



International Correspondence Chess Federation

ICCF Congress 2019

Vilnius, Lithuania

18 August 2019 – 22 August 2019

List of Participants

Australia:

Garvin Gray as ICCF National Delegate for Australia

Belarus:

Dmitry Vitalievich Lybin

Bulgaria:

Richard Akrill as Delegate Designee for Bulgaria

Hazel Akrill as Accompanying Person

Czech Republic:

Josef Mrkvička as ICCF National Delegate for Czech Republic; with proxy for Ecuador,

Alena Mrkvičková as Member of the Czech Delegation

Petr Buchníček as Guest of Congress

Eduard Buchníček as Accompanying Person

Denmark:

Søren Rud Ottesen as ICCF National Delegate for Denmark

Kim Ronnow Jensen as Member of the Danish Delegation

England

Andrew Dearnley as ICCF National Delegate for England

Richard V. M. Hall as Delegate Designee for England and Chair of the Arbitration

Committee

Finland

Jussi Salminen as Delegate Designee for Finland

Heikki Arppi as Member of the Finnish Delegation

Ms. Maija Pesonen as Accompanying Person

Olavi Riikonen as Member of the Finnish Delegation

Anneli Riikonen as Accompanying Person

Seija Nuutilainen as Accompanying Person

France

Eric Ruch as ICCF National Delegate for France and ICCF President

Frank Geider as ICCF World Tournament Director

Germany

Stephan Busemann as ICCF National Delegate for Germany; with proxy for Austria
Uwe Staroske as ICCF Qualifications Commissioner
Jörg Kracht as ICCF Non-Title Tournament Commissioner
Matthias Kribben as Member of the German Delegation
Monika Rüter-Busemann as Accompanying Person
Frau Cornelia Bartelt as Accompanying Person
Ricarda Soehndel as Accompanying Person
Robert Bauer
Rejane Aparecida Santi as Accompanying Person
Leonardo Santos Jacyntho as Accompanying Person
Matjaž Pirš
Georg Windhausen
Simone Dilge as Accompanying Person

Indonesia

Yosua Sitorus as ICCF National Delegate for Indonesia
Verawaty Barimbing as Accompanying Person

Italy

Luz Marina Tinjacá Ramirez as Delegate Designee for Italy
Patrizia Limoli as Member of the Italian Delegation
Gianni Mastrojeni as Honorary Member
Elena Temnianu as Accompanying Person

Latvia

Artis Gaujens as ICCF National Delegate for Latvia
Maigonis Avotīns
Anita Avotina as Accompanying Person
Guntis Gerhards
Liene Gerharde as Accompanying Person

Lithuania

Virginijus Grabliauskas as ICCF National Delegate for Lithuania
Ruslanas Prigodinas as Member of the Lithuanian Delegation
Marijonas Ročius as Member of the Lithuanian Delegation
Dmitrijus Chocenska
Alfonsas Kupšys
Kestutis Mužas
Alfredas Samerdokas

Netherlands

Wim H. van Vugt as Delegate Designee for Netherlands
Roelofje Wilms as Accompanying Person
Jan M. Vosselman as ICCF Finance Director

Poland

Mariusz Wojnar as ICCF National Delegate for Poland; with proxy for Hungary
Marzena Wojnar as Accompanying Person
Ewa Wojnar as Accompanying Person

Romania

Sebastian Andreica-Navruc as ICCF National Delegate for Romania
Roxana Andreica-Navruc as Accompanying Person

Russia

Andrey Nikolaevich Pavlikov as ICCF National Delegate for Russia and Europa Zone
Director
Sergey Yakovlevich Grodzensky as Honorary Member; with proxy for Belarus
Grodzenskaya Natalia Borisovna as Accompanying Person
Sergey Konstantinovich Matyukhin
Nikolay Nikolaevich Poleshchuk
Vilga Saveleva as Accompanying Person

Slovakia

Ján Helbich as Delegate Designee for Slovakia
Tatiana Helbichová as Accompanying Person

Slovenia

Marjan Šemrl as ICCF National Delegate for Slovenia and World Correspondence
Chess Champion XXIV

South Africa

Everdinand Knol as ICCF National Delegate for South Africa and Africa and Asia Zone
Director
Hannie Knol as Accompanying Person

Sweden

Per Söderberg as ICCF National Delegate for Sweden and Honorary Member; with
proxy for Portugal

Switzerland

Ulrich Baumgartner as ICCF National Delegate for Switzerland

U.S.A.

