

Arbiting Matters Too



Newsletter of the Chess Arbiters Association

May 2016 Issue 15

Editorial: An unfortunate act by a blind Norwegian player may have repercussions on many disabled players. This player was using a Bluetooth earpiece as a receiver under the guise of it being a normal headphone so that he could play back the moves he had made on his voice recorded 'scoresheet'. In reality it would seem that he was using it to get future rather than past moves. Arbiters will now be paying closer attention to the equipment used by visually impaired players. Opponents are also more likely to query if the equipment is legitimate or not. The arbiters at the TV2 International have received criticism for not investigating properly complaints made. Closer scrutiny could have meant catching the player red handed. Details are given on page 3.

I hope to have further news of British appointments to foreign events in the next issue.

Some very good news to follow that. There were fears that the actions of former ECF officials might still have been hampering the chances of English Arbiters being invited to officiate at the Olympiad in Baku on the Caspian Sea. Fortunately these fears seem to have been groundless. David Welch and Alex Holowczek were accepted as the ECF nominations for the event. Congratulations to them both. Others were not so lucky and AMToo sympathises with them.

A reminder that changes to the Laws will be discussed in Baku. All arbiters (and others) are able to propose changes to take effect from July 2017. Suggestions must be sent to FIDE by 17 June. Full details on the Rules Commission area of the FIDE website.

Nakamura Makes Headlines Again

Having attracted criticism for castling using both hands Hikaru Nakamura again was involved in a controversial incident in Round 6 of the Candidates Matches. Against Levon Aronian he touched his king on move 74 as shown in the picture below.



It is claimed that Nakamura said “j’adoube” after clearly touching the king. What is clear is that Aronian was unhappy about the possibility of him making a move with another piece and the Arbiter, Werner Stubenvoll, stepped in to confirm the king had to be moved. Nakamura had his right hand hovering over the king briefly before grasping it for some seconds and then releasing it as can be seen in videos. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WeyXKTVYenA>) On moving his king the game was quickly lost from what was probably a drawn position.

Some have commented that Aronian may have over-reacted. But bearing in mind that an appeal over the castling incident was rejected because the opponent didn’t complain at the time Aronian’s reactions are justifiable.

I'm no Aronian!

10 days before the Aronian-Nakamura incident I too had problems with an opponent. In my case it was a league match with no arbiter present. My opponent lifted his knight, held it over its destination square and realised this move almost immediately lost. He returned his knight to its square and thought a bit more. I wrote N on my scoresheet. My opponent then decided to move his king. I complained to him. The players on the adjacent board had seen nothing. We went outside with the opposing captain (my captain was still playing). My opponent denied even touching the knight stating that he had put his hands over the knight but not close enough for it to be even considered as touched. The opposing captain explained that I was an experienced arbiter and effectively how making a false claim like this would damage my reputation. He still maintained that he had not touched it. The captain then asked me what should happen. I stated that it was his word against mine and without witnesses the game just continued with him making the alternative move.

On returning to the board my opponent decided that he should move his knight. He was convinced the game was drawn even then and told me so. That was not the end of matters. He had stopped recording approaching the first time control which he safely made. His captain asked him to get his scoresheet up to date. I decided not to press that point as he was almost down to 5 minutes.

Before the incident I had decided that I would have a quiet word with my opponent after the game pointing out that he had frequently adjusted his pieces on my time and that opponents could rightly be annoyed by this. I chickened out of doing that!

I did win the game as his alternative knight move still gave me an advantage, though I think I was winning anyway. But Aronian said the same thing!

CHEATING AGAIN

A blind Norwegian player, 50 year old Stein Tholo Bjornsen, has been banned by the Norwegian Chess Federation (NSF) for 2 years following an investigation into his tremendous surge in form which saw him win 66 tournament games without loss.

“On the basis of the facts presented, the Central Board of the Norwegian Chess Federation views that it is beyond reasonable doubt that there has been a violation of FIDE’s Laws of Chess, paragraphs 11.3a and 11.3b, whereby Bjørnsen, by using a Bluetooth earphone, has received information either from a chess analysis program or by external assistance, and that this has taken place at least during the National Championship in 2015 and the TV2 Chess International 2015/2016.”

The result of the investigation has also been notified to FIDE. In Norway all his

games have been altered to losses. At the time of writing wins still appear on the FIDE site.

