

County Championship Proposals

1. FIDE-Rating the ECF Stages of the Open and Major sections

This proposal goes before Council periodically, and has been rejected before on the grounds that not enough of the players were FIDE-rated and/or not enough of the players were members. A few things have changed since the last time:

- The number of FIDE-rated players has increased, and thus
- The number of Gold members has increased.

Some statistics:

Open 2015/16

95.9% of players were FIDE-rated

86.6% of players have the relevant level of membership for them (see below)

90.7% of players will be eligible once the membership exemption clause is applied (see below)

96.7% of players eligible under the current rules

Minor 2015/16

60.9% of players were FIDE-rated

64.5% of players have the relevant level of membership for them (see below)

87.8% of players will be eligible once the membership exemption clause is applied (see below)

97.5% of players eligible under the current rules

What does “eligible under the current rules” mean?

Some players are ineligible even at present because they don't hold the relevant level of membership.

What is “the relevant level of membership”?

- For people who are or would like to be English on the FIDE-rating list, they need to be Gold members.
- For people who are not English on the FIDE-rating list, or would like some other nationality, they need to be members at any level (as now). Players without FIDE IDs who would like some other nationality on the FIDE-rating list must apply to their Federations in advance.

Why should my players have to take out a Gold membership when they might only play one FIDE-rated game?

They don't have to, and we don't need to change anything to make that either. One of the existing exemptions says: The requirement for ENG players to be Gold members is waived in respect of players playing one game. The statistics above on having the relevant level of membership do not include people eligible under this one game exemption.

Will non-Gold members have to pay the £10 non-membership fine?

This is levied to all players at present as a penalty for players who do not hold any level of membership. This will be retained. The exemption above only covers one game's worth of non-Gold membership. Were a player to play a second game as a non-Gold member, then the £10 fine would be levied.

[Note: If Council voted in favour of Item 9 on the Agenda, then: (a) the fine would be changed from £10 to the difference between the price in Gold and Silver membership, and (b) a Silver member would be upgraded to Gold membership, in accordance with the principle set out in Item 9.]

Do arbiters need to be present?

No. I have this in writing from the FIDE Qualification Commission, the Commission relevant for the rating of games. Telephone arbiters will be provided as usual. Where teams agree to have arbiters on site, then FIDE Licenced Arbiters will be needed. The majority of candidates to do this sort of thing are likely to be already Licenced, but the ECF receives little information as to who does this if anyone at any matches, and so we are not well-placed to comment.

Will the Union stage be FIDE-rated too?

That’s up to each individual Union to decide, and it is not part of this proposal.

Will the 10-point board order rule change to reflect the change to the event being FIDE-rated?

Yes, it will be amended to an 80-point rule for the FIDE-rated sections, based on a player’s Elo rating. Where a player has no FIDE-rating, an ECF grade converted using the normal conversion formula will apply.

Proposal:

From 2016/17 onwards, the Open and Minor sections of the County Championship will be FIDE-rated at the ECF stage.

2. Staggering of default dates for the Final Stage

From time-to-time, this gets suggested at various points, and I have decided it was worth putting to Council for a vote.

At present, the following is the rule:

- Preliminary Round – Fourth Saturday in April
- Quarter Finals- Third Saturday in May
- Semi-Finals – Second Saturday in June
- Finals – First Saturday in July

The proposal is that the default dates for the Quarter Finals and/or Semi Finals be split over two weekends to allow counties to field more teams in the national stages where multiple teams qualify for them.

The best way to split the sections up is to have the following:

- Date A: Open, Minor, Under 160, Under 120
- Date B: Under 180, Under 140, Under 100

A county will enter either the Open or the Minor, so holding those sections on the same default date is not a problem.

Proposal:

(1) Should the default dates be split by sections as above in principle?

- | | |
|-----|-----------------|
| Yes | Proceed to (2) |
| No | Rejected |

(2) Should the default dates be split for the following:

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|-----------------|
| (a) Quarter Finals and Semi Finals | Yes | Proceed to (3) |
| | No | Proceed to (b) |
| (b) Quarter Finals only | Yes | Proceed to (3) |
| | No | Rejected |

(3) Should the default dates differ by:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|-----------------|
| (a) A week | Yes | Accepted |
| | No | Proceed to (b) |
| (b) Saturday/Sunday of same weekend | Yes | Accepted |
| | No | Rejected |