tournaments used to supply each player with a board and set on which to analyse in their hotel room. Now they analyse on their computer and this is less necessary. It is best to use identical equipment for play; players particularly prefer not to use different clocks for different games. Indeed, where electronic clocks are only used on the top boards, this is unfair to weaker players who only occasionally play there.

The FIDE Technical Commission recommends a king height of 7-8.5cm, with a base a little under 50% of the height. The square on the chessboard should have a size 5-6.5cm. The size square should be twice the diameter of a pawn's base. Geurt Gijssen suggests, "Four pawns should fit exactly on one square. When a rook is laid down it should fit precisely on one diagonal".

Preferably wooden boards should be used, but plastic are also acceptable. They should be at least semi rigid. Some players do not like a raised border on the board. The colours should be contrasting dark and light, as should the pieces. Stark black and white is always off-putting. Neither boards nor pieces should be shiny.

It is common practice in the US to require players to provide their own equipment in large events. White has choice. If Black complains it is for the arbiter to decide whether the equipment is acceptable.

If the games are being watched by spectators, the clock face should be large enough to be viewed or seen on closed circuit TV.

Electro-sensitive boards are available where, immediately a move is made, it is transferred to a computer screen and the clock times shown. The moves played are also displayed. The information can also be transmitted down a telephone line and to the web or a national teletext system. The players are still required to press a separate chess clock and to keep score. This complies with the current Laws of Chess, but that does not mean that alternatives cannot be considered in the future.

Spectators may be confused by the different times displayed by the electro-sensitive board and the clock used by the players. Ideally the latter should be hooked up electronically and only that displayed.

Scoresheets

These should be large enough for the moves to be recorded but not too large for the table. Usually the player keeps one copy and the organiser one or more. NCR (no carbon required) scoresheets are much less messy than inter-leaving with carbons. The scoresheets are the property of the organiser. They should be designed so that a new one is required neither just before a time control nor just after the first. Many events are played 40 moves in 2 hours, followed by a further 20 moves in one hour. Thus a scoresheet of 60 moves is appropriate. There should be no space at the bottom of a column. Backing cards should be provided for the scoresheet. Some events provide books of scoresheets so that the players have a permanent memento. Monroi Electronic Chess Assistants are as yet untested.

Result slips

These are often used to hand in results where scoresheets are not collected. They are essential for team events and are often called the 'protocols'.

Adjournment envelopes
These should have the required data printed on the outside and be large enough so that the scoresheets do not have to be folded more than once.

Board numbers
These should be used for Swisses. It is best not to rely solely on name-cards which may be placed incorrectly.

2. Furniture
The table should have a minimum length of twice the chess board and a width 15-20cm more than the board. Ideally each game should be played on a separate table about 80cm wide, 74 cm high and120 cm long. Two games can be played comfortably in an open event on one 2 metres long. Struts should not interfere with the legs of the players. The tables should be sturdy and not rock easily. If the lighting in imperfect, white tablecloths help. The chairs used by both players should be identical and not swivel unless mutually agreed otherwise. A soft base is desirable. Young children may need cushions to bring the chair to the required height.

Flooring
It is best if the playing hall is carpeted. If not, players should be encouraged to wear soft shoes.

Rubbish bins
Smoking is forbidden. Thus ash-trays are unnecessary. But players and organisers need somewhere to put their rubbish. Adequate provision is rare.

3. Arrangements for spectators

Demonstration Boards
These should be large enough to be viewed throughout the spectating area. If electronic and this is not so, additional screens

should be provided. Players may be disturbed by flickering screens and thus they should be sited forward of the players. In small areas care needs to be taken to ensure good sight-lines and particularly that the players and demonstration board operators don't get in the way. Whose move it is should be shown and also the last piece moved.

If operated by hand, it is difficult to display the clock times accurately and thus it is best to rely on the players' chess clocks. Displaying the number of moves played is difficult in time scrambles and it is best to stop doing so at this stage of the game, especially as the players may be misled. The demonstration boards should give details about the players. Demonstration board pieces are often stolen.

It is difficult for the arbiter to see the play and not get in the way of the spectators. It is possible to do this by having the clock face away from the spectators and the arbiter sitting just behind the board, facing the audience. This method is not recommended when seeking to promote chess as a spectator sport.

Flags of the countries of the players should be displayed. If on the playing table, these are best sited behind the chess clock. It is sometimes easier to display these as part of the players' name cards.

Viewing

If there is room, the players should be on staging. The spectators should be at a reasonable distance from the players (12 metres used to be required for the World Championship but that was unnecessarily big even for that event) and a barrier erected if necessary. Spectators close to the players should not be allowed to analyse on pocket sets.

Earphone commentary

Commentators must be in a sound-proof box. Earphones mustn't be allowed too near the players as leakage of sound may disturb their concentration. Commentators must be warned not to make the audience laugh.

Sound-proof playing rooms

Kasparov played Anand inside a glass box in 1995. It is difficult for the sound-proofing to be totally adequate and spectators must still not be allowed to move before the eyes of the players.

Commentary room

An expert comments on the games in progress to an audience. Moves are transmitted to him by hand or electronically. The commentator will often have several games going at the same time. He frequently prefers to see the new moves before the audience. The audience will usually prefer a grandmaster to an excellent commentator.

4. Notices

These are to direct people to the appropriate playing hall; different sections; analysis room; refreshments; commentary room; toilets; controllers' offices; bulletin office; bookstall; sponsors' rooms; where to hand in results; no entry areas; no smoking; quiet; message board. Frequently these are not thought out in advance and become a scrawled mess. When there are too many notices about activities, they are not read or overlooked. Putting notices on the playing tables causes clutter and should be removed at the end of a round.

5. Arbiters' requirements

A suitable place to work away from the players. Comfortable, quiet footwear.

When not computerised: Swiss Pairing Cards; tables for round robin events; tournament charts; round-by-round pairing sheets; pairing boards; leader boards.