Dennis M. Doren as Delegate Designee for U.S.A. and ICCF Rules Commissioner; with
proxy for Cuba and Israel
Patricia Van Dyke as Accompanying Person

Ukraine

Iurii Koshmak as Delegate Designee for Ukraine
Kosolapov Vadim as Accompanying Person
Demianiuk Andrii as Accompanying Person
Koshmak Nina as Accompanying Person

Wales

Russell Sherwood as ICCF National Delegate for Wales and ICCF Marketing Director
Helen Sherwood as Accompanying Person
Alexander Sherwood as Accompanying Person
Ellie Sherwood as Accompanying Person
Austin Lockwood as ICCF Services Director and ICCF Webmaster

Chess Match ICCF vs VILNIUS (20/08/2019)

ICCF – VILNIUS match 20-08-2019

No	White	Res.	Black
1	Buchníček Petr CZE	0:1	Chocenska Dmitrijus
2	Bauer Robert GER	0:1	Bučinskas Valdas
3	Helbich Ján SVK	0:1	Novikov Vitalij
4	Busemann Stephan GER	0:1	Mickevičius Juras
5	Koshmak Yuriy UKR	0:1	Limontas Martynas
6	Salminen Jussi FIN	½:½	Sevrukas Gediminas
7	Heikki Arppi FIN	0:1	Prigodin Ruslanas
8	Riikonen Olavi FIN	0:1	Paulauskas Andrius
9	Ottesen Soren Rud DEN	0:1	Ketlerius Arijus
10	Gray Garvin AUS	0:1	Petkevičiūtė Justina
11	Poleshchuk Nikolai RUS	0:1	Dičiūnas Valdas
12	Demianiuk Andrii UKR	1:0	Minelga Dainius
13	Mastrojeni Gianni ITA	0:1	Kupšys Alfonsas
14	Wojnar Mariusz POL	1:0	Gaujens Artis
	Total ICCF	2½ : 11½	Total Vilnius

BLITZ Match ICCF (21/08/2019)**BLITZ ICCF Vilnius 2019****Final Ranking after 9 Rounds**

Rk.	SNo	Name	sex	FED	RtgI	Club/City	Pts.	TB1	TB2	TB3	K	rtg+/-
1	5	FM Buchniecek Petr		CZE	2236	ICCF	6,5	46,5	50,5	34,25	20	-7,6
2	9	Vosselman Jan		NED	2080	ICCF	6,5	45,0	48,5	33,50	20	45,0
3	12	Paulauskas Andrius		LTU	2006	Vilnius	6,5	45,0	47,0	32,25	20	29,4
4	3	Novikov Vitalij		LTU	2293	Vilnius	6,5	44,5	48,5	32,75	20	-7,2
5	2	IM Grabliauskas Virginijus		LTU	2325	Vilnius	6,5	42,0	45,0	31,00	20	-19,4
6	6	CM Soderberg Per		SWE	2187	ICCF	6,0	39,0	42,0	26,50	20	-23,4
7	19	Diciunas Valdas		LTU	1715	Vilnius	5,5	41,5	44,0	24,00	20	58,4
8	7	Semrl Marjan		SLO	2111	ICCF	5,5	41,5	44,0	23,75	20	-0,2
9	8	Busemman Stephan		GER	2087	ICCF	5,5	30,0	32,0	18,50	0	0,0
10	13	Ketlerius Arijus		LTU	1994		5,0	45,5	45,5	21,00	20	18,4
11	16	Prigodin Ruslan		LTU	1923	Vilnius	5,0	44,5	48,0	23,25	20	11,8
12	15	Arppi Heikki		FIN	1929	ICCF	5,0	42,5	46,5	25,50	20	20,6
13	24	Demianiuk Andrii		UKR	0	ICCF	5,0	41,0	44,0	20,00		
14	4	FM Chocenska Dmitrijus		LTU	2250	Vilnius	5,0	37,5	40,5	19,50	20	-58,2
15	25	Doren Dennis		USA	0	ICCF	5,0	32,0	34,5	17,75		
16	11	Kribben Matthias Dr.		GER	2010	ICCF	4,5	38,0	41,5	18,50	20	-8,6
17	30	Bucys Andrius		LTU	0	Vilnius	4,0	42,0	45,5	17,25		
18	22	Vainermanas Berelis		LTU	1520		4,0	40,0	42,0	16,00	20	22,0
19	10	Bauer Robert		GER	2068	ICCF	4,0	38,0	40,5	13,50	20	-18,0
20	18	Sevrukas Gediminas		LTU	1813	Vilnius	4,0	37,0	37,0	12,50	20	18,0
21	17	Koshmak Yuriy		UKR	1913	ICCF	4,0	36,5	38,5	13,00	20	10,8
22	14	Salminen Jussi		FIN	1955	ICCF	4,0	36,0	36,0	11,50	20	0,4
23	1	FM Pavlikov Andrei Nikolaevich		RUS	2348	ICCF	4,0	34,0	36,5	16,25	20	-62,2
24	29	Van Vugt Wim		NED	0	ICCF	3,5	34,0	34,0	8,50		
25	23	Matyukhin Sergey		RUS	1372	ICCF	3,5	32,0	32,0	6,50	20	16,8
26	20	Kraujunas Vladas		LTU	1685	Vilnius	3,0	38,0	38,0	9,00	20	14,6
27	28	Riikonen Olavi		FIN	0	ICCF	3,0	35,0	35,0	9,00		
28	21	Ottesen Soren Rud		DEN	1615	ICCF	2,5	35,0	35,0	4,00	20	-19,6
29	26	Gray Garvin		AUS	0	ICCF	2,0	32,5	32,5	3,00		
30	27	Limoli Patrizia		ITA	0	ICCF	0,0	28,5	30,5	0,00		

