

Proposal for New Version of FIDE Rating Regulations

Proposal for New Regulations to be discussed before and in Dresden Congress 2008
 Comments sent were intended to be included in the document at least once a week.
 There were very few comments in the beginning, then there were several large comments.
 The plan is to have comments gathered and interim versions published so that a final proposal to be sent to federations with the congress agenda in September.
 Send comments to mikko.markkula@pp.inet.fi

The text is from FIDE web site, and should be the correct current version.

Red italic is to mark corrections and clarifications of the present regulations

Blue italic is to mark proposals and comments of Mikko Markkula

Green Italic is to mark proposals and comments by other people (name in comment)

The comments inserted since previous published version are marked as above, and **also highlighted.**

Initials in comments:

SR Stewart Reuben

VV Varlam Vepkhvishvili

NF Nick Faulks

MM Mikko Markkula

FIDE Rating Regulations

Approved by the 1982 General Assembly, amended by the General Assemblies of 1984 through 2004.

0.0 Introduction

The basic data for measurement of chess performances must be broad and ample. Play will be rated by FIDE when it takes place in a FIDE registered competition and meets all the following requirements.

0.1 The following regulations shall be altered by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Qualification Commission.

Any such changes shall come into effect on 1st July of the year following the decision by the General Assembly. For tournaments, such changes will apply to those starting on or after that date.

Comment/proposal by MM

Why not January 1?

VV

Of course, better is from January-

SR

Because usually the FIDE Congress is in the latter part of the year. More than 6 months advance notice is needed

0.2 In principle, all important events should be rated. All top level tournaments may be rated by FIDE even if no rating report is submitted by the federation of the territory in which the event is held.

Comment/proposal by MM

Tournaments organized by a private organizer in another federation's territory, who should report, who should pay?

It is clear that all important tournaments have to be rated, but who is responsible for costs?

Pre-registration does not work reliably now. Pre-registration should be possible only by federation rating officers, the reporting possible only on registered tournaments.

1.0 Rate of Play:

1.1 For a game to be rated each player must have the following minimum periods in which to complete all the moves, assuming the game lasts 60 moves.

Where at least one of the players in the tournament has a rating 2200 or higher, each player must have a minimum of 120 minutes.

Where at least one of the players in the tournament has a rating 1600 or higher, each player must have a minimum of 90 minutes.

Where all the players in the tournament are rated below 1600, each player must have a minimum of 60 minutes.

Examples of ways in which 1.11 can be achieved include:

All the moves in two hours.

40 moves in 75 minutes, followed by all the moves in 15 minutes but each time a player makes a move an extra 30 seconds is added to his clock time.

40 moves in 90 minutes, followed by all the moves in 30 minutes.

Comment/proposal by MM

I propose to have same rules for players at all playing strengths. Instead I propose to have different K coefficients for games played at different playing rates.

If both players have at least 2 hours for 60 moves, with the minimum base time of at least 60 minutes, then full coefficients are used.

If both players have at least 1h30min for 60 moves, with the minimum base time of at least 60 minutes, then the coefficients multiplied by 0.8 are used.

If both players have at least 60 minutes for 60 moves, then the coefficients multiplied by 0.5 are used.

If both players have at least 15 minutes for 60 moves, then the coefficients multiplied by 0.3 are used.

This would mean deleting separate rapid chess ratings, and combine all measurements of games played at different rates.

VV

If the event's reports will be sent to FIDE during 3 days after the event will be finished, it will be possible to calculate ratings after each event and not after 3 months.

After each event must be used different "K" coefficient, not taken into consideration any first rated 30 games. For example, for players with rating:

1401-1599 K=50

1600-1799 K=45

1800-1899 K=40

1900-1999 K=35

2000-2099 K=30

2100-2199 K=25

2200-2299 K=20

2300-2399 K=15

2400 and more K=10

if after any event rating of any player will achieve 2400 and in future less than 2400 coefficient will not be stayed as K=10. Coefficient after each event can be changed in accordance of current rating, not taken into consideration any number of rated games.

If it's not possible to use current ratings after each event and will stay 3 months period, even in this case can be used different K, but taken into consideration current ratings after calculation each event

VV

FIDE group will have difficulties to use such coefficients: multiply by 0.8, 0.5 or Very much material, many reports even are not indicated time limit

NF

I think these points address two completely different issues. I assume the different minimum time requirements reflect a view that weaker players require less thinking time to play a reasonable game within the limits of their ability, or that they will be willing to devote less time to a single game. Personally I doubt both of these premises, except where their poor playing strength results from their extreme youth.