Clerical needs:

Headed note-paper; computer and accessories; photo-copier and accessories; including enlargement facilities; paper for notices; notepads; marking pens; pencils; pens (some for sale

48

to players); eradicators; masking tape; sellotape; blue-tac; pritt; paper clips; staple gun and staples; rubber bands; drawing pins; calculator; envelopes; carbons; certificates, including those for title results and ratings. Increased computerisation means there is less need for these items.

If computerised it is still necessary to be able to justify particular pairings in a Swiss. It is usually best to prepare Pairing Cards just in case. A PC and accessories are needed; adaptors for computers, including those for the use of foreign competitors; tournament charts need to be photo-copied and enlarged for display; access to e-mail.

Reference Material:

Chess Organisers Handbook, Laws of Chess, FIDE Handbook, local handbook; International Rating List; National Rating List; players' special needs; Prizes List.

6. Treasurer's Requirements

Completed entry forms; cheque book; payment authorisation forms; receipt book; cash; cash account book; box to maintain money securely; details of money to come; details of money to pay out; budget and on-going analysis of it.

7. Publicity Officer's Requirements

Lists of media addresses and telephone, fax and e-mail numbers; biographies of players and how to make contact when not in play; photographer and digital camera; envelopes suitable for posting photos; interview room; branded insignia readily available for visual opportunities: banners, pennants, tee-shirts, sweat shirts, jackets.

Press Room

This needs computers; typewriters (some journalists may not be computer literate); fax machines; telephones; writing stations; notice boards; note-paper. In a large event this will require separate accounting procedures of its own. With the growth

of access to chess on the Internet, fewer members of the press attend in person than in the 1990s.

Website
See Chapter 19.

Do not fall into the trap of assuming all you need is a couple of computers and phone lines and it will then fall into place. A separate webmaster is required and reporting procedures and a schedule must be determined in advance. A means of creating a flow of press stories, other than just bare game scores, needs to be created.

8. Bulletin Production
Computer with ChessBase or similar; storage of scoresheets; adverts; notes to be included. With the growth of computerisation of games scores, the days of the printed bulletin are numbered, indeed they may be an unnecessary expense. However the thirst for chess games is greater than ever.

9. Concessions
The provision of a chess bookstall provides a service to the contestants and spectators. It is quite common for commercial organisations to pay in cash or kind for the privilege at larger events. The display may extend beyond books to chess computers, sets, clocks, other games, memorabilia, first day covers. Mementos of the event such as: programmes, badges, pens, postcards, umbrellas, medals may be sold separately. The company requires a high profile area which is secure. No bookstall provider with ever be content with his amount of space. It should be well-signposted and on the players' routes.

10. Refreshments
Players require easy access to light refreshments during play. It is desirable to have a water-dispenser available. Round robin tournaments usually have a table with light refreshments so that players can help themselves.

11. Organiser's Requirements

Brochures of own event; brochures of other events and display system; programmes; Grand Prix Charts and rules; special prizes; trophies; telephone numbers such as: doctor, local hospital, police, taxis; change - particularly for the telephone and cash entries; parking passes; stamps; string; plastic folders; lists of local places: to stay, to worship, to eat, for entertainment; badges for staff; security badges; fax machines; answer phone; mobile phone – but switched off in the venue; computer; list of functions of administrators and how to contact them; first aid box - including particularly headache relief for self.

Chapter 8

Chess Clocks and Timing Games

It should be a relatively easy task for a chess organiser to choose a suitable clockwork clock depending on how much he can afford and whether he wants the display to be visible to spectators. Although electronic clocks have existed since the 1970's, none is perfect. The following is a list of what to look for in a electronic clock:

Visibility and display

Many clocks are set at 45 degrees, ergonomically the optimum angle. A large display is desirable, especially for the arbiter and spectators, but this increases the cost and difficulty of transportation. That black can see the last digit of the display easily is essential.

Determining which player is to move

Players want to be able to see whether their clock is in motion from across the room. Thus the levers need to be distinct. A light can be used to show which clock is in motion. This leads to a high drain on the batteries and the warning display may not be visible from behind the clock.

Reliability

This can only be verified with long term usage.

Appearance

The clock should look like a quality product and be sturdy. None is acceptable that shifts around on a shiny table.

Noise of operation

A loud cracking sound is heard when the button is pushed on some electronic clocks. This disturbs other games. However the switching mechanism becomes soft with usage on some clocks.

Ease of operation

It should be possible to switch on the clock and use it immediately. The arbiter must be able to make any necessary adjustments and to check the parameters easily.

52

Time and move display

No clock can be perfect unless both the time and the move number can be displayed simultaneously. A large display is required so the players, spectators and arbiter do not become confused. It is essential it be easy to see at a glance whether the clock is displaying the time in hours and minutes, minutes and seconds or just seconds.

Indication of conclusion of a time phase

In a standardplay game, the clock can be programmed to 'freeze' when the player oversteps the limit. But what if an illegal move is made? Then the opponent usually presses the clock button, the move is corrected, the button again pushed and the game continues. Yet the clock 'thinks' one more move has been made than is the case. If the number of moves is displayed this can be corrected. Otherwise anarchy rules.

In speed games the clock should not be programmed to freeze when one player's time is used up. The clock should display which is first to use up all the time and it should be possible for the other clock to run to zero, if the player fails to notice. Once both flags are down, the game is drawn. Any alternative would change the FIDE Laws

Sound option

This seems only to be valuable for blind players.

Electro-sensitive boards

The moves and their number are registered on such a board and the clock times on a chess clock with the two linked together. The data is shown on a computer and the Internet.

Options

A balance has to be found between offering many options and ease of operation. There is greater expense and danger of confusion. On the other hand the market is increased. The following are the minimum options:

- All the moves in 1 time period.
- All the moves in 2 time periods, with and without the move counter.
- All the moves in 3 time periods, with and without the move counter.