New title holders (GM, SIM, IM, LGM, LIM, IA)

GER	GM	Windhausen, Georg
LTU	GM	Novikovas, Vitalijus
RUS	GM	Kochemasov, Andrey Leonidovich
AUS	SIM	Dunlop, Gordon
BLR	SIM	Malashenkov, Alexei
ENG	SIM	Rallabandi, Praveen Kumar
ESP	SIM	Tarrío Ocaña, Francisco Javier
GER	SIM	Schäfer, Uwe
GER	SIM	Even, Roland
ITA	SIM	Delizia, Costantino
LTU	SIM	Minelga, Dainius
RUS	SIM	Pavlikov, Andrey Nikolaevich
RUS	SIM	Mikhalchuk, Vitaliy Borisovich
SCO	SIM	Mackintosh, Iain
SLO	SIM	Jemec, Viktor
SWE	SIM	Hagberg, Jan
UKR	SIM	Felytin, Leonid
USA	SIM	Kulick, Neil
WLS	SIM	Yeo, Gareth
AUT	IM	Moza, Manfred
BEL	IM	Van Habberney, Guy
BLR	IM	Rynkevich, Sergey Anatolievich
BLR	IM	Shetko, Leonid Vladimirovich
BLR	IM	Osipov, Anatoly Vladimirovich
CAN	IM	Czerniawski, Andrew
CRO	IM	Dorić, Nenad
CRO	IM	Piacun, Eduard
CUB	IM	de la Rosa Solórzano, José Guillermo
CUB	IM	Rodríguez Fraga, Yoandy
CZE	IM	Hrubčík, Martin
CZE	IM	Binas, Jindřich (*1954)
DEN	IM	Konstantinov, Maxim
ENG	IM	Wharrier, Jo A.
ENG	IM	Thompson, Brian
ENG	IM	Cade, Steven
ESP	IM	Martín Martín, Oscar
FIN	IM	Purga, Oleg
FRA	IM	Ress, Jacques
FRA	IM	Fonteneau, Brice
GER	IM	Keskowski, Thilo
GER	IM	Glatzel, Hans-Joachim

GER	IM	Scheiba, Manfred
GER	IM	Hesse, Olaf
GER	IM	Zejewski, Paul
GER	IM	Schmitz, André
GER	IM	Philipps, Ralf
GER	IM	Meißen, Frank
GER	IM	Tiemann, Christoph
GER	IM	Boos, Markus
GER	IM	Gähler, Sebastian
GER	IM	Rach, Jens
GER	IM	Bär, Lutz
INA	IM	Sitorus, Yosua
ISR	IM	Elyoseph, Harel
ITA	IM	Tinjacá Ramirez, Luz Marina
ITA	IM	De Filippis, Francesco
ITA	IM	Bonfissuto, Giulio
ITA	IM	Mosconi, Tiziano
ITA	IM	Emanuelli Simoncini, Renato
LAT	IM	Limanskis, Nikolajs
LTU	IM	Voveris, Gediminas
LUX	IM	Schuller, Jean-Claude
NZL	IM	Johnston, Allan
PAN	IM	Rösch M., Hermann V.
ROU	IM	Taras, Iulian
ROU	IM	Becsenescu, Florin
RSA	IM	Fourie, M. J.
RUS	IM	Pavlikov, Andrey Nikolaevich
RUS	IM	Pavlikov, Andrey Nikolaevich
RUS	IM	Toropov, Maksim Olegovich
RUS	IM	Efimov, Yury Vasilievich
RUS	IM	Degtyarev, Anatoly Aleksandrovich
RUS	IM	Talnis, Aleksey Romanovich
RUS	IM	Parshin, Vitaly Alekseevich
RUS	IM	Malin, Denis Sergeevich
RUS	IM	Kornev, Aleksey Nikolaevich
RUS	IM	Ilyin, Pavel Egorovich
SLO	IM	Coklin, Marko
SLO	IM	Praznik, Niko
SLO	IM	Malnar, Aleš
SUI	IM	Salzmann, Stefan
SUI	IM	Schmid, Pablo
SVK	IM	Berza, Štefan
SVK	IM	Jakubčín, Miloš
SWE	IM	Larsson, Mats
TUR	IM	Ankay, Askin

