

**86<sup>TH</sup> FIDE CONGRESS**  
**1-8 SEPTEMBER 2015**  
**ABU DHABI, UAE**

**SYSTEMS OF PAIRINGS & PROGRAMS COMMISSION**

4th September 2015  
 11.00-19.00

**Chairman:** C. Krause (GER)

**Present:** R. Ricca (ITA), M. Held (ITA), W. Brown (USA), A. McFarlane (SCO), I. Vereschagin (RUS), A. Holowszak (ENG), G. Wastell (AUS), J. Lehtivaara (FIN), S. Reuben (ENG), C. Abundo (PHI), W. Stubenvoll (AUT), G. Urošević (SRB), F. M. Alhammadi (UAE), R. Anatharam (IND), C. Jarecki (IVB), A. Vardapetian (ARM), M. Pahlevanzadeh (IRI), D. Madhloom (IRQ)

**2015 SPPC Minutes**

**1. Approval of the endorsement procedure (section C.04.4)**

The proposed endorsement procedure was agreed.

The FE-1 form (request for endorsement), the description of the TRF and the list of the endorsed programs are now part of the handbook.

**2. Discussion of the current draft of the new wording for C.04 FIDE Swiss rules to be finalized at the 87th Congress in Baku 2016**

The necessary amendments presented in the Commission's proposal were agreed.

The Commission was asked to change the definition of topscorers in such a way that it would be possible for the arbiter to make a choice.

**3. Experiences with the Dutch wording**

The solutions given to some issues reported to the Commission were accepted.

**4. Proposed amendments to the Dutch Swiss Rules**

The following proposals were presented, discussed and agreed:

- Switching the priority of downfloaters from two rounds ago and upfloaters from the previous round
- Consider unplayed loss as downfloats (which means that all unplayed games are downfloats)
- A half-point-bye should not prevent anybody from receiving the pairing-allocated bye

**5. New candidates for the endorsement**

The late application made by Swiss-Chess was accepted, since the rules defined in section C.04.4 were not operative yet. The Chairman will summon a subcommittee that will conduct the endorsement procedure before the end of the year. If the program behaves satisfactorily, it will be added to the list of the endorsed programs.

As there are still other programs asking for endorsement, the endorsement procedures will continue during the next year.

**6. Deadline for compulsory use of an endorsed program for tournaments valid for FIDE titles and norms**

The Qualification Commission agreed to add a new item to the International Title Regulations valid from July 1st, 2017: *In individual Swiss competitions, in which norms were achieved, the pairings will be verified by an endorsed pairings-checker (see C.04.4.4). The proper use of an endorsed program for the pairings of the tournament is recommended.*

**7. Proposal for a FIDE Pairing Server (FPS) to help organizers comply with deadline**

## **requirements**

The proposal for a FIDE Pairing Server was presented, and in principle accepted.

### **8. Discussion of accelerated systems**

An overview about existing systems was presented. Due to the fact that such systems are widely used, the Commission will make a performance review on them, in order to identify the ones to be proposed to the Qualification Commission. The latter will indicate the systems to be put in the rules and implemented in endorsed programs.

### **9. Miscellaneous**

A proposal was presented to remove from the list of FIDE approved Swiss systems the ones for which there are no endorsed programs.



Christian Krause  
Chairman

**Application for Swiss Pairing Program FIDE Endorsement (C04.4)****FE1**

To be sent to: FIDE Systems of Pairings and Programs Commission

Program name Swiss-Chess (WinSwiss.exe)	Application date August 2015
--	---------------------------------

**Author**

Name Franz-Josef Weber	Country Germany
E-mail <a href="mailto:turniersoftware@swiss-chess.de">turniersoftware@swiss-chess.de</a> / <a href="mailto:swiss-chess.turniersoftware@t-online.de">swiss-chess.turniersoftware@t-online.de</a>	
Website <a href="http://www.swiss-chess.de">www.swiss-chess.de</a>	
Other contact (Phone/Fax, Whatsapp, Skype, Facebook, other ...) 0049 7 24	

**Program**

Version 8.91 and higher	Previous endorsement (if any) 1995
Platform or Operating system(s)	
Pairing system Dutch	

**Downloads**

Download details (including URL and/or download instructions) Can be downloaded from <a href="http://swiss-chess.de/download">swiss-chess.de/download</a>	
Free software q YES q NO No free software	
Trial version limitations (if any) Can be downloaded from <a href="http://swiss-chess.de/demo">swiss-chess.de/demo</a>	

**Specifications**

Internal engine q YES q YES
FPC - Pairing checker (if available, state calling statement or sequence) Can be used with: winswiss-console.exe (see help screen)
RTG - Tournament generator (if available, state calling statement or sequence) -----

**Auto-test reports (tests made by applicant)**

Note: an Endorsement Request can be received only if the error ratio is not worse than 1 difference every 10 test tournaments.