- An unlimited number of time periods, with and without the move counter.
- Cumulative (Fischer) mode.
- Delay (Bronstein) mode.
- Such as 40 moves in 2 hours, all the moves in 30 minutes, adding on 30 seconds for each move from 41.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Different Types of Time Controls

(a) All the moves in 5 (Blitz or Game 5) or 30 (Rapidplay or Game 30) minutes are both popular. The former speed is viewed less favorably by weaker players.
(b) All the moves in 2½ hours (Game 150). This is the minimum time for games in events which count for title norms. Such rates are rarely seen. Some players are extremely ill-disciplined and will end up making all the remaining moves in 5 minutes, even if they had 3 hours at the start. It is nannyism to prevent players doing this, but someone has to exhibit a measure of control. Spectators would become extremely bored watching a game where nothing happened for 2 hours.
(c) 40 moves in 100 minutes, followed by all the moves in 20 minutes. This is popular for weekend Swisses in Britain.
(d 40 moves in 2 hours, followed by all the moves in 1 hour. This used to be the minimum time to count for title norms. This has been popular for international tournaments where two games are played on one day.
(e) 40 moves in 2 hours, 20 moves in 1 hour, followed by all the moves in 30 minutes. This is sometimes called 'Classical'. Sudden-death is rare and recourse to 10.2 of the Laws of Chess rarer still. 7 hour sessions are now rare.
(f) 40 moves in 2 hours, followed by 20 moves in 1 hour thereafter, usually with adjournment after 6 hours. This is now rarely seen and only popular with those who don't have electronic clocks and also dislike quickplay finishes. Most players intensely dislike adjourning games.

(g) Cumulative mode. Below are equivalents:
Blitz: all the moves in 3 minutes, but every time a player moves he receives an extra 2 seconds thinking time. Rapidplay: all the moves in 20 minutes, but every time a player moves he receives an extra 10 seconds thinking time. Weekend: all the moves in 80 minutes, but every time a player moves he receives an extra 30 seconds thinking time. FIDE: 40 moves in 90 minutes, followed by all the moves in 15 minutes, but every time a player moves he receives an extra 30 seconds thinking time. This is the closest equivalent to type (b). Tournament: 40 moves in 100 minutes, followed by 20 moves in 50 minutes, followed by all the moves in 10 minutes but every time a player moves he receives an extra 30 seconds thinking time. This is the equivalent of type (e)

For the blitz mode I personally prefer all the moves in 3 minutes, adding on 3 seconds every time a move is made. As a wrinkly I find 2 seconds too little extra time to react.

I am convinced an add-on time of 30 seconds is inadequate for a player to keep score and decide on his next move. Events I run have time controls such as 40 moves in 80 minutes, all the remaining moves in 20 minutes, adding on one minute for each move from the first.

All the cumulative variations have the advantage that they eradicate the wild time scrambles which mar so many games. Once a player has 30 seconds add-on he is required to keep score throughout so that games aren't lost to posterity. Article 10.2 is totally unnecessary. It is true the games aren't of fixed length, but this has never provided a problem.

Dr. John Nunn feels that standardplay games with such rates are blander. It is true the players make fewer blunders but also there are fewer highlights as players can't take the risk their opponent will fail to analyse correctly due to time trouble. There can be little doubt the cumulative mode is better in the last session.

(h) Delay mode. This is used in the US. I have no experience of this. In a slow game there would never be a let-up in the final stage, once a player was in time-trouble.

It is true the swashbuckling excitement of seeing the players thrash around in agony in time trouble is lost in these add-on modes. Relatively few games are played with large numbers of spectators present. Sudden-death modes can continue to be used if preferred where chess is being displayed as a gladiatorial conflict.

Above, the first time period always comes after 40 moves. It is very much in the interest of the players for this to be standardised. If a player is used to a climax after 36 moves, he will be troubled by needing to make 40 moves. Having got used to playing 40, gearing up to 45 will cause problems.

After the last fixed time control there should always be a minimum of 10 minutes added before going into the final cumulative or delay mode. This provides a 'comfort' stop in which players can recover from a time scramble. Also it enables players to meet the requirements of 8.4. If you are not convinced of the reliability of the clock, it is better to use all the moves in a given period.

I am very impressed with Bent Larsen's viewpoint that it is good to have different events with a variety of methods of timing games.

Where a cumulative mode is used, arbiters should check the clocks at least every hour. This is arithmetically difficult without a move counter, but there have been occasions where clocks were set incorrectly. Also occasionally the display blanks out and a record of the times used, though not up to date, may be useful.

56

Comments on some Commercial Electronic Clocks Available early in 2005

This section of the book is the one that has undergone the most extensive revision since 1997. Nothing dates a book more than description of advanced technology.

DGT XL

This clock is endorsed by FIDE. The position of the lever indicates which player is to move from either side of the clock from some distance. An extremely versatile range of options is offered. It can be connected with a computer. Most of the earlier problems have been ironed out and, in my experience, the clock is quite reliable.

Excalibur Game Time II

This clock is endorsed by the USCF. It is an unusual design and the display is fairly small, but everything you need to know is there. It shows the time, the number of moves and the mode. I am puzzled as to why it has not been sent in for consideration of endorsement by FIDE. Since I have not used it in tournaments, which is the only true test, I cannot comment on its reliability. The fact that the arbiter would not be able to see the clock times at a distance is irrelevant in the US, few arbiters there look. Which button has been pressed can be seen at some distance.

Schach Timer Silver

This is a good-looking solid piece of equipment. Even the most recent edition does not fully fit the FIDE Regulations. It is difficult to determine which model is to hand. The light which shows which clock is going is difficult to see from any distance. The clock face however is larger than most others. It has provided no problems in events in which I have competed.

CHRONOS

This is of the few clocks where both the time and the number of moves can be displayed simultaneously. Very few are produced

annually, indeed I don't know whether it is still in production. The explanatory booklet is difficult to understand, partly because the features are changed without indicating this on the body of the clock. It is impossible to tell from the back which clock is going.

SAITEK MARK 2

This is an attractive looking clock. It has all the usual features and is easy to programme. It is impossible to tell from the back which clock is going. Players must learn to press down the button firmly, otherwise there is a risk of it not registering the change. I have not used it very much and thus cannot comment on its reliability.

Please do not take this to imply a recommendation on my part. New equipment is coming out all the time. I have not commented on the cost of the above products. This is not a 'Which' survey.