His rise was spectacular. Prior to his upturn he had finished with 50% in the bottom section of the blind championship. In July 2015 he won the Class 2 section (U1900) of the Norwegian Championship with a score of 8/9 (7 wins). He was unrated at the time. He then won 5 games (with 2 forfeits) at the Baltic Sea Braille Cup in Germany. There do not appear to be games available from that event. He then won Hans Olav Lahlum's festive event. The final tournament was the TV2 International held over the New Year period.



During these events he was clearly wearing an earpiece. Blind players now commonly record their games on tape. The earpiece was allegedly to allow him to replay the game if necessary in the same way as a sighted player could refer to his scoresheet.



He initially denied that the earpiece was a Bluetooth device but that was quickly disputed with pictures of him being shown wearing the Jaybird device.

Bjornsen admits to being poor at doing analysis but claims he is able to memorise lines of analysis spending up to 10 hours a day doing so.

The NSF ordered him to undertake a test. He initially agreed but then refused as he had not trained for a month and insisted that such tests should be during play. "I won't accept any chess theory in the test. What I'm good at is moving pieces."

The NSF has published three reasons behind the Bjørnsen ban: Photos that show with high probability that Bluetooth earphones have been used, games that demonstrate the use of a computer and the rejected offer to undergo testing.

18 games were analyzed by Professor Kenneth Regan, the man who has developed special anti-cheating software for FIDE. Regan operates with three levels associated with correspondence with computer moves: if the coefficient is under 2.75 the play

is human and there is no cheating; from 2.75 to 4.75 there is a high probability of cheating; over 4.75 is regarded as definite cheating. In the Regan tests the games produced a result of probably over 5. The FIDE/Regan report expresses regret that the games played in Germany were not included in the analysis.

NSF President Bjørn Salvesen admitted to a time consuming process, and made the following statement.

“They wanted more material than we had prepared. They would not accept this, but they have to accept that the NSF has taken the time it has. We have been extremely careful not to go wrong, this is virgin territory since there are no FIDE rulings to refer to. We are treading new ground so it was important for us to use the time needed and we have gathered everything in a report, which was ready a week in advance.

For me, Stein Bjørnsen has been a member of the NSF who has been innocent until the verdict last Saturday. This is also how we have treated him. We have had telephone conversations, he received the FIDE report as soon as it was finished. He got the FIDE report immediately.

The lawyer came into this later. He got a chance to respond. We have received a lot of information. The report was ready a week before the Central Board meeting on Saturday and was sent to Bjørnsen and his lawyer. The elements in the verdict are the FIDE report, the use of illegal equipment and that he has not cooperated in taking a test.

The claim that he got the information just a week before is taking things to extremes, because the main factors have been know the entire time – the report itself, the final edits and adjustments were sent a week before.

Considering that this is new ground it has gone quite well. If we get another such case it will go faster since we now have a precedent. But this is a very special case with many delicate aspects. We took the time we needed”.

The NSF president explained that there was a test ready for Bjørnsen and he originally agreed to it, but he reversed his position.

This can be seen as a test case. A major concern of this is that innocent visually impaired players will now be under more suspicion. It will be interesting to see if the Laws or instructions regarding visually impaired players are tightened.

‘COURT’ CASE AGAINST ARBITERS

What is described as a court case was held in South Africa in which the claimant, amongst other things, wanted disciplinary action taken against the arbiters and the local organising committee. The court in question, called a Grievance Committee would appear to fulfil the same duties as that of the Standards Committee for Chess Scotland. The ECF has attempted to have a similar body.

The case was lodged by Tshwane Chess and related to the 2014 South African Junior Chess Championships which were actually held in January 2015.

There were four incidents which lead to the court case. In the U16 team event the Manager of one team was discovered to have a mobile phone in his possession. As a result of this the score of that match was altered from a potential 6-4 win for the Manager's team to a 10-0 loss. This resulted in Tshwane being 'relegated' to second place as they were then 2½ points behind the winning team.

In the Under 10 section with Tshwane winning 6-4 their manager took out his phone to photograph the last game's 'notation'. This resulted in the result being changed to 0-10. This was unsuccessfully appealed to both the Committee and to the national body. The recorded result moved the team down from 2nd place into 4th and out of the medals.

In the U12 Section the Manager returned to the playing hall having left to make a phone call. He returned with his phone still on—it rang. Again the team was awarded a 0-10 score. The claim here is that all the games were finished 6-4 in favour of Tshwane and that the change of result moved the team from 1st place to 4th.