SR

I deliberately made it easier to run events for weaker players and yet they be FIDE Rated. In fact few such events exist

1.2 Games played with all the moves at a rate faster than the above are excluded from the list.

1.3 Where a certain number of moves is specified in the first time control, it is recommended to be 40 moves. Players benefit from uniformity here.

Comment/proposal by MM

If the playing time is of the format base + increment/move + additional time at a certain time, 60 minutes is the minimum base time.

NF

I am strongly opposed to this approach. Rapidplay is a different game, and should not be allowed to affect traditional ratings

SR

Such a system has only proved popular in the US. There is a danger of confusion.

2.0 Laws to be followed:

2.1 Play must take place according to the FIDE Laws of Chess.

NF

Add "except in the case of tournaments held in the United States, where organizers may apply rules of their own choice." This brings our regulations into line with established practice

SR

I too think it ridiculous that the USCF be allowed to flout the regulations.

2.2 Smoking is banned in FIDE-rated events. Smoking is not permitted in the playing hall for the duration of the tournament. This applies to everyone present - players, officials, media representatives and spectators.

A separate area outside the playing area must be provided where smoking is permitted. This should be easily accessible from the playing hall. If local ordinances totally prohibit smoking on the premises, the players and officials must be provided with easy access outdoors.

Comment/proposal by MM

This belongs to Tournament Rules, not here.

SR

It has never done any harm here. Remove it and there is the peril of smoking becoming being allowed. Leave well alone.

MM

Rating regulations should more or less mathematics, this mis clearly a tournament rule.

Comment/proposal by Michal Krasenkov

Add articles:

"2.3 Any round-robin tournament, in which a GM, IM, WGM or WIM norm can be achieved, any tournament, in which less than 8 players take part, as well as any individual match must be pre-announced and evidenced as in B.01, Art.1.4, otherwise the event will not be rated.

Small multi-round robin tournaments and individual matches are a very popular way of gaining rating points in a suspicious way (Strumica, Crisan)

2.4 In case of justified doubts (too big rating gains of particular players) the FIDE Rating Administrator may suspend rating any event and demand the evidence mentioned in B01, Art.1.4.

2.5 In case of credible evidence that the event or its results are forged, the FIDE Rating Administrator must send the material to the FIDE Ethics Commission and suspend rating the event until its decision.

2.6 If the FIDE Ethics Commission gets the evidence mentioned in 2.5 from another source, the FIDE rating administrator must suspend rating the event until the decision of the Commission, at the request of its Chairman."

This is, of course, to avoid rating fraudulent events.

3.0 Number of rounds per day:

3.1 No more than three rounds per day and a total playing time of no more than 12 hours.

Comment/proposal by MM

If faster games are allowed, see my proposal after 1.1, then the number of rounds per day can be higher, 12 hours limit may stay, although with incremental time, a round that is planned to last maximum 6 hours may get longer, then two rounds may be more than 12 hours.

VV

No event must be rated if per day it is played more than 2 games and this problem, about 12 hours, will be decided

NF

I take all the times to apply to notional 60 move games. With the currently prevalent 30 seconds increments games can of course take very much longer.

SR

I am happy with the current 3 rounds per day. If Mikko's idea of variable K factor came in, it can be considered at that time.

4.0 Duration of the event:

4.1 A period not greater than 90 days.

4.11 leagues may be rated which last for a period greater than 90 days.

Comment/proposal by MM

For example club tournaments can be approved, although they last, for example, from autumn to spring. These tournaments have to be pre-registered and pre-approved.

The ratings used for calculations in these cases may be those at the start of the tournament, or those valid at the time of each game. The rating server needs some modification to use different ratings for the same player during the long tournament.

SR

This is a difficult decision. The title regs would have to fall into line.

5.0 Unplayed games

5.1 Whether these occur because of forfeiture or any other reason, they are not counted.

Comment/proposal by MM

If the walkover is caused by medical or other acceptable reasons, then it is clear that the game should not be rated, just a no-show should be penalized by loss of rating, it is another story, whether the winner by w.o. should gain points?

6.0 Composition of the tournament

6.1 If an unrated player scores zero or half in his first event, his score and that of his opponents against him are disregarded.

Comment/proposal by MM

This may be necessary in round-robin tournaments, but 0,5/3 in a Swiss may be a good result. If in a round-robin tournament one player scores 0, and is removed from the table, it may cause that the next player has 0 and is also removed, and so on.