<b>Internal FPC (Pairing Checker)</b>	
Reference RTG JaVaFo	
Number of test tournaments 5601	Rounds per test tournament (min/max/avg) 6 / 14 / 10,5
Number of rounds with pairing differences detected by internal checker 268 (0,45%) (more details and comments in excel file "TestJaVaVoxxxx-1000-6600.xlsx")	

<b>Internal RTG (Random Tournament Generator)</b>	
Reference checker	
Number of test tournaments	Rounds per test tournament (min/max/avg)
Number of rounds with pairing differences detected by reference checker	





# Switching the priority of downfloaters/upfloaters

## Background

In the Tallinn 2013 Draft, the order in which the protections for downfloaters and upfloaters were renounced was defined by Articles B.5, B.6:

<b>B.5</b>	<i>No player shall receive an identical float in two consecutive rounds.</i>
<b>B.6</b>	<i>No player shall have an identical float as two rounds before</i>

and by Article C.10 (in the algorithmic section):

<b>a.</b>	<i>(Heterogeneous score brackets) Drop B.6 for upfloaters and restart from C.4.</i>
<b>b.</b>	<i>(Heterogeneous score brackets) Drop B.5 for upfloaters and restart from C.3.h</i>
<b>c.</b>	<i>(Bracket produces downfloaters) Drop B.6 for downfloaters and restart from C.3.g</i>
<b>d.</b>	<i>(Bracket produces downfloaters) Drop B.5 for downfloaters and restart from C.3.f</i>

As we can see, B.5 and B.6 make no difference between downfloaters and upfloaters - although a certain degree of asymmetry is required to univocally define the order of generation of pairings.

That asymmetry is then introduced in Article C.10, considering first downfloaters and then upfloaters. But in fact this Article also mixes up B.5 and B.6, as it drops part of B.5, then part of B.6, then the rest of B.5, and finally the rest of B.6.

Hence, a player who downfloated two rounds ago, enjoys a better protection than another player who upfloated during the previous round. As a result, we make a player upfloat for two rounds in a row rather than make another one downfloat "on the other round".

The new wording, being (in this respect) equivalent to the previous one, maintains the very same situation:

<b>A.11-g</b>	<i>minimize the number of players who receive (in order of priority):</i>	
	<b>1</b>	<i>the same downfloat as the last round</i>
	<b>2</b>	<i>the same downfloat as two rounds before</i>
	<b>3</b>	<i>the same upfloat as the last round</i>
	<b>4</b>	<i>the same upfloat as two rounds before</i>

But now coherence with B9-B12 is enforced:

<b>B.9</b>	<i>No player shall receive a downfloat in two consecutive rounds.</i>
<b>B.10</b>	<i>No player who had a downfloat two rounds before shall receive a downfloat.</i>
<b>B.11</b>	<i>No player shall receive an upfloat in two consecutive rounds.</i>
<b>B.12</b>	<i>No player who had an upfloat two rounds before shall receive an upfloat.</i>

## Rationale

Players are rather sensitive to floating conditions, either downwards or upwards, and usually definitely prone to protest when they have to float twice in the same direction. I think that having just upfloated (thus having played a typically "harder" game) is a more severe condition for a player, than having downfloated two rounds ago. The former situation should then enjoy a better protection than the latter.

## Wording considerations

The wording adjustment to introduce the modification is minimal, requiring a reversal of A.11.g-2/3 and consequently of B.10/11, and, in the algorithmic section, a reversal of the application conditions in C2.f/g and C9.b/c (i.e. exchanging "(bracket produces downfloaters)" and "(heterogeneous brackets)").

Mario Held

# Consider unplayed losses as downfloats

## (From draft) Rule A.4 (Floats), last paragraph:

*A player who, for whatever reason, receives half point or more without playing, is also a downfloater.*

To get ½ or one point without playing is considered to be an easy game and the player is marked as a downfloater to avoid several easy games in a row.

## Scenarios

1. In a 9 round tournament Mr. Wolf asked to start in round 3 because his daughter got married. For the first two rounds he got 0 points, no opponents. Before round three he is unrated with 0 points. There are 4 other unrated players with zero points, but Mr. Wolf was unlucky with his surname and got a pairing-allocated bye in round 3. Is this fair? (Actually this player was quite good, and scored > 50% in his remaining games.)
2. In WYCC 2012 an unrated girl who had lost her flight connection, got zero point in the first game and since she was unrated, a pairing-allocated bye in the second. It was 80 players in the group, so that she should get the bye in round 2 was quite unfair. (The girl was not very good player, so she would have received a bye in round 4-11 anyway).