In the U14 Section a clerical error meant that Tshwane were announced in 4th place instead of 3rd. This had been accepted but at the time the court action was taken the proper medals had not been received.

In the case of coaches and managers, the penalty published for having a phone was "banning from entering the hall again for the duration of the tournament". This penalty will immediately be applied for a first offence.

During a meeting referred to as the Technical Meeting, held the night before the start of the tournament, the penalty regarding the rule was amended. The new penalty stated that a team will be penalised with the full 10 points, which will be awarded to the opposing team, in the case of a team manager or a team coach being found in contravention of the rule that no electronic devices may be brought into the hall. This rule was amended verbally, but never published in writing.

The Court's decision makes interesting reading. Taking everything into consideration it determined that it is not the intention of FIDE, nor is it ideal, that players be penalised for conduct of non-players. It could not rule however, that such a penalty imposed by a Chief Arbiter (CA) and Chief Organiser/Local Organising Committee (LOC) is in direct conflict with FIDE rules. In this case it determined that the amended penalty, although harsh and not ideal, is not in conflict with FIDE Rules and is therefore valid.

The last question it had to answer is whether the CA and LOC acted against the Spirit of Chess, given the harshness of the penalty, the effect it had on the children play-

ing who were affected and the way the penalty was enforced. From the outset the Grievance Committee made it clear that it did not agree with the amended rule and penalty. It found it harsh to the extreme to penalise players and teams in such a way, given that there are other options available such as banishment or a fine. In these matters they were of the opinion that a ban as published originally, with a fine for the Region, would have been the best penalty.

It was also of the opinion that the rule, as amended, opens the door for team managers and coaches to actively seek out opportunities to “catch their competition out” in order to elevate their own points on the standings table. The rule, as amended, did not enhance the Spirit of Chess. They were sympathetic to the young players affected in the final team standings. The CA and LOC were criticised for amending the rule as such, in the light of a previous incident during the 2013 SAJCC in Durban where a ruling was made that this type of sanction should not be imposed.

This all being said, it is clear that it was never the intention of the CA and LOC to act against the Spirit of Chess or not to perform their duties in the best interest of Chess.

The intention was clearly to give full effect in line with the very strict policies by FIDE On the banning of electronic devices. It is a question of weighing up two evils, and deciding which is the lesser. It is clearly also against the Spirit of Chess to use electronic devices to cheat, and it is clear that the CA and LOC wanted to clearly bring the point across that cell phones and mobile devices are not allowed in any way, shape or form. Unfortunately the CA and LOC overcompensated in the way they acted, and the sanction imposed. In the end, it was evident that the harsh penalty did not avoid the actions the CA and LOC were trying to discourage.

The last important factor needed to be taken into account was Tshwane’s own conduct. Tshwane never raised any objections against the amended rule/sanction, until it was enforced. Account was taken of Tshwane’s argument that the rule was not communicated clearly and the court agreed with them, but it could not find that the amendment was invalid. Many who attended the SAJCC confirmed that they did take note of the amended rule/sanction before the start of the tournament. It was ruled that the CA and LOC could have done more to communicate the amended rule, it was unlikely that there was not one person from Tshwane Management who did not take notice of the amended rule and was not aware of the possible sanction, before it was applied in the first incident. It was concluded that Tshwane took note of the rule, although it was clearly harsh and flawed in many instances, and consented to it by way of acceptance. It was also beyond doubt that Tshwane was clearly aware of the fact that they were not allowed to bring cell (mobile) phones into the hall. Tshwane’s argument that the persons in question had no intention to disobey the rule, and then still brought phones into the hall, cannot be accepted.

The following decision was made.

1. The LOC must place a notice on the CHESS SA website confirming the correct standing of the Tshwane Under 14C team, with an apology for the inconvenience

caused by the miscalculation.

2. The CA and LOC of any team competition held in South Africa in future should refrain from publishing a rule where players are punished due to the transgressions of any non-playing person.

3. The grievance in terms of the Under 10 and Under 16 Championship as well as the Under 12C Section is dismissed.

An Unusual Resignation

I've had players knock all the pieces off the board as a way of resigning. I've even had a game myself in a club championship with only the two of us present where my opponent scrunched up his scoresheet, threw it over his shoulder and left the room. I decided to just let his clock run which was just as well as about 15 minutes later he returned, picked up his scoresheet, tried to flatten it out and continued the game. He resigned in a more conventional manner a few moves later.