UKR	IM	Anokhin, Yury
USA	IM	Faridani, Adel
USA	IM	Woodard, Daniel S.
USA	IM	Parsons, Larry
USA	IM	Meiners, Edwin
USA	IM	Biedermann, Kyle
USA	IM	Koo, Oliver
USA	IM	Adams, John Dain
USA	IM	Shuler, James
USA	IM	Stein, Kurt W.
USA	IM	Kulick, Neil
WLS	IM	Lockwood, Austin
WLS	IM	Yeo, Gareth
POL	LGM	Jamka-Pietroń, Barbara
POR	LGM	Gil, Maria do Carmo de Vasconcelos
UKR	LGM	Voronina, Tatyana
UKR	LGM	Tkachenko, Yuliya
AUS	LIM	Lane, Nancy
BLR	LIM	Kozenko, Tatyana Sergeevna
CZE	LIM	Dočekalová, Alexandra
GER	LIM	Keyserlingk, Chanda von
GER	LIM	Lombeck, Greta
RUS	LIM	Kolesnikova, Kseniya Konstantinovna
UKR	LIM	Tkachenko, Yuliya
BRA	IA	Neves, Bianor de Oliveira
LTU	IA	Grabliauskas, Virginijus
NED	IA	Doorn, Jos P. M. van
RUS	IA	Panitevsky, Ivan Anatolevich
UKR	IA	Yeremenko, Andrei
USA	IA	Relyea, Alexander
WLS	IA	Lockwood, Austin

Elections for EB and Auditor positions for the period 1/1/2020 to 31/12/2023

Secret ballots distributed and used, Sergei Grodzensky (RUS) and Gianni Mastrojeni (ITA) served as scrutineers (prior email voting checked by Michael Millstone and Richard Hall) -

The following votes were cast in the EB and Auditor election:

President: Eric Ruch 40 votes (elected)
General Secretary: Michael Millstone 40 votes (elected)
Finance Director: Jan Vosselman 43 votes (elected)
Marketing Director: Russell Sherwood 40 votes (elected)
Services Director: Austin Lockwood 44 votes (elected)

World Tournament Director

Jason Bokar: 22 votes
Frank Geider: 23 votes
Everdinand Knol: 1 vote (withdrawn)
Olli Ylönen: 1 vote

No candidate attracted more than 50% of the votes cast, therefore the second round of voting was conducted according to the voting regulations.
Everdinand Knol withdrew from round 2 of the election.

World Tournament Director (second round)

Jason Bokar: 18 votes
Frank Geider: 28 votes (elected)
Olli Ylönen: 0 vote

Auditor

Ferdinand Burmeister: 12 votes
Paul Scott 23 votes (elected)

Financial matters:

Jan Vosselman presented from tables of income and balance sheets

- last year, ICCF's income increased by 14,000 Euros compared to previous year (mainly from invitational tournaments of categories 4 - 13); total assets remained within 1000 Euros of the total from the previous year
- comment: Veterans Cup brings a substantial portion of income and needs to be continued; noted that Master Norm events also substantially increased income compared to previous year

Question: any progress to players paying in some way besides PayPal?

Answer: credit card payments allowed for Turkey some years ago but got used only once.

Decision: credit card payments will be made available for all MF.

Services Matters

Services Director's report contains estimate of costs per proposal, no issues raised about any of these.

Qualification Matters

Qualification Commissioner (QC) report: about 700 titles awarded this year (see GM, SIM, IM, LGM, LIM and IA new title holders above in the minutes).

The main issue seen is that many norms earned due to ETLs by players who go ETL frequently. (Presentation by Rules Commissioner made about ETL data from last year: most of the frequent ETL players drop out of many games "all at once", as opposed to going ETL "one at a time" across events; Presented by QC: 1/3 of every GM norm helped by ETL).

The Executive Board has decided to combine the Rating Commissioner (RC) and Qualification Commissioner (QC) positions into one position (because the QC position is often involved with rating issues, and the work of the RC has decreased over the years). The Congress approved the merger. One objection made to the merger idea by the Polish Federation, as not good for the players. No other objection from Congress.

Marketing Matters

Marketing report highlights:

- a new newsletter containing our games; new award of ICCF voucher (where players use a code);
- now started using Facebook,
- we need to concentrate on serving the players rated in our lower half of the rating system (non-title-based achievements) and long-term view of our set of players (meaning concentrating more on younger players)

Question: any work in finding new nations (member federations)?

Answer: use promotional activities (e.g., getting to play top player; to player versus pure engine moves) - concentration instead on finding player "enthusiasts" rather than working directly towards new federations.

Each federation can also develop its own promotional banner (its own logo for its own events) - to give personalized feel to its events.

Zone Matters

Zone 1 report: (approximately 4000 active players; largest Zone); European Championship still very popular; 3 new tournaments started including under-2000 event (very popular); still very difficult to run postal tournament even with prize fund of 600 €, so such will not be supported again. There were no questions in response to the report.

World Zone report: no comments.

Zone 4 report: the first Zonal Championship recently finished (14 teams of 6 players each), included many isolated players; semi-finals of 19th Zonal Championship made it to a major category event (category 1) for first time.