One or two more mature players have had difficulties with perception with digital displays. Whether this is simply being reactionary, or a genuine problem with eyesight, I don't know. For a time rate such as 40/2, all in 1 there would be no problem with changing the clock for a mechanical one. Whether an arbiter would accede to such a request would be their decision. The opponent would also have to be consulted. This option would be quite impossible when using the cumulative or delay modes.

Chapter 9

Swiss Pairing Systems

Different systems have different objectives. Thus it is impossible to design one which will meet everybody's requirements. However we can agree there should be no in-built bias of any type and that players with similar rating performances should achieve similar scores. Generally players like to be able to predict their next round opponent.

A number of computer programs are available to help the controller. Christian Krause Chairman of FIDE Swiss Pairings Committee has said, "it is the controller who makes the pairings. The computer is just a tool which he may use." I resisted the introduction of computerised pairings in England until experimentation had ceased on the BCF Seeded Pairing System. I feared its introduction prior to that would stultify fresh consideration of the rules.

Mr. Krause designed PROSIM which is able to simulate Swiss System Tournaments by generating results in accordance with the expected score according to the FIDE Rating Tables (Page 168). This could prove to be a powerful tool in due course to help investigate the efficacy of each pairing system.

Colour Bias

No matter what system is used, tournaments with an odd number of rounds innately favour players who have White in round 1. Usually an attempt is made to maintain alternation. Thus such players are likely to have 5 Whites in, for example, a 9 round Swiss. Assuming White scores 57%, such a player would score 4.57 if he meets opponents of the same average strength. A player meeting exactly the same opposition, but with 4 Whites would be expected to score only 4.43. There are two further factors. Doing well in the last round catapults a player into a higher score. White in the last round helps a player achieve this. Finally, if you start well in Round 1, then you are likely to continue performing well.

Thus an even number of rounds seems fairer. But an odd number of rounds has one significant advantage. It is very rare in a 9 round Swiss for any player to have other than 5 games of one colour and 4 of the other. In 10 rounds, inevitably a few players will have 6 and 4. Three Prosim tournaments of 60 players, one using Dubov, one Dutch and one Lim Pairings Systems and the 1995 British Championship after 10 rounds were investigated. The first two tournaments resulted in 4 players having 6 Whites, the third 3 and the fourth 5. The average score of the White-favoured players was 5.16 and the disadvantaged players 3.5. This may be inadequate information to be statistically valid, but the pattern was identical in all four systems.

We expect players who have White to fare better. Thus there should always be an imbalance of more players seeking Black in the next round on the higher scores and a similar imbalance of White seekers on the lower scores. It may be impossible to eradicate this. A start can be made for round 2 of a seeded Swiss. Every fifteenth higher rated player due White could be given Black in Round 1.

In 2004-5 at Hastings we tried giving Black more time than White partly in order to compensate for this bias. The overall result was 155½-153½, but one event is inadequate data. The lower number of participants can be partly attributed to this innovation and Hasting has inadequate funds to pursue this idea.

Validity of Places

The following has often been asserted. For every extra place that needs to be determined, two extra rounds, above the number required for a knock-out are needed. I have never seen any statistical or mathematical justification for this equation.

Any Swiss system will find the winner reasonably efficiently. Doubt will always be cast on the remaining places. Grandmaster Jonathan Mestel has stated there may be nothing wrong with a pairing system; it is assessing the results on raw score that is incorrect. Some other methods are considered in the chapter on Tie-breaks.

60

It should not be assumed increasing the number of rounds automatically leads to more accurate placing. If a tournament continues too long, all the leaders will have met and will need to delve into the pack of lower scores. A degree of randomisation may result and thus there is probably a mini-max number of rounds.

Lottery Swiss

The system offered in previous editions is extremely simple and there is no bias whatsoever caused by, for example, ratings. It seems pointless to include it here when nobody seems to use a lottery system. Any random system has the defect that, at the end of the event, some players may have been disadvantaged. If the tournament were to be repeated, others could be affected. The other disadvantage is that it is impossible to predict the pairings. This may have the effect that the controller cannot prove that he isn't biased.

If you want to have a computerised Lottery System, why not use the Seeded system, but assign the players' rankings randomly?

Seeded Swiss Systems

These are widely accepted and computer programs are available for running tournaments. Two systems are recognised by FIDE, Dutch and Lim. For reasons of space only the former is included here. The Australian, British and United States Chess Federations all have their own variations, as no doubt do other countries. One system, Swiss Perfect, is available free – but reputedly it does not live up to its name. The BCF System is extremely similar to the Dutch, although developed independently. I have never heard comments about the Swiss 46 and higher numbers for the Dutch System giving the wrong pairings. This program is now available in Windows.

They are all based on the premise that throughout the tournament all players on all score groups are paired top half v second half in rating order, after taking into account colour equalisation and then colour alternation.

The Seeded Systems work extremely well to find the winner. However there are fears that they are uniformly **all** basically flawed. Players at the top of the second half may be perpetually disadvantaged. Consider a 64 player tournament and compare the opponents of players 32 and 33 assuming all games are won and go according to seeding. After 4 rounds they will have both scored 2/4. 32 meets 64, 15, 48 and 19, the sum of which is 146. 33 meets 1, 50, 17 and 46. Now the sum is 114. 32 has encountered easier opposition. The effect is most marked if all the games are drawn by all players in the first three rounds. Then 32 plays 64, 62, 60 and 58. 33 meets 1, 3, 5 and 7. This is particularly unfair to players of static strength who take part in events of similar rating structure. I have twice observed this effect for one or two players in the British Championship over the past 25 years. However computer simulation does not exhibit such bias after extremely limited experimentation.

Players dislike the 'bouncing effect'. In 2001 in Bermuda I played a five round Swiss. I won Round 1, 3 and 5 with White against players I was expected to score virtually 100%. Rounds 2 and 4 I lost with Black against opponents much higher rated than me.

David Welch, the BCF Chief Arbiter has suggested the following way of pairing round 1. Place the players in rating order and then divide into 6 groups. Then pair Group 1 v Group 3, Group 2 v Group 5 and Group 4 v Group 6. Subsequent rounds follow the normal Seeding System. This has the objectives of avoiding pairing together players of tremendous different rating and avoiding the potential bias against the top of the second half. I don't know whether this has ever been tried.