## Discussion

Most people that are not present for a game have very good reasons, and/or with reasons beyond their control. In my last tournament the reasons for having a bye (no opponent) were: wedding, two funerals, a 75 year celebration and two players being too exhausting to play the double round. All these reasons were accepted, zero points, no opponents. The rules, as they work today, are a strange punishment that hits you if you are low rated, otherwise not. If all unplayed games were downfloaters, both the unrated Mr. Wolf and the unrated girl in WYCC2012 in the scenarios should avoid pairing-allocated bye in the round after the zero bye since a pairing-allocated bye would give consecutive downfloats.

Also for players not appearing in time, most of them have good reason. The most common are problems with public transportation, or other factors outside their control.

For players that have had a round without playing, it's best for them and the tournament that they are paired in the next round, at least when there are other good candidates for pairing-allocated bye. Today the rules give downfloat when your opponent not appears in time, for pairing-allocated byes and for ½ point byes. It's reasonable also to give it to zero point byes since not playing is a break from the tournament, and equal to an easy game. A player who receives a zero point bye should in average have scored ½ point if he had played. Also from this point of view he is downfloated with his zero point bye.

## Conclusion

- a) To consider zero point byes as downfloaters will give a better tournament for the player who asks for zero point byes.
- b) It's more correct due to the fact that the player got a break from the tournament (easy game).
- c) If the player had played the previous round he would in average had ½ point more than he has with zero point bye, and is already in a score bracket under his playing level.

## New rule, last paragraph A4 (proposal)

*A player who, for whatever reason, does not play in a round is also a downfloater.*



# **A half-point bye should not prevent anybody from receiving the pairing-allocated bye**

## **Background**

At the FIDE Congress in 2011 there was a long discussion about half-point byes. The main concern was the question of whether a player who has already received a half-point bye in the Swiss system can later receive a bye for being the unpaired player or vice versa.

Eventually it was agreed that under the Swiss system a player can only be intentionally allowed one unplayed game for which they score points - though of course it may happen that a player unintentionally receives more than one, for instance because of an unexpected forfeit.

## **Scenarios**

1. In Reykjavik Open 2014 the organizer gave  $\frac{1}{2}$  point bye up to round 7. In total 64/255 players took advantage of this. For all players who completed the tournament with 2.0 or less had all (5) of them  $\frac{1}{2}$  point bye, and shall not have a pairing-allocated bye according to the rules. In Swiss-Manager 2014 this was not implemented, and three of these players also got pairing-allocated bye. If the rules were correctly implemented, players with 2.5p should have byes instead of players with  $\frac{1}{2}$  or 1 point. Why should a player that has scored 2.5p against opponents have a pairing-allocated bye instead of one who gain  $\frac{1}{2}$  points for nothing, and no points from playing?
2. It is a new trend in club tournaments where the organizer wants to get rid of postponed games. Instead of a tournament with 9 evenings for normal rounds and 3 evenings for postponed games, you simply play 12 rounds without postponed games. In return you give the players the right to skip up to three rounds with  $\frac{1}{2}$  point bye. If a player is absent more than three rounds he will get 0 points for absence fourth and more. (The most extreme I have hear about was a seven round tournament where four half point byes were accepted). The problem now is that in the end of the tournament all players have at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  point without playing, and you will get an incompatible pairing.

## **(From draft) Rule C.04.1.d**

*A player who, for whatever reason, has received half or more points without playing, shall not receive the pairing-allocated bye.*

## **Discussion**

In Krakow 2011 the main concern was that you got points twice without playing.

Why is an asked ZPB is treated differently from an asked HPB? If a player is among the weakest players in the group, he must expect one PAB regardless of the asked bye gave 0 points or  $\frac{1}{2}$  point.

In Reykjavik Open 2015 you could take two HPB, and if you got a PAB, you could gain 2 point without playing. Does it matter? No - It's 2 unrated points and we must expect to find this player in the bottom of the table anyway. In fact, it is possible also with today's rules to gain 2 points, since you may have a PAB in round 1 and later take two HPB.

Should we worry about that the player plays three games less than the other? - Not at all. It's a decision made by the tournament organizer/chief arbiter to accept  $\frac{1}{2}$  point byes, and then he must also expect to find players with max numbers of HPB + one PAB. As a conclusion, rule C.04.1.d must not cover HPB.

## **New rule C.04.1.d (proposal)**

*A player who has received a half point or more either through a pairing-allocated bye or due to an opponent not appearing in time, shall not receive the pairing-allocated bye.*

## **Comment**

Rule C.04.1.d has not been implemented in Swiss Manager before the new versions were re-endorsed in Tromso 2014.

So most tournaments played after 2011 were played according to the rule in my proposal.

Otto Milvang