Ra-736 is a very low performance rating (result 0), if cumulative rating for new players is used, it could be included.

VV

After the rule, as rating is calculating after each game, in Round Robin and Swiss events the rule of calculations of rating changes for all participants is one and the same. Now in Round Robin event the result of any rated player against of unrated player does not mean nothing, is not calculating and now is not clear what means this rule about of result of unrated player.

For title purposes O.K. but for rating calculations, nobody is interesting how many points scored unrated player, zero, 0.5 or more.

Comment by NF

This used to be just zero, why was it changed? Not knowing the reason, I should be inclined to change it back.

SR

The problem of a “pyramid” of zeroes is real, but I see no solution.

As mentioned below, for a second or third result Ra-735 is used

The reason 0.5 was not as rating performance in the first event was because I saw a likelihood that an unrated players has zero, he meets a rated opponent in the last round and is given a charitable draw, thus distorting the system. The pyramid effect in an RR is a real problem.

6.44 In a round robin tournament where one or more games are unplayed, or a player scores 0 or ½, the results are to be reported for Rating as a Swiss system tournament.

6.2 The results in events involving preliminaries and finals or play-offs are pooled.

Comment/proposal by MM

I prefer the wording “may be pooled”. This has no significance now that We is calculated game by game and not using opponents’ average ratings.

VV

You are right, of course

SR

That is true apart from where more than one player is unrated. Since it makes no difference if everybody is rated, why ot leave it as is? There is also the problem of such an event stretching across more than one rating period.

6.3 In a round robin tournament at least one-third of the players must be rated.

6.31 If the event has less than 10 players, at least 4 must be rated.

6.32 In a double round tournament with unrated participants, there must be at least 6 players, 4 of whom must be rated.

6.33 National Championships played as round robins shall be rated if at least 3 men (or 2 women in events exclusively for women) participants had official FIDE Ratings before the beginning of the tournament.

Comment/proposal by MM

Is the iteration method for round-robin still necessary? I would like to know how many round-robin tournaments with fewer than 50 percent rated players are rated annually. Should we give up the different handling of round-robins and Swisses?

VV

I think we must decide: how many rated players must be in Round Robin or in Swiss event that was allowed to registration and send report.

For example: Can be rated Swiss event, about 30-40 participants,

If there are only 2 rated players, and were paired ? or 3-4 rated players ?

Similar is in Round Robin. Minimal how many rated players must be ?

As this question will be decided, needs to change, or remove above items.

NF

The different treatment accorded to round-robins allows small closed communities to enter the rating system when this would otherwise be impossible – in Bermuda we increased the pool from three to six, and then to nine, by this means, which could not otherwise have happened. From that base numbers have increased naturally through Swisses.

SR

Korea also benefited initially. Mikko knows better than anybody though about this matter. There might be more than 50%, for example 6 rated and 4 unrated.

NF

I would reduce the minimum number of rated players from 4 to 3, whether the event is classed as a National Championship or not. I see no reason to maintain any special rules for women’s events, particularly now that the Olympiads do not.

SR

I am not so sure about this. Fewer rated players can lead to more manipulation. I agree about the women though.

NF

6.32 is aimed specifically at five player double round robins with one unrated player. Have there been problems with these?

SR

I had always assumed this was again protection from manipulation with greater numbers.

6.4 In a Swiss or team event (except Scheveningen matches), only the games against rated opponents are counted. Scheveningen tournaments/matches in which more than one unrated player participates will not be rated.)

Comment/proposal by MM

If Scheveningen matches are approved to be rated, the system is the same as for Swiss tournaments.

Comment/proposal by MM

Was this meant to mean, if Scheveningen matches are rated as if Swisses, then more than one unrated player can be included? SR

MM

The method to calculate ratings in Scheveningen is the same as in Swiss, not like RR.

MM

For the moment, a rated player has no risk concerning the ratings when playing against an unrated player, this has clearly caused "selling" draws and even full points in situation when a rated player has lost the chances to get a prize in the tournament.

I propose to have all games rated, using the rating floor for unrated players, or, if the unrated player has a better provisional, but not published rating, that rating, corrected with the result of the new player in the tournament, requires at least three rated opponents.

It means that first ratings for unrated and previously provisionally rated players are calculated. Then, for the ratings for the previously rated players, these ratings for unrated or provisionally rated players are used.