Burstein System

Almog Burstein of Israel has devised a Swiss System based on pairing by Buchholz Score (Sum of Opponents' Scores). After some rounds (normally 3-4) of a normal Seeded Swiss, players on a score group are ranked in their Buchholz order. If there are 8 players, then 1v8, 2v7, 3v6 and 4v5 are the pairings, avoiding players meeting twice and adjusting for colours.

62

This avoids the problems of the Seeded Swiss described above. However, it may be too late to avoid bias if not started until Round 5. It has the merit that later pairings are made on data from the actual tournament, not on historical ratings. It has the disadvantage that players cannot predict their opponent unless they know the Buchholz scores (which information can however be provided). Unless computerised the system is laborious. The precise rules have only been provided for the Olympiad. It is particularly effective for that event.

Dubov System

Edward Dubov of Russia devised this system which has similar objectives to the Burstein System. After each round, on a given score group, the players seeking White are listed in order of the Sum of their Opponents' Ratings. The player with the lowest sum is placed at the top. The players seeking Black are listed alongside, ranked according to their rating, with the highest rating at the top. Then the White top players are paired with the Black top players, following the normal Swiss requirements.

This is easier to apply without a computer than the Burstein System. It is heavily reliant on accurate ratings. I have little direct knowledge of how effective the system is. It would almost certainly be better than the Seeded Swiss for a tournament, such as the Continental Championships, where a large number of players qualify for the World Championship.

Accelerated Systems

Unless otherwise indicated, follow the standard procedure of the Seeded Swiss. Accurate ratings and a wide range of abilities are required to avoid anomalies. At least 75% of the players should be rated and there should be a rating range of at least 400 points.

Basically in the first round the top quarter is paired against the second quarter and the third quarter against the fourth, all in rating order. In the second round the winners from the top half are paired together. The winners from the bottom half are

paired with the highest rated players who did *not* win in the first round. The latter are listed in rating order, irrespective of whether they drew or lost. In the third round players with 2/2 from the top half are paired together. The players with 2/2 from the bottom half are paired with the highest rated players with less than 2/2. The process is continued in Round 4 if necessary, unless the tournament is only of 5 rounds, in which case the Seeded System is used after Round 3. There are many variations on this basic system. One of its problems is that, once controllers have grasped the basic principle, they often branch off into their own ideas, without first grasping the finer points.

Some complain this isn't a true Swiss System as players are frequently paired together who do not have the same score. It all depends on one's definition.

It is extremely effective in dealing with large numbers of players in few rounds. It is also valuable in keeping apart players where title results are a major objective. The bouncing effect is reduced relative to a Seeded Swiss. Thus bias against the top of the second half is reduced and no doubt replaced by other bias. However this can be varied from event to event by changing the cut.

Phil Haley was the first person to devise Accelerated Pairings. When it was explained to me in Atlantic City in 1964 I didn't grasp the nuances. This resulted in my accidentally designing a system different from Phil's. The French have a computerised version of his system available free on a website. In my limited experience it is inferior as weak players may readily break through into the higher score groups.

Systems such as the Lottery, Crouch or Reuben systems have been explained in previous editions. That named by me after me, although viable, was partly written as a joke for the previous edition. However, the principle was used for the Hastings System event of 2004-5.

64

THE DUTCH SYSTEM

This is now available as a Windows computerised program. I have never known it to provide an incorrect answer and am puzzled as to why anybody bothers with any other computerised seeded system.

Dutch System

Swiss System Based on Rating

A. Introductory Remarks and Definitions

A1. Rating
It is advisable to check all ratings supplied by players. If no reliable rating is known for a player the arbiters should make an estimation of it as accurately as possible before the start of the tournament.

To convert British BCF use BCF x 8 + 600 = FIDE

A2. Order
For pairing purposes only, the players are ranked in order of, respectively:
- (a) score
- (b) rating
- (c) FIDE-title (GM-WGM-IM-WIM-FM-WFM-no title)
- (d) alphabetically (unless it has been previously stated that this criterion has been replaced by another one).

The order made before the first round (when all scores are obviously zero) is used to determine the pairing numbers: the highest one gets #1 etc.

A3. Score brackets
Players with equal scores constitute a *homogeneous* score bracket. Players who remain unpaired after the pairing of a score bracket will be moved down to the next score bracket, which will therefore be *heterogeneous*. When pairing a heterogeneous score bracket these players moved

down are always paired first whenever possible, giving rise to a *remainder* score bracket which is always treated as a homogeneous.

A heterogeneous score bracket of which at least half of the players have come from a higher score bracket is also treated as though it were homogeneous.

A4. Floats

By pairing a heterogeneous score bracket, players with unequal scores will be paired. To ensure that this will not happen to the same players again in the next round this is written down on the pairing card. The higher ranked player receives a downfloat (↓), the lower one an upfloat (↑).

A5. Byes

Should the total number of players be (or become) odd, one player ends up unpaired. This player receives a bye: no opponent, no colour, one point.
A bye is considered to be a downfloat.

A6. Subgroups

To make the pairing, each score bracket is divided into two subgroups, called S1 and S2.

In a heterogeneous score bracket S1 contains all players moved down from a higher score bracket.

In a homogeneous score bracket S1 contains the higher half (rounding downwards) of the number of players in the score bracket.

The number of players in S1 is indicated by "p", indicating the number of pairings to be made.

In both cases S2 contains all other players of the score bracket.

In both S1 and S2 players are ordered according to A2.

A7. Colour differences and colour preferences

The colour difference of a player is the number of games played with white minus the number of games played with black by this player.

After a round the colour preference
can be determined for every player.

(a) An absolute colour preference occurs when a player's colour difference is greater than 1 or less than -1, or when a player played with the same colour in the two latest rounds. The preference is white when the colour difference is < 0 or when the last two games were played with black, otherwise black. In this case the (obligatory) colour is written down on the score card immediately. This rule does not apply when pairing players with a score greater than 50% in the last round.