Question: number of countries from which there are active isolated players?

Answer: many, number not known

Tournament Matters

World Tournament Director (WTD) Report:

Memorial Team Tournament is a big success. WTD has no questions about approving invitational events but there has been confusion about what constitutes an open event. Proposal 30 is the proposed resolution.

There are 8 events for which approval was requested of the WTD for which the WTD requested the okay of Congress (issue raised in response: how this may apply to Silli system events). There was a lot of discussion about the potential approval of those 8 events. Issue: last year we decided to reduce the number of ICCF opens per year to 1 - adding all of these 8 is contrary to the intention of last year's decision to have only one big open event per year (and this number, desired within a 6 month period, cannot be coordinated in the calendar easily).

Recommendation vote supported the WTD approving these 8 events.

Title Tournament Report

The main issue is planning to start 32nd WCCC Final in June 2020 instead of June 2021 because there are already almost 17 players who have qualified. (Some qualified players were not allowed to play this time around because of the limit to 17- player Final section); also, since the qualified teams already known, Olympiad Final to start January 2020.

Adjudication System Report

944 adjudications with 78 adjudicators this past year; 3-person panel procedures have been automated (out of necessity). Issue discussed of main problem being some players not submitting analysis with win claims and then being upset the adjudication is for a draw (Responses: remedies

are already in place. We can't help players who won't read the instructions on the adjudication claim screen.)

Non-title Tournament report:

Jörg Kracht (GER) new nominee by EB for Non-Title Tournament Commissioner, applauded by Congress.

Champions League: next season CL9 (2021) will serve as test tournament for Triple Block system.

No comment for the other tournament Office's reports.

Working Group

It has been decided to set up a working group about the increasing number of draws in modern CC. That workgroup will be formed after Congress.

Arbitration Committee

Arbitration Committee (AC) report: Richard Hall, Alan Borwell both retiring; Brian Jones had to resign for health reasons.

The EB has nominated chairman Ambar Chatterjee (IND) and the nomination was approved by the Congress.

The new members of the AC are HM Gerhard Binder (GER) and HM Per Söderberg (SWE).
Comment by Richard Hall: He considers ETLs (= "gift" of point) to be very serious due to proliferation of draws in modern game.

External Matters

There is a contractual issue with sponsor, to be resolved in next few months

Internal Matters

ICCF Platinum Jubilee tournaments

In 2021, the ICCF celebrates its 70th anniversary. EB will conduct several activities to celebrate this anniversary such as:

1. Special Jubilee tournaments (world champions, elite players, ICCF officials, including events for postal players and elite 960 players) – start date 2021, duration about 2-4 years.
2. Jubilee World Cups (regular and chess 960) carried out with the Silli system in 2 stages (preliminaries and final) over a 4-year period with special provisions for promotions [separate events from the regular ICCF activities] – start date 2021-02-15.

Special invitation is addressed to world champions, elite players and officials. Tournament announcements will be issued at the next congress.

For all these ICCF Jubilee tournaments Mariusz Wojnar, ICCF Delegate for Poland, was appointed as CTL (Central Tournament Leader).

The appropriate budget (including prize funds) will be allocated for the implementation of the above projects as a result of EB decision.

Proposal votes

Approval of 2018 Congress Minutes. Proposal 001

For: 45

Against: 2

Discussion about the (past) need for a signed copy of the minutes by the president; Response: Such signature not needed any more. Discussion about the list of proxies (in case there was an issue - to be determined and resolved prior to any proposal voting); the list was reviewed, as were the rules for who can vote. Recommendation made that the relevant rule always be listed in each proposal.

Hong Kong to be Dismissed from ICCF. Proposal 018

For: 45

Against: 2

No detailed discussion

Precedence of Conflicting Proposals. Proposal 026

For: 26

Against: 17

Numerous issues raised: what constitutes "conflict", who determines "conflict" (the EB has taken that role), a small degree of conflict (a small overlap) is being treated as the same as completely conflictual (a big overlap), - Proposal was approved, to be added to Voting Regulations document

2/3 Majority Required for Changes to Voting Regulations.

Proposal 042

For: 37

Against: 5

No discussion

Add Two Weeks of Discussion Time on Last Minute. Proposal 039

For: 40

Against: 4

Discussion: we need time to discuss proposals submitted toward the end of the time of proposal consideration (Procedurally, this extra time period is ready to be put onto server.) Does this need $\frac{2}{3}$ vote because proposal 42 was already passed? (Yes) - (Comment: we need to quantify the timing of deadlines) - we need to add a new phrase to the Voting Regulation so a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote is needed (became moot point, as this passed by over $\frac{2}{3}$ majority)

Approve Financial Reports and 5-year Financial Plan. Proposal 002

For: 42

Against: 0

Financial plan: (just 2-year plan, not 5-year plan); we think there will still be a lot of activity that will bring income, but are planning less than 2018 brought in, just as a conservative estimate.