VV

I think no one Scheveningen matches must be not rated and officially must be not used this system. In this case simple will be solved these problems, nobody will to buy points,

NF

I don't quite follow the long sentence, but see the point. This is important and controversial, but at first sight I think the suggestion is a correct one. I doubt that much actual "selling" goes on in these circumstances (how much is a 1500 FIDE rating worth?), but I can certify that having one's FIDE rating at risk does concentrate the mind.

There has long been a principle that a player knows the effect of the game on his rating before the start of the game, except in iterated RRs. Using the rating floor of 1400 would destroy open Swisses in which unrated players participated. How about:

SR

6.4. All games against rated opponents are counted. Once an unrated player has met at least 3 rated opponents in the tournament and scored at least ½ point, then his rolling rating is computed and that Rr used to rate the games of his opponents.

For rated players, all games against rated opponents are counted.

For unrated players, results are only counted if the player meets at least three rated opponents in the event.

In the case of a round robin tournament where one or more games are unplayed, the results of the tournament are to be reported for rating as for a Swiss system tournament.

Comment/proposal by MM

Should we give up the different handling of round-robins and Swisses?

VV

Of course, Round Robin and Swiss now are one and the same.

I used my Swiss Pairing Program in 305 rated events and last 2 years

I am using the same programs for our Round Robin events. Only pairings in

Round Robin is known earlier, all other procedures are same, nothing difference, even a little.

NF

As above, I believe the separate treatment does serve a purpose.

6.5 Where a match is over a specific number of games, those played after one player has won shall not be rated.

Comment/proposal by MM

I would like to have statistics of rated matches from the past years to see how many they are.

SR

Tiny I am sure because there are few matches. I would have no problem with deleting this rule, but it has been in and out. Leave it as is.

7.0 Registration of events to be rated

7.1 As in B.03. Events not pre-registered will not be rated.

Comment/proposal by MM

The pre-registration with all the required data is now a bit problematic, it should be possible to register a tournament, and only after the tournament is started, it is known whether the tournament has multiple groups, whether it is a round-robin, or Swiss and so on.

The basic parameters of a tournament to be rated must be pre-registered, if a tournament is registered, then the results, or information that the tournament was cancelled, have to be reported.

Comment/proposal by Michal Krasenkov

Change article 7.1 to

“As in B.03”.

B.03 doesn't say anything about the pre-registration, so the reference in 7.1 is senseless. Generally, B.03 is a completely “dead regulation” and we must think about its future. Pre-announcement of important events – see above my proposal of 2.3.

SR

MM knows more about this than anyone.

8.0 Submission of reports

8.1 As in B.01 article 7, except 7.2 is ignored where inapplicable.

Comment/proposal by MM

This article refers to a now non-existent article.

The problem with late submissions is a separate issue. It may harm players' rights, for example, titles approved conditionally on rating. Titles based on rating (for example, FM) may be decided at the publication of a rating list, then a tournament submitted late can change the rating and so on.

The dead line of tournaments must be clearly defined: for example, tournaments that are finished at the latest 15 days before the list date, are included in the list, provided that the results are submitted to ratings at the latest 7 days before the list date. If the tournaments of the period are submitted by at the latest 7 days before the list date, then there is no penalty. If the results are submitted later, then the results are late for the list, and there is a substantial penalty.

Official FIDE events can be included in the list even if they finish one day before the list date, that has to be clearly communicated to the participants at the start of the tournament.

SR

I thought we had the idea of allowing all events finished before the due date which are submitted less than seven days in advance, shall be rated provided twice the rating fee is paid.

9.0 Official FIDE Rating List:

9.1 The Qualification Commission shall prepare a list four times a year which incorporates the rated play during the rating period into the previous list. This shall be done using the rating system

formula based on the percentage expectancy curve and derived from the normal distribution function of statistical and probability theory.

- 9.11 The list published 1.1 is used for events commencing 1.1-31.3.
 The list published 1.4 is used for events commencing 1.4-30.6.
 The list published 1.7 is used for events commencing 1.7-30.9
 The list published 1.10 is used for events commencing 1.10-31.12.

9.12 The following data concerning each player whose rating exceeds 1400 as of the current list:

Comment/proposal by MM

Instead of fixed figure, use "floor"

FIDE title, Federation, Current Rating, ID Number, Number of games rated in the rating period and Birthdate.

Comment/proposal by MM

Now only Year of Birth.

VV

have registered already more than 800 Georgian players, via good FIDE Ratings Server and is requiring also birhdate, I input for all players.

Why is not shown in personal card birthdate and is only year ?