However I've been told of an incident from the second top section of the Edinburgh Congress which beats anything I've experienced.

10 minutes into the playing session a player comes up to the arbiter and attempts to claim a draw. The arbiter asks if there has been a repetition of position. Certainly the position has been constant for ten minutes as the opponent has not yet appeared! The player is informed that he cannot claim a draw.

He states that this opponent kept him waiting for almost an hour at a previous congress. (That congress has not been held for 5 years and it was probably another 5 since it had a 1 hour default time.) It looks like the player may have been trying to claim a draw on repetition of being late!

Anyway the game does start and several moves are made when the first player disappears for a prolonged period. His opponent getting a cup of coffee spots him in the cafeteria and tells the arbiter. He is persuaded to return to his board. But he does not make a move until he has 8 minutes remaining on his clock at which point he starts his opponent's clock. The arbiter is called and confirms that no move has



been played. The player then states that he had lost on time. He is told that he has 8 minutes left and so only then does he say that he resigns. (I assume he misread the 8 as a 0 but who knows?)

Apparently in the previous encounter some pieces were knocked over in the time scramble and the player has borne a grudge for the following 10 years. I accept in chess some disputes have lasted much longer than this but at least in those cases both parties realised they were in disagreement.

Applying Article G4

Chess Scotland has drawn up the following advice for arbiters. At present it is only a draft.

Guidance for Arbiters on Events with Quickplay Finishes which allow players in their last two minutes to request increments (Article G4).

If the rules of the tournament allow for incremental finishes then the arbiter should permit these if possible. (The Rules of the tournament should say if this is incremental or delay but it may be assumed to be incremental if not stated.)

There are however some occasions when an arbiter may decline such a request.

These include:

- The request has not been made properly
- There is a very limited number of digital clocks capable of giving increments
- A player has waited until he has very limited time left on his clock
- A player has played a minimal number of moves in the time before the request
- The opponent for reasons of age or disability would be severely disadvantaged

The purpose of the rule is to allow a fair ending to the game. It is not to let someone who has mismanaged their time have a second bite of the cherry.

If there are a very limited number of digital clocks the arbiter must decide which games are most appropriate for the increment to be allowed. The more level a game is on position and time then the more likely it is that an arbiter should allow it to be decided in this manner. The provision of increments should not be allowed simply to prolong a game needlessly.

The arbiter should have the available clocks set in the right mode and with the in-

crement set for 5 seconds. All that is necessary then is to set the clocks for the time remaining remembering to add 2 minutes to the time on the opponent's clock.

The arbiter should also remind the opponent that he has in fact been offered a draw which he may accept. The draw offer will stand until rejected in the normal way. The draw offer is **not** ended by the arbiter starting the replacement clock.

If G4 is available G5 (the old 10.2) will apply only if the arbiter denies a G4 request. A player is not allowed to insist on G5.

It is not expected that G4 would be used in a situation where no arbiter is present.

Constructive comments on the above are welcome.

PENALTIES

The Laws of Chess list the penalties which can be enforced but with only a few exceptions they do not say which penalty should be applied in a particular case. In most cases it is expected that the arbiter will use common sense but as we all know common sense is not very common!

A question was posed regarding an opponent adjusting pieces on a players time. The Laws only allow you to adjust pieces on your own time so it is obviously wrong for the opponent to act in this way. But what penalty should be applied?

As with many things there are varying degrees of severity of the offence.

- There is the player who makes a move, presses the clock and then adjusts his piece immediately
- There is the player who does the above but adjusts more than one piece
- There is the player who repeatedly does either of the above
- There is the player who long into the opponent's thinking time adjusts a piece often loudly saying j'adoube to justify his actions.

In the first case and even the second I would normally issue a warning after the game. The 'warning' would be simply pointing out that he should not adjust pieces on the opponent's time and that if a future opponent complains he may find that the opponent will be awarded extra thinking time to compensate for the disturbance.

In the third case I would wait until the player was on the move before issuing the verbal warning (stopping the clock if necessary). If it was repeated I would then award the opponent some additional time.

The fourth case is the most annoying. It can interrupt the concentration of the other player. In such a case I would be quite happy to get involved and award 2 minutes to the innocent party.