2019 Tournament Fee Structure. Proposal 033

For: 41

Against: 3

Purpose of proposal was to simplify current fee structure (example: remove distinction between open and Invitational events), (also to take into consideration differentiation between national versus international team events). No change in income is expected as result of this proposal. Will apply to bills sent out in January 2020 for events running in 2019. This was an issue for some; response was that the billing will not change in any way except some events called national will be

billed as international - the change will just be a simplification. A direct comparison of current versus proposed fees was shown, with the only change being the discontinuation of distinction between open and invitational events

No Charge for National Postal Games. Proposal 020

For: 30

Against 15

Comment: the cost for the use of the server is essentially the same for postal and server games (due to ratings, storage, etc); this perspective was debated (example: any adjudication is done by national adjudicators) - counterargument being national postal events don't get the same service from the ICCF.

Promotion of School Events. Proposal 025

For: 39

Against 5

Question: would home-schooled people be included? Answer: if you identify as school event, then it is. What is school that is free of charge? Primary/elementary, secondary/high school? Proposed answer: school involves teachers and students, and/or could be certain age like maximum 18 - Question: is this proposal in conflict with the proposal ridding of age-determined events? Response: a "school event" can include teachers and students (meaning this is not in conflict with the age-related proposals). Comment: the purpose of this proposal is to try to attract mostly youth to increase their chess participation. Abuse of this free status, if found, can be addressed in the future.

Congress Expenses for Officials. Proposal 029

For: 42

Against 2

If important position needs to be filled, and the person needs to attend Congress, the person should have expenses covered.

Approve Services Committee Budget for 2020. Proposal 003

For: 41

Against 0

Requested budget for development is same as last year and many previous years; no big projects scheduled this year, so plan is to work on the long list of backlog items.

ICCF Medal and Certificate Awards. Proposal 005

For 45

Against 1

Comment: there used to be similar rules;

Question: who is taking responsibility to inform the TOs?

Answer: the NDs and/or the NTTC have this responsibility

Direct Norms for the GM – Title. Proposal 035

For: For 21

Against 23

Problem (discussion also made here related to proposal 038, so both discussions listed here): 1/3 of GM norms helped by ETL, additionally current rate of GM title is 2-3 per year compared to about 20 per year many years ago; issue: far many more draws, in past GM norms were earned in category 7+ events, but today one essentially needs to be in category 10+ event to earn GM norm; purpose of the GM norm proposals (035 & 038) are to give same reward for the same achievement; discussion: 035 reflects the old system used given GM norm per tournament result (e.g., a first place finish), a system we left behind in favour of the ELO rating system instead; criticism is that this proposal reverts back;

contrary view: the rating system has been negatively affected by the high volume of draws and does not work for determining GM performance anymore; clarification: 035 would change the likelihood for GM norms, but not change the requirements for getting the title (playing certain number of GMs, etc); % of draws currently for 2500+ rated players = 95%; issue raised by multiple people: we are not attacking the real problem which is the growing number of draws (and its effect in the rating system); idea of workgroup to address issues of growing number of draws and related ratings issues; we need to be careful what we do related to our "gold standard", and also realize that we are talking about something that affects only about 5% of our players; example of problem shown with final cross table of 29th WCCC Finals where only the winner achieved a GM norm (though this example used the old norm-determination system, not the current one). Argument in favour of 035: players may be more willing to take risks to try to win tournament to get a GM norm.

Adjustment of GM Norm Requirements. Proposal 038

For: 19

Against 23

See discussion for 035.

Provisional Rating Procedure. Proposal 014

For: 46

Against 0

Purpose is to avoid the possibility of a rating going down after winning (which has happened many times); no other comments.

Calculation for Fixed Ratings. Proposal 034

For: 26

Against 15

Purpose to minimize special procedure given that people are now able to play more games more quickly than in past; the threshold of 80 games instead of current 50 games would affect only 3 players versus current 17 players (per rating period); comment: we made the reverse change just in 2015 (from 80 to 50) so going back so quickly is not right; there has been a way to "game" the rating system by playing 51+ games, so changing the threshold to 80 will lower that potential.

Merger of Zone 4 into World Zone. Proposal 037

For: 19

Against 23

Explanation given by AUS ND about why AUS ended up in WZ; AUS ND is against forcing any MF into different Zone. Argument made that this proposal would interfere with internal affairs of MF contrary to ICCF policy; issue: Zone has not progressed in size and is expected to decrease next year (Cape Verde has not paid fees and gone uncommunicative.) - should the other zones still be required to subsidize this Zone?; issues raised: the countries in Zone 4 prefer to stay in Zone 4; Issue raised by Rules Commissioner: there is a conflict with proposal 040, despite not being marked as such, meaning the new rule concerning resolving conflict will apply if both are approved [not approved, so issue became moot].