SR

I thought it was normal to provide the date of birth, but only the year is published. It helps with player recognition.

The current value of k for the player and over how many games this has been played when

k = 25 (see 10.52).

Comment/proposal by MM

K value is not shown, neither is the number of games shown for players with K=25.

SR

I don't understand.

MM These are not shown on the web.

9.13 The closing dates for receipt of information for a particular list are usually one month before the publication of that list.

9.13a Rated play received after the closing date will not normally be included in computation for the rating list in question.

Comment/proposal by MM

See the comment in 8.1. The rules must be clear, no decision afterwards.

SR

Agreed

9.14 A rating for a player new to the list shall be published only if it meets the following criteria:

9.14a If based on results obtained under 6.3., a minimum of 9 games.

Comment/proposal by MM

Do we need the iteration? The number of games should be higher, for example, 14, or even 24.

VV

About 12-15 years ago was as I remember 24 instead of 9

NF

This defeats the object of getting people into the system who would otherwise be excluded from it. We should stay at 9, and retain iteration.

SR

II agree absolutely

9.14b If based on results obtained under 6.4., a minimum of 9 games played against rated opponents.

Comment/proposal by MM

The number of games should be higher, for example, 14, or even 24.

NF

I think 9 is a good number. At entry level (remember we're not talking about 2200 any more) this means decent results in three Swisses. For less committed players this may already take a year, and we are trying to bring them into the rating system, not keep them out – otherwise why has the floor come down to 1400?

SR

Remember also that eventually it is intended to bring the floor down to 1001.

9.14c The condition of 9 games need not be met in one tournament: results from other events, played within the same or next 7 rating periods, are pooled to obtain the initial rating.

Comment/proposal by MM

I prefer cumulative calculation, instead of weighted average.

NF

I assume the weighted average is there to accommodate 6.3 results.

Comment/proposal by MM

Define the rating period, is it 1.1.-31.3. etc, or 1.12.-28.2. etc?

NF

Can we remove the idea that rated results expire after 2 years? I don't see why they should, time limits on title norms have been removed.

SR

What does cumulative calculation mean? If $10 \times 2200 + 5 \times 2000$ leads to 2100, instead of 2133, I disagree. The reason for a two year period is that the information may be terribly out of date after two years. Title norms are quite different. With a Rating a player may have a terrible result, not play for two years and then come back in as a much stronger player.

9.14d

If based on results obtained in the Olympiad, a Continental Team Championship or World Team Championship, a minimum of 7 games.

NF

I have to admit that I had never noticed this one, I assume it is there to give players a chance to get a rating from one Olympiad even though there are now only 11 rounds. At the lower levels, 7 rated opponents from 8 or 9 games is still uncertain.

SR

It also works well for various Continental Championships.

9.14e If a player is a member of the IBCA, ICSC or IPCA, a minimum of 7 games.

Comment/proposal by MM

This and other special rules for ratings from the tournaments should be reviewed.

VV

I agree. The rule and style must be one and the same for all

NF

I agree, I do not understand these rules

SR

I introduced it to make it easier for such players to get ratings. I know it got a blind Indian player a rating.

9.2 Players who are not to be included on the list:

9.21 Players whose ratings drop below 1401 are listed on the next list as 'delisted'. Thereafter they are treated in the same manner as any other unrated player.

SR

Change 1401 to the Rating Floor as per MM's proposal.

9.22 Unrated titled players are published in a separate list concurrently with the list of rated titled players.

9.23 Inactive players are not included on the list but nonetheless are considered rated at their most recent published rating for rating and title result purposes.

- 9.23a Players are considered to commence inactivity if they play fewer than 4 rated games in a one year period.
- 9.2.3b Inactive players are shown on the next 7 rating lists after starting being considered inactive. Their names are then flagged as inactive in the alphabetical section of the rating list and removed from the national federation's lists which would contain only the list of active players.
- 9.2.3c A player regains his activity if he plays at least 4 rated games in a one year period and he is then listed on the next list.
- 9.2.3d For the purposes of the FIDE rating list ranking of top players, a player who is inactive over a 12 month period of inactivity on the rating list will no longer appear on the top list.

Comment/proposal by MM

Use the expression "current floor" instead of a fixed figure. Change to one figure, floor is now even, here it is floor+1. (9.21)

Comment/proposal by MM

The information above is generally out of date. It refers to characteristics of a printed list

- 9.3 The Qualification Commission shall move to monthly rating lists on 1 July of the year following a decision to do so by the Presidential Board. The above regulations shall be amended as follows:
The list published on the 1st of the month shall be effective between the first and the last day of that month.