(b) A strong colour preference occurs when a player's colour difference is unequal to zero. The preference is white when the colour difference is < 0, black otherwise.

(c) A mild colour preference occurs when a player's colour difference is zero, the preference being to alternate the colour with respect to the previous game. In this case the colour difference is written down as +0 or -0 depending on the colour of the previous game (white or black respectively).

(d) Before the first round the colour preference of one player (often the highest one) is determined by lot.

A8. Definition of "x"

The number of pairings which can be made in a score bracket, either homogeneous or heterogeneous, not fulfilling all colour preferences, is represented by the symbol x.
x can be calculated as follows:
w = number of players having a colour preference white.
b = number of players having a colour preference black.
q = number of players in the score bracket divided by 2, rounded upwards.
If b > w then x = b-q, otherwise x = w-q.

A9. Transpositions and exchanges

    (a) In order to make a sound pairing it is often necessary to change the order in S2. The Rules to make such a change, called a transposition, are in D1.

    (b) In a homogeneous score bracket it may be necessary to exchange players from S1 and S2. Rules for exchanges are found under D2. After each exchange both S1 and S2 must be ordered according to A2.

B. Pairing Criteria

Absolute Criteria

These must not be violated. If necessary players must be moved down to a lower score bracket.

B1. (a) Two players shall not meet more than once.

    (b) A player who has received a point without playing, either through a bye or due to an opponent not appearing in time, shall not receive a bye.

B2. (c) No player's colour difference may become $>+2$ or <-2.

    (d) No player may receive the same colour three times in row.

Relative Criteria

These are in descending priority. They should be fulfilled as much as possible. To comply with these criteria, transpositions or even exchanges may be applied, but no player may be moved down to a lower score bracket).

B3. The difference of the scores of two players paired against each other should be as small as possible and ideally zero.

B4. As many players as possible should receive their colour preference. (Whenever x of a score bracket is unequal to zero this rule will have to be ignored. x is deducted by one each time a colour preference cannot be granted.)

B5. No player should receive an identical float in two consecutive rounds.

B6. No player should have the identical float to that of two rounds before.

    Note:B2, B5 and B6 do not apply when pairing players with a score greater than 50% in the last round.

68

C. Pairing Procedures

Starting with the highest score bracket apply the following procedures to all score brackets until an acceptable pairing is obtained. Afterwards the colour allocation rules (E) are used to determine which players will play white.

C1. If the score bracket contains a player for whom no opponent can be found within this score bracket without violating B1 or B2 then:

• if this player was moved down from a higher score bracket apply C12.

• if this score bracket is the lowest one apply C13.

• in all other cases: move this player down to the next score bracket.

C2. Determine x according to A8.

C3. Determine p according to A6.

C4. Put the highest players in S1, all other players in S2. **C5.** Order the players in S1 and S2 according to A2. **C6.** Pair the highest player of S1 against the highest one of S2, the second highest of S1 against the second highest of S2, etc. If now p pairings are obtained in compliance with B1 and B2 the pairing of this score bracket is considered complete.

• in the case of a homogeneous score bracket: the remaining players are moved down to the next score bracket. With this score bracket restart at C1.

• in the case of a heterogeneous score bracket: only players moved down have been paired so far. Start at C2 with the homogeneous remainder group.

C7. Apply a new transposition of S2 according to D1 and restart at C6.

C8. In the case of a homogeneous (remainder) group: apply a new exchange between S1 and S2 according to D2. Restart at C5.

C9. Drop criteria B6 and B5 (in this order) for downfloats and restart at C4.

C10. In the case of a homogeneous remainder group: undo the pairing of the lowest moved down player paired and try to find a different opponent for this player by restarting at C7.

• if no alternative pairing for this player exists then drop criterion B6 first and then B5 for upfloats and restart at C2.

C11. As long as x is less than p: increase x by 1. When pairing a remainder group undo all pairings of players moved down also. Restart at C3.

C12. In the case of a heterogeneous group: undo the pairing of the previous score bracket. If in this previous score bracket a pairing can be made whereby another player will be moved down to the current one, and this now allows p pairing to be made, then this pairing in the previous score bracket will be accepted.

C13. In the case of the lowest score bracket: the pairing of the penultimate score bracket is undone. Try to find another pairing in the penultimate score bracket which will allow a pairing in the lowest score bracket. If in the penultimate score bracket p becomes zero (i.e. no pairing can be found which will allow a correct pairing for the lowest score bracket) then the two lowest score brackets are joined into a new lowest score bracket. Now another score bracket is the penultimate one, C13 can be repeated until an acceptable pairing is obtained.

C14. Decrease p by 1 (and if the original value of x was greater than zero decrease x by 1 as well). As long as p is unequal to zero restart at C4. If p equals zero the entire score bracket is moved down to the next one. Restart with this score bracket at C1.

D. Transposition and Exchange Procedures

Example: S1 contains players 1, 2, 3 and 4 (in this sequence);
S2 contains players 5, 6, 7 and 8 (in this sequence).

D1. Transpositions within S2 should start with the lowest players, with descending priority:
- (a) 5-6-8-7
- (b) 5-7-6-8
- (c) 5-7-8-6
- (d) 5-8-6-7
- (e) 5-8-7-6
- (f) 6-5-7-8
- (g) 6-5-8-7, etc.

Hint: put all numbers constructable with the digits 5, 6, 7 and 8 in ascending order.

D2. When applying an exchange between S1 and S2 the difference between the numbers exchanged should be as small as possible. When differences of various options are equal, take the one concerning the lowest player of S1.

S1

	4	3	2
5	a	c	f
6	b	e	h
7	d	g	i

S2 = 5,6,7

Exchange of two players
S1

	3+4	2+4	2+3
5+6	j	l	o
5+7	k	n	q
6+7	m	p	r

The above matrices contain the sequence in which exchanges should be applied.

Exchanging one player: a) 4 and 5; b) 4 and 6; c) 3 and 5; etc. until i) 2 and 7.

Exchanging two players: j) 3+4 with 5+6; k) 3+4 with 5+7; l) 2+4 with 5+6 etc.