Eliminate the ICCF Zonal System. Proposal 040

For: 14

Against 27

Decision differs from 037 in that this would apply to everybody; there was attempt to withdraw proposal but not allowed because online voting already completed - issue of withdrawal possibility argued (counterargument that voting has already begun, and a single ND does not have the right to stop the voting); concerning proposal: better we just have one ICCF versus split world into two zones,

better financially and make everything easier; comment: this proposal raises valid question for the ICCF, why wait until next year?

Clarifying the Difference Between Invitational and Open Events. Proposal 030

For: 42

Against 2

Issue about application to Silli system events (discussion on this issue postponed).

[CONFLICT] Eliminate Age and Gender Specific Events. Proposal 010

For: 9

Against 35

Clarification made about application of previous decision on how conflicts with 022 and 029 are resolved; discussion on all three proposals at once; there is data retention issue, but also another potential legal issue that any discrimination must relate to a “significant disadvantage in the wider pool” and we cannot demonstrate this disadvantage of veterans or women (versus treating everyone the same) - contrary view: this interpretation is too strict and not accurate; other argument is that the veteran player often has cognitive deficits compared to general player.

[CONFLICT] Eliminate Gender Specific Events. Proposal 022

For: 28

Against 18

Question: do existing ladies titles go away? No. Comment: posting the LIM and LGM titles identifies them as female. (We can get their approval or have them convert to CCE and CCM titles).

[CONFLICT] Eliminate the ICCF Ladies Olympiad and Ladies World Championship. Proposal 028

For: 18

Against 25

Consultation in Team Play – Proposal 027

For: 29

Against: 14

A recent e-mail by Rule Commissioner Dennis Doren addressed to all NDs forbade consultation about ongoing games in team events. This proposal argues that the contrary should hold and that rules should be changed to be clear on that. Proposal, “Extend Rule 2.15 (5) by: “Consultation between players of a team including the team captain about positions in active games in their team event is acceptable behaviour.”

In recent communication was the first time this rule was in writing, communication from others does not mean the player fails to decide his own moves, getting information from a teammate is no different from getting input from books, etc.; counterproductive to make rules for things we cannot enforce/control; if we allow in teams, do we keep it forbidden in individual events? Team situation is different in its nature (more than sum of its members) - other sports more straightforward (archery); purpose: adheres to concept of team (includes team captain); forming team does not mean team members cooperate/ communicate; concerns: lower rated players asking higher rated players for advice (increases their rating), if team play were unrated then would take different position; other information (books) is passive and available to everyone; in tennis there are different rating systems for individual and team events, but in chess the consultation changes the actual skill of play. One federation response, “Given the engine level of play as the baseline, it would cost the advising player a lot of time to intervene, discuss and convince effectively. A player can thus not rely on such help. Besides, playing someone else's games remains forbidden.”

Implement the Silli system in Large ICCF Tournaments. Proposal 036

For: 28

Against 8

There needs to be some server improvements and rule development if this proposal is approved before it can be implemented; comment: this system used to exist such that its implementation involves only technical issues; there is no issue using this system with title norms (agreed); (some brief description of the Silli system - advantage is you can run a very large tournament in fewer sections than the current system) question; would players' fee structure and prize funds remain the same? Issue needs to be determined; question: only to be used in preliminary sections? Not necessarily

"Reserve Players" in WCCC Stages. Proposal 032

For: 38

Against 4

Issue: Won't this potentially increase the number of candidate sections, and therefore the number of finalists? - Response: not true. The recent problem was just that too many qualified players wanted to play right now, contrary to usual pattern

Clarifying ICCF Rules by Eliminating the Word "Should" – A. Proposal 008-A

For: 42

Against: 1

Purpose is to diminish degree of ambiguity in the ICCF Rules. Got a very large degree of consistency in ND responses to survey and made that into proposals A and B.

Clarifying ICCF Rules by Eliminating the Word "Should" – B. Proposal 008-B

For: 42

Against 1

Defining When to Apply the at Least 50% ETL Rule. Proposal 004

For: 41

Against 4

Purpose: threshold of number of games needed; comments made about how there have regularly been difficulty having TDs become aware when players reach this threshold - that being why the proposal includes an automated process to send the required "TD inquiry" to the offending player and a notification to the TD of having done so, this as means to ensure the 50% rule gets enforced in timely way.

Limiting When Recorded Game Results can be Overturned – A. Proposal 016-A

For: 39

Against 3

Purpose to limit disruption to tournaments and unfairness to opponents.