The case in question was of type 4 but the arbiter was not present. The player did not report it as he felt his opponent would only get a warning. His concentration had already been broken and he feared he would have lost even more of the thread of the game. This is a justified fear. If the arbiter had been called over it is possible that the two players would have disagreed on the circumstances and even if they had been in broad agreement a warning is the most likely penalty.

A big problem for the arbiter can be the player who responds in kind. The opponent smashes a piece into (rather than onto) the board so his reply move means he has to do the same harder and louder, the opponent adjusts a piece at the wrong time so he does the same but with two pieces, etc. In these cases both players should be warned about their future behaviour.

A j'adoube problem which comes up from time to time concerns knights and the way they are facing. Here the adjusting is done legally but player A likes all 4 knights to face the opponent whilst player B likes them facing the edge (or an imaginary line running between the d and e files) of the board. Player A on his move turns all 4 knights to face forwards. When he moves player B turns the knights to face the side, and so it continues ... The solution here is for the arbiter to rule that A's knights face forwards and B's knights face sideways. The opponent should not adjust them to point in any other direction.

It would not be a good decision for the arbiter to annoy both players by having A's knights permanently facing sideways and B's forward! But it would be understandable.

History—Chess 960

Chess 960 first appeared in the Laws of Chess in the 2009 edition as an appendix. Other popular variants such as Bughouse and Kriegspiel have not been afforded this privilege.

The invention of Chess 960 is often credited to Bobby Fischer who announced it publically in Buenos Aires, Argentina on 19 June 1996. As such it is often called Fischer Random though the rules mean that it is not entirely random as the bishops must be placed on different coloured squares and the king must come between the rooks. This is why it is named 960 rather than the truly random arrangement which would have 40320 initial positions assuming the black pieces mirror the whites. This is often called Shuffle chess.

Mention of Shuffle Chess goes back to a Dutch book by Philip Julius, Count Van Zuylen van Nijvelt and Governor of Amsterdam in Napoleonic times. The oldest known recorded game is from 1842. Another advocate of Shuffle Chess was Lord Brabazon of Tara (08/02/1884-17/05/1964). John Moore-Brabazon, an aviation pioneer (picture on following page shows him in his plane 1909), was also involved



in politics being a Cabinet Minister in Churchill's government during the second world war (Minister for Transport and Aircraft Production). Lord Brabazon thought that analysis was killing chess and as a first

step to overcome this he suggested that the king and queen should swap positions. When this simple change had also been analysed 'to destruction' further back rank alterations could be made.

He was attacked in Chess magazine for his views.

The idea that Fischer was the first to come up with the concept for this variation of the game is obviously wrong though he did refine it.

DID KASPAROV CHEAT?

Following the USA Championship a blitz event was held in St Louis. The name varies between sources but is generally called something along the lines of "The Ultimate Blitz hosted by Garry Kasparov".

Various sources accuse Kasparov of taking back a move against, ironically, Nakamura. I have been unable to find a set of rules published for this event. Certainly there seems no doubt Kasparov released a knight and then touched it again and moved it to another square (shades of his incident with Polgar). If FIDE rules applied then this was certainly illegal. However the games do not appear to be either FIDE or USCF rated so it is unclear which set of rules if any applied.

As a youngster (OK so we are going back a long way) I can well remember club blitz chess where moves could be taken back if the clock had not been pressed. This still seems to be a popular way of doing it in America, though the rules there



outlawed this in 2013. It looks like they were using USCF rules but this is not 100% certain. If the old rules were being used then Kasparov has done nothing wrong. Certainly the arbiter didn't do anything and the opponent

never complained. The opponent might have had two very good reasons for not pointing out Kasparov's transgression. The first would be that it would be difficult for him to pull anyone up given his history but perhaps even more so, would you call up the person the tournament was named after and a significant reason for the event taking place. I would hope that an arbiter would not be concerned that enforcing the rules would jeopardise future invitations to top events.

It would be nice if the organisers would confirm what the rules were!

They're Not Mine.

It is not often that I am left speechless but it did happen at the Blackpool Congress (or Conference as they prefer to call it).

A player held a large bunch of keys behind his back which were jangling fairly loudly. I pointed this out to him to be met with the reply, "They're not my keys."

With hindsight I can only assume he was confessing to the theft of the keys! Whatever, it certainly left me speechless.

