ECU Arbiters' Council Meeting
(Slovenia/ Terme Catez – November 12th 2021, 20:00 CET)

Agenda.

1. Preface of the Chairman.
   Presentation of the committee members: Tomasz Delega.

2. Annual report of the Arbiters' Council which will be submitted to the ECU General Assembly: Tomasz Delega

3. Annual report of the arbiters' activity during ECU Events.
   Overview of the appointment of arbiters during ECU Events based on the "Call of Interest": Geert Bailleul, Secretary of ECU AC.

4. Presentation Regulations for the appointments by ECU AC and GDPR collection status: Marco Biagioli.

5. Presentation of the ECU AC Website and online evaluation system: Jirina Prokopova.

6. Online Arbiters Certification Program: Tania Karali.

7. Proposal of the ECU Arbiters Council to change ECU Tournament Regulations regarding direct encounter - to be submitted for ECU GA approval: Tomasz Delega (see Annex 1).

8. Discussion about the proposal of Marco Biagioli to change in the future ECU Tournament Regulations regarding Tie-Breaks (see Annex 2).

9. Question of the attendees.

10. Closing of the meeting: Tomasz Delega.

Geert Bailleul   Tomasz Delega
Secretary of the ECU Arbiters' Council   Chairman of the ECU Arbiters' Council

Annex 1.

Proposal to amend the Tournament Rules, regarding the definition of the tie-break "Direct encounter".

The Arbiters' Council hereby suggests to amend the definition of the tie-break "Direct encounter" as written in Article B.6.2 of the European Chess Union Tournament Rules, approved by the ECU General Assembly on the 25th of October, 2019, in Batumi, Georgia:

"(a) Results of direct encounters between the tied players (If all the tied players have met each other, the sum of points from these encounters is used. The player with the highest score is ranked number 1 and so on. If some but not all have played each other, the player with a score that could not be equalled by any other player (if all such games had been played) is ranked number 1 and so on.)"

https://www.europechess.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/ECU-TR-2020.pdf

to:

"(a) Results of direct encounters between the tied players (If all the tied players have met each other.)"

The reason of this proposal is to align with the definition given in Article C.02.3.15 of the document "Standards of Chess Equipment, venue for FIDE Tournaments, rate of play and tie-break regulations", as approved by the 2018 FIDE General Assembly:

"Direct Encounter"
If all the tied players have met each other, the sum of points from these encounters is used. The player with the highest score is ranked number 1 and so on."

https://handbook.fide.com/files/handbook/C02Standards.pdf

The definition that is currently given in the ECU Tournament Rules is no longer in accordance with the definition given in the aforementioned document and, therefore, we suggest it to be amended.

Annex 2.

Proposal to amend ECU Tournament Rules regarding tie breaks.

Current:

B.6. Scoring and tie-breaking system
B.6.1 The score in each game is 1 for a win, ½ for a draw and 0 for a lost game.
B.6.2 Tie-breaking in individual competitions.
The order of players that finish with the same number of points shall be determined by application of the following tie-breaking procedures in sequence, proceeding from (a) to (b) to (c) to (d) to (e) the extent required:

(a) Results of direct encounters between the tied players (If all the tied players have met each other, the sum of points from these encounters is used. The player with the highest score is ranked number 1 and so on. If some but not all have played each other, the player with a score that could not be equalled by any other player (if all such games had been played) is ranked number 1 and so on.),
(b) Buchholz Cut 1,
(c) Buchholz,
(d) The greater number of games played with black,
(e) The Greater number of wins

Proposal 1:
Reverse Buch Cut 1 and Buch so that the article will be worded as following:
(…)
(b) Buchholz,
(c) Buchholz Cut 1,
(…)
Explanation: the Buchholz system counts the sum of the opponents' scores in a particular tournament. In case there are BYES or unplayed games (for whatsoever reason) in a tournament, the current regulations provide the *virtual opponent* solution. The *virtual opponent* is a numerical system which creates a value to be summed as Buchholz contribution.
However, this value is artificial: having as first criterion Buchholz Cut 1 increases the impact of the virtual opponent (either, if it is the lowest contribution, either, if it is the highest), which is dome undesirable effect.
Reversing the order gives the priority to the system where the virtual opponent has the lesser value in the total sum.

Proposal 2:
Remove (d) the greater number of games played with black, and (e) the Greater number of wins and replace them with Sonneborn-Berger and ARO so that the article will be worded as following:
(…)
(d) Sonneborn-Berger,
(e) ARO.
Explanation: the current criteria *"greater number of black"* and *"greater number of wins"* are poor quality criteria to measure the best performance.
The overall idea of a tie-break is to put upper in a standing the one who gained a better performance.
That is not the case of the mentioned criteria, which make no sense in terms of "better performance".
The proposed new ones are based on results and opponents, thus ordering players according to an order that is effectively related to their performance during the tournament.