Limiting When Recorded Game Results Can Be Overturned – B. Proposal 016-B

For: (Option A) 21

Against (Option B) 20

Rules commission could not decide between two options, so both given to Congress to decide. Pros and cons to both options, as described in proposal

Clarification of Request for Accepted Withdrawal. Proposal 021

For: 19

Against 23

Purpose is to make life easier for the TDs, belief being that the player's ND is always closer to the player than is the TD, and that a player "would not dare" to claim serious illness if the player had to tell ND (from same country); as concerns the counterargument that NDs cannot have access to player's medical record, the ND only needs to make statement to the TD that the ND believes the player's claim; question: if this proposal approved, what would happen if the ND does nothing (does not confirm) - what is the TD to do? Does TD follow the ND advice, or does TD have right to grant withdrawal anyway? Proposal says the ND "must" confirm before the request goes to the TD, which seems to indicate that the TD would not have authority to grant accepted withdrawal; problem the proposal trying to address is that the reasons for accepted withdrawal can be very difficult to confirm by TD; response: the current investigation process already "asks" the ND for input, but the proposal says the ND must confirm the reason for withdrawal before the TD can do anything,

Clarifying a Requirement for an Adjudicated Win. Proposal 024

For 36

Against 7

Purpose to help address the most common complaint by player's related to adjudications, by specifying details of what is required for both players and adjudicators. Plan is to make this information available on adjudication claim screen for players.

Additional Analysis Submission for the 3-person Panel Review. Proposal 006

For: 42

Against 2

Proposal is due to Appeal Committee suggestion when applying the concept that the 3-person panel represents the appeal level review for the withdrawn player's adjudication; contrary view: a player already adjudicated with a win is not likely to feel any need to send further analysis, coupled with potential delay up to 14 days for this step to be completed.

Defining "Repeated Misbehaviour". Proposal 007

For: 41

Against 2

Purpose of proposal is to clarify the interpretation of the concept of recurrent misbehaviour in the disciplinary rules to include the enactment of any types of misbehaviour and not just repeating the same type of misbehaviour.

Argument: Recent communication was the first time this rule was in writing, communication from others does not mean the player fails to decide his own moves, getting information from a teammate is no different from getting input from books, etc.; counterproductive to make rules for things we cannot enforce/control; Question: if we allow in teams, do we keep it forbidden in individual events? Response: Team situation is different in its nature (more than sum of its members) - other sports more straightforward (archery); purpose: adheres to concept of team (includes team captain); Counterargument: forming team does not mean team members cooperate/ communicate; concerns: lower rated players asking higher rated players for advice (increases their rating), if team play were unrated then would take different position; other information (books) is passive and available to everyone; in tennis there are different rating systems for individual and team events, but in chess the consultation changes the actual skill of play.

Players Should be Free to Decide if They Want to Use Linear Conditional Moves. Proposal 041

For: 29

Against 15

Issue: the player receiving the opponent's immediate responses may not wish to have the move without intervening time.

Rules for Multiple Member Federation Participation Events. Proposal 012

For: 38

Against: 5

No comments except clarification that an internal event can include players of the same flag and players living in the same country as the MF irrelevant of their flag. It was noted that **all events** organised by MFs involving players from other federations require WTD approval.

[CONFLICT] Allowing Claims Based on the 7-Piece Endgame Tablebase. Proposal 019

For: 43

Against: 3

See Proposal 023

[CONFLICT] Change the 50 Moves Rule to 100 moves and Accept Claims up to 100 Moves. Proposal 023

For: 10

Against: 34

There are positions that require hundreds of moves that don't look like wins; the tablebase changes the rules in the middle of the game (by eliminating the 50-move rule); much discussion about the technical issues, cost, etc.; contrary views expressed

Comment added by Per Söderberg (SWE):

The aim of the proposal was that the rules shall be consistent and valid during the whole game. It is noted that the present 50-moves draw rule makes a mate position in 52 moves, with 8-pieces on the board and no capture or pawn move occurs, will then be a draw by the present rules, while a table base mate in many more moves, i.e., 546 moves, will be awarded as a win.

ICCF Disciplinary Review Process. Proposal 013

For: 41

Against: 2

Only comment was support by the WTD and the Arbitration Committee Chair

Clarifying the "Regulations" of the ICCF Appeal Committee. Proposal 015

For: 44

Against: 0

Purpose is just to update a document not updated since 2005.

Applying Appeal Committee Regulations to the Arbitration Committee. Proposal 017

For: 44

Against: 0

Proposal has approval of Arbitration Committee Chair (who indicated a larger set of principles would be better). This more conservative set proposed for now.

Sensitive Personal Information. Proposal 009

For: 44

Against: 1

Based on European GDPR, "special category" information needs to be handled very carefully, a lot of risk storing it - the ICCF keeps health information "forever" - purpose to follow GDPR.

Improve ICCF Congress Minutes. Proposal 031

For: 27

Against: 13

Proposal takes away the review of the minutes by the NDs that currently exists, the time frames seem inappropriate to impose on the single individual who is General Secretary, the wording of “must” without any consequence has no meaning.

ICCF Congress in 2020. Proposal 011

For: 47

Against 0

Presentation made; no issues raised.

The next ICCF Congress will be held in Glasgow from August 16th to August 20th.

Russia has expressed an interest to organize the ICCF Congress in 2022.

Thanks to Dennis Doren and Austin Lockwood for their help in producing these minutes.