After each exchange both S1 and S2 should be ordered according to A2.

Remark: if the number of players in a score bracket is odd, S1

contains one player less than S2. So with 7 players S1 contains

players 1, 2 and 3, S2 4, 5, 6 and 7. The exchanges, needed in that case, can be found from the above ones by deducting all numbers in S1 and S2 by 1. The last column of the second matrix has then become obsolete.

E.   Colour Allocation Rules

For each pairing apply (with descending priority): **E1.** Grant both colour preferences.
E2. Grant the stronger colour preference.
E3. Alternate the colours to the most recent round in which they played with different colours.
E4. Grant the colour preference of the higher ranked player.
E5. In the first round all even numbered players in S1 will receive a colour different from all odd numbered players in S1.

F.   Final Remarks

F1. After the pairings are complete, sort the pairings before making them public.
The sorting criteria are (in descending priority)
•   the score of the higher player of the pairing involved;
•   the sum of the scores of both players of the pairing involved;
• the rank according to A2 of the higher player of the pairing involved.
F2. Byes, and pairings not actually played, or lost by one of the players due to arriving late or not at all, should not be taken into account with respect to colour. Such a pairing is not considered illegal in future rounds.
F3. A player who, after five rounds, has a colour history of BWW-B (i.e. no valid game in round 4) will be treated as -BWWB with respect to E3. Similarly WB-WB will count as -WBWB and BWW-B-W as - BWWBW.
F4. All players are in one homogeneous score bracket

before the start of round one and are ordered according to A2. Thus the highest player of S1 is paired against the highest player of S2. If the number of players is odd, the lowest ranked player receives a bye.

F5. Players who withdraw from the tournament will no longer be paired. Players known in advance not to play in a particular round are not paired in that round. They score 0, unless the controller agrees otherwise.

F6. Once official pairings have been made public, they shall not be changed unless the absolute pairing criteria in B1 or B2 are violated.

F7. If a game was played with the wrong colours, or a player's rating has to be corrected, then this will only affect future pairings.

Whether it will affect a pairing already made public but not yet played shall be decided by the arbiter.

Unless the rules of the competition state otherwise:

F8. Players who are absent for a round without notifying the arbiter will be considered to have withdrawn.

F9. Adjourned games are considered draws for pairing purposes only.

F10. To determine the final standings the following criteria apply in descending priority.

• the highest number of points scored: should this be equal for several participants, the prize money should be shared;

• where it concerns first place: the best results in games played against each other

• the highest average rating o the opponents

• drawing of lots

(See Chapter 13 for alternative tiebreak systems.)

ACCELERATED SWISS PAIRING RULES

In an Accelerated Swiss Tournament the pairings are designed to avoid games between players of widely differing rating and to reduce the number of players on the 100% score level.

In tournaments with seven rounds or fewer, it is permissible to pair weaker players on the 100% score level with stronger players not more than one point below them. When no weaker players remain on 100% the acceleration ceases.

For tournaments with eight or more rounds the procedure can also be applied to the score level immediately below 100%.

Steps marked * may only be used for these longer events.

Accurate ratings are required in an Accelerated Swiss Tournament if anomalies are to be avoided. The system is unlikely to work unless at least 75% of the participants are rated and there is a rating range of at least 400 points.

Unless otherwise stated, pairings at each stage are conducted in accordance with the normal seeded Swiss Pairing Rules.

1.   Divide the cards into two sections. The highest rated players are placed in the top section. The top section must contain at least as many players as the bottom, with the division usually pitched at some convenient rating gap. The top section must contain an even number of players.

2. For Round One - Pair each section within itself.

3. For Round Two

(a)   Pair together all top section players with 1 point.

(b)   Pair bottom section players with 1 point against top section non-winners, who are taken in rating order regardless of their score.

* In longer tournaments be careful to leave sufficient top section players on 0 points to accommodate step (d)*.

(c)   * Pair together all remaining top section players with ½ point.

(d)   * Pair bottom section players with ½ point against top half players with zero.

(e)   Pair together all remaining players

4. For Round Three

(a)   Pair together all top section players having 2 points.

(b)   Pair all bottom section players with 2 points against top section with either 1½ or 1 point.

(c)   Pair together all remaining top section players with 1½ points.

74

(d) * Pair bottom half players on 1½ points with top half players on 1 point and, if necessary, ½ point.

(e) Pair together all remaining players.

5. If necessary the principle of this process is continued in further rounds until the bottom section players have dropped at least ½ point, (* at least a full point for longer tournaments). It is ESSENTIAL however that any tournament concludes with at least two rounds determined by normal Swiss Pairing Rules. Acceleration should not normally be needed beyond round Four and usually is only needed for three rounds.

6. Steps (b) and (d*) are special pairings and not regarded as floats. For float pairings involving top section players on the top score level (* top two score levels), the downfloater is chosen according to normal seeded rules, but the upfloater is the highest rated player of the correct colour remaining after the special accelerated pairings have been made. All other steps form a normal seeded draw.

DUBOV SWISS PAIRING SYSTEM

This is designed to maximise the fair treatment of the players. This means that a player having a higher score than another player in a tournament should also have a higher rating performance.

If the average rating of all players throughout the tournament is roughly equal, as in a round robin tournament, the goal is reached. As a Swiss System is a more or less statistical system, this goal can only be reached approximately on a given score group.

The approach is an attempt to equalise the average rating of the opponents of all players of a score group. Therefore the pairing of a round will pair players who have played low rated players with players who have high ratings.

A number of changes have been made to the wording to be found in the FIDE Handbook. These changes are not indicated in this text. A number of comments have been made on the text. These are in italics.

1. Definitions

1.1. **R** is the rating of a player

1.2. **ARO** is the average rating of a player´s opponents. ARO must be calculated after each round as basis of the pairings system. *This can be simplified to Sum of Opponent's Ratings if no player has a bye.*

1.3. **Due colour of a player is white**

- if he has played more games with black than white.

- if these numbers are equal and he has played black his previous game.

Due colour of a player is black

- if he has played more games with white than black.