\$25,000 fine for using a phone

An organisation now imposes a \$25000 fine for using a mobile phone. There is also a \$5000 fine for being in possession of a such a device. Fortunately this is not an application of *Law 13.9 d 'a fine announced in advance'*. These penalties apply in NASCAR (the American National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing) events. The reason for the rule is not safety but as in chess it is to prevent cheating. Smart phones could be programmed to control the electronics in the car giving such drivers an advantage.



One driver, Brad Keselowski, has suffered the maximum fine. He took photos and tweeted during a race when a red flag had been shown. The red flag means that all competition must stop. This not only includes the drivers on the race track but also the pit crews. If the crew is working on repairing a car in the garage area then they too must stop work when the red flag is displayed. The red flag is com-

monly seen during a rain delay or when the track is blocked due to emergency vehicles or a particularly bad accident.

As a result of his pictures Keslowski's twitter followers increased to more than 325,000.

3 Rounds and 2 Moves

At a recent FIDE rated tournament a player reached round 4 having played a total of 2 moves. He had requested around 1 bye = 0 moves. He had failed to upgrade to ECF Gold membership so the organiser had instructed the arbiters not to include the player in the draw. He duly turned up to find no opponent though a graded game against a suitable opponent was found for him = 0 moves. In round 3 everything started well, he had an opponent and both of them turned up. He played his first move, his opponent replied, he played his second move, his phone rang!! Three rounds and a total of 2 moves played. He did make up for it in round 4 where his game went to move 76.

Alternative Dictionary (Part 2)

D	
Diversion	The Welsh form of chess
Double attack	Arbiter eating two puddings simultaneously
Draw Offer	To invite your opponent to join you outside for a cigarette
E	
Elo Rating	Abbreviated form of typical chess player's greeting "Hello, what is your grade?"
F	
FIDE	Grandmaster term for the day that their conditions are paid
Flag	The art of losing games, possibly on time, in the latter part of a tournament
Friendly Game	An impossible concept in chess

G	
g pawn	Loud honking device fitted to a Jeep
Game Score	The number of deer seen on the way to a remote congress
H	
Handicap	Readily available headwear
Hijack	Rudd on a very good score
I	
Illegal Move	Taking a sick bird to the vet
Illegal position	Playing chess whilst driving
Inactive	Description of the movement of an arbiter
Increment	Mistaken interpretation of Chinese player's description of the weather
Isolated Pawn	Remote location of financial provider
J	
Jangle	Noise made with keys to disturb opponent
Jargon	Unintelligible speech required to be ECF CEO
K	
KIA	A type of orange squash
KID	Young player who always seems to beat you
Kingside	A player who supports Charles' ascension to the throne

History

The following are claimed as facts but I have no proof as to their absolute veracity.

The first chessboard with alternating light and dark squares appears in Europe in 1090.

The possibility of advancing of a pawn by two squares on its first move was introduced in Spain in 1280.

In the 1950s, Humphrey Bogart (1899-1957) played a chess game against a friend at a restaurant and lost. He then went home, phoned his friend and bet some money on a new game played over the phone. Bogart won the game, but then admitted he cheated. At the time, U.S. Champion Herman Steiner (1905-1955) was visiting Bogart at his house, who helped Bogart with the moves. Bogart himself said that he liked chess better than poker because you couldn't cheat at chess.

In the early 1960s, the first recorded incident of computer chess cheating occurred at MIT. Some MIT students went to two professors (both chess players), stating that they had a breakthrough in chess algorithms and that they should come to the lab immediately to see their discovery. One professor was led into one lab room and the other was led into another lab. One of the professors was

placed in front of a TX-0 computer, and the other in front of a PDP-1 computer. They were then asked to enter chess moves. Each believed that they were playing against the computer. Unknown to them, their computers were connected to each other by a single wire and the two professors were actually playing each other.

CAA Officials

Chairperson - Lara Barnes
Secretary - Alan Ruffle
Treasurer - Tony Corfe
Chief Arbiter - Alex McFarlane
Information officer - Alex McFarlane
Committee - David Welch, Kevin Staveley and Neville Belinfante.
ECF delegate - Neville Belinfante
Chess Scotland Delegate - Alex McFarlane
Welsh Chess Union - Kevin Staveley
Independent Examiner - Richard Jones



Items for inclusion in future issues should be sent to Alex McFarlane

ahmcfarlane@yahoo.co.uk