- if these numbers are equal and he has played white his previous game.

2. Pairing limitations

2.1. Players cannot meet more than once.

2.2. A player who has had a bye or won or lost a game by default, shall not receive a bye.

2.3. The difference of the number of black and the number of white games shall not be greater than 2 or less than -2.

2.4. A player shall not have the same colour three times in a row.

2.5. Transfers. Unless a player cannot otherwise be paired; apart from the last round a player shall not be transferred to a higher score group:

2.51. in two consecutive rounds.

2.52. more than three times if the tournament has 9 rounds or less.

2.53. more than four times if the tournament has more than 9 rounds.

3. Colour allocation

When pairing two players their colour allocation shall be decided as follows in order of decreasing priority:

3.1. give both players their due colour

3.2. bring as close to equality as possible the numbers of black and white games played.

3.3. alternate the colours of both players, looking for the first difference in their colour history going back from the previous round to the first round.

3.4. assign white to the player with the higher ARO

3.5. assign white to the player with the lower R

4. Odd number of players in the tournament

The player from the lowest score group, who has the lowest R is given the bye.

(*This seems wrong. Should it not be the player from the lowest score group, from the dominant colour group, of lowest R?*)

If there are players with the lowest R in both the colour subgroups, then the player to get the bye must be due the dominating colour and in case there are several players with equal R, the player to get the bye must have the higher ARO.

The player receiving the bye has played without colour in that round and scores 1 point.

5. Pairing for the first round

This is as Round 1 for any Seeded Swiss.

6. The standard pairing procedure for the remaining rounds

6.1. Standard requirement (Special cases see below chapter 7.):

The number of players having the same score is even and the number of players due white and black is the same. Each player in the score group has at least one possible opponent in the score group

6.2. First attempt

The players who should play with the white pieces are arranged in order of increasing ARO. Where the ARO is the same the player with the lower R is placed higher. If ARO and R are identical, the players are placed alphabetically *(presumably the player later in the alphabet is placed first)*.

The players who should play the black pieces are arranged in order of decreasing R. Where R is the same, the player with the higher ARO is placed higher. If ARO and R are identical, the players are to be placed alphabetically *(presumably the player earlier in the alphabet is placed first)*.

Two columns of numbers are written down, thereby arranging the pairs.

For example:

White (ARO)		Black (R)
2310.0		2380
2318.4		2365
2322.3	2300	
2333.7		2280
2340.5		2260
2344.6		2250

The names of the players are then written down, and only one fact is checked - whether the players have played their opponents before

6.3. Improvements

If the players have already played each other, then the player seeking white is paired with the first player seeking black whom he has not played before, from the lower rows;

If such a coincidence takes place in the last row for a group of players with the same score, then the last but one row is changed.

If a coincidence takes place in a row No. k of a group with the same score and all the black seekers from the lower group have already played with the white No. k, then we change the pairing in row No. k - 1, if this does not work, in row No.k-2, etc. If the last row is exhausted, proceed up row k + 1, etc.

If the white seeker No. k has already played all the blacks seekers, we look for an opponent for him, beginning with the white seeker No.k+1 down to the end of the column, and then,

beginning with the white seeker No. k -1 down to the white seeker No.1. The colours of the pairings are assigned by the colour allocation rules Chapter 3.

6.4. Floater

The aim of the pairing procedure is to pair the maximum number of players within their own score group.

If this cannot be achieved the remaining unpaired players are transferred to the next lower score group and treated according to chapter 8.

If there is a choice the floaters are chosen by the following procedures in order of decreasing preference:

the player had not already floated from a higher score group and can be paired in the lower score group.

the player had not already floated from a higher score group and cannot be paired in the lower score group.

the player had floated from a higher score group and can be paired in the lower score group.

the player had floated from a higher score group and cannot be paired in the lower score group.

7. Transfer of players to meet the requirements of Chapter 6

If the requirement of the standard pairing procedure is not fully fulfilled the following transfers shall be carried out in the order listed below

7.1. If a player has already played with all the players of his own score group, a player from the next possible lower score group is transferred to the score group to be paired who has not yet played with the player in question and can be paired according to the colour allocation rules

The player to be transferred shall fulfil the following requirements in descending priority:

the due colour is opposite to the due colour of the player in question.

if there is a choice, then the player with the highest R is to be transferred.

if there is more than one player having the same R then the one with the lowest ARO is transferred.

7.2. If the number of players in the score group is odd, a player from the next possible lower score group shall be transferred to the score group to be paired, who has not yet played with at least one of the players of the higher score group and is allowed to be paired according to the colour allocation rules.

The player to be transferred shall fulfil the following requirements in descending priority:

his due colour is opposite to the dominating due colour of the higher score group.

if there is a choice, then the player with the highest R is to be transferred.

if more than one player has the same R, then the one with the lowest ARO shall be transferred.

7.3. If the number of players in the score group is even and the number of whites exceeds the blacks by 2n, then n white players, who have the lowest ARO, are transferred to the black group. If their ARO is equal, the player with the higher R is chosen. Should both (ARO and R) coincide completely, the list of the players is arranged alphabetically, the transfer being made from the earliest alphabetically.

7.4. If the number of players with the same score is even and the number of whites is smaller than the number of blacks by 2n, then n black players, who have the highest ARO, are transferred to the white group. If their ARO is equal, the player with the lower R is chosen. Should both (ARO and R) coincide completely, the list of the players is arranged alphabetically, the transfer being made from the earliest alphabetically.

8. Treatment of floaters
8.1. Priority of floater-pairing

The floaters due white are arranged according to chapter 6.2

The floaters due black are arranged according to chapter 6.2

Beginning with the highest white floater the floaters are paired one by one going down to the lowest floater alternating between white and black.

8.2. Pairing the floaters

Each of the floaters is paired with the player having the highest R, if possible due the opposite colour. If there is more than one player with equal R, the player with the lowest ARO is chosen.

9. Final remarks

The list of AROs should be published after each round to make it possible for players to calculate the pairings on their own.

If a situation arises which is not covered by the specific instructions, the controller shall use his best judgement according to the basic principles of the system.