9.31 The name of each player whose rating exceeds 1400 shall be published.

Comment/proposal by MM

Use "floor" instead of a fixed figure

- 9.32 The closing date for receipt for information will normally be the end of the month, 30 days before the next list.

Comment/proposal by MM

See the proposal for dead lines in Article 8.

- 9.33 Players whose rating drops below 1401 will be listed in the next list as 'delisted'.
Thereafter they will be treated in the same manner as any other unrated player.

Comment/proposal by MM

Use "floor" instead of a fixed figure

10.0 The working of the FIDE Rating System

The FIDE Rating system is a numerical system in which percentage scores are converted to rating differences and vice versa. Its function is to produce scientific measurement information of the best statistical quality.

- 10.1 The rating scale is an arbitrary one with a class interval set at 200 points. The tables that follow show the conversion of percentage score 'p' into rating difference 'd_p'. For a zero or 100% score d_p is necessarily indeterminate. The second table shows conversion of difference in rating 'D' into scoring probability 'P_D' for the higher 'H' and the lower 'L' rated player respectively. Thus the two tables are effectively mirror-images.

NF

What is a class interval?

Comment/proposal by MM

0 % = -736, 100 % = +736

.

SR

but has been set notionally at 735

It has been 735 for some years. Why the proposed change?

NF

I'm not sure about the -736. Three consecutive losses against 2400 opposition does not evidence playing strength of 1664, or anything like it.

In any case, this change has in practice already been made, and the 735 number (not 736) has for some years been used in calculating ratings.

SR

The 735 number is also useful for determining a TPR where a player scores 100% MM

In the table 735 is 0.99, more than 735 1.0, the first figure of that range is 736!

(a) The table of conversion from percentage score, p, into rating differences, d_p

P	d _p	p	d _p	p	d _p	p	d _p	p	d _p	p	d _p
1.0		.83	273	.66	117	.49	-7	.32	-133	.15	-296
.99	677	.82	262	.65	110	.48	-14	.31	-141	.14	-309
.98	589	.81	251	.64	102	.47	-21	.30	-149	.13	-322
.97	538	.80	240	.63	95	.46	-29	.29	-158	.12	-336
.96	501	.79	230	.62	87	.45	-36	.28	-166	.11	-351
.95	470	.78	220	.61	80	.44	-43	.27	-175	.10	-366
.94	444	.77	211	.60	72	.43	-50	.26	-184	.09	-383
.93	422	.76	202	.59	65	.42	-57	.25	-193	.08	-401
.92	401	.75	193	.58	57	.41	-65	.24	-202	.07	-422
.91	383	.74	184	.57	50	.40	-72	.23	-211	.06	-444
.90	366	.73	175	.56	43	.39	-80	.22	-220	.05	-470
.89	351	.72	166	.55	36	.38	-87	.21	-230	.04	-501
.88	336	.71	158	.54	29	.37	-95	.20	-240	.03	-538
.87	322	.70	149	.53	21	.36	-102	.19	-251	.02	-589
.86	309	.69	141	.52	14	.35	-110	.18	-262	.01	-677
.85	296	.68	133	.51	7	.34	-117	.17	-273	.00	
.84	284	.67	125	.50	0	.33	-125	.16	-284		

(b) Table of conversion of difference in rating, D, into scoring probability P_D, for the higher, H, and the lower, L, rated player respectively.

D	P _D	D	P _D	D	P _D	D	P _D	D	P _D		
Rtg Dif	H	L	Rtg Dif	H	L	Rtg Dif	H	L	Rtg Dif	H	L
0-3	.50	.50	92-98	.63	.37	198-206	.76	.24	345-357	.89	.11
4-10	.51	.49	99-106	.64	.36	207-215	.77	.23	358-374	.90	.10
11-17	.52	.48	107-113	.65	.35	216-225	.78	.22	375-391	.91	.09
18-25	.53	.47	114-121	.66	.34	226-235	.79	.21	392-411	.92	.08
26-320	.54	.46	122-129	.67	.33	236-245	.80	.20	412-432	.93	.07
33-39	.55	.45	130-137	.68	.32	246-256	.81	.19	433-456	.94	.06
40-46	.56	.44	138-145	.69	.31	257-267	.82	.18	457-484	.95	.05
47-53	.57	.43	146-153	.70	.30	268-278	.83	.17	485-517	.96	.04
54-61	.58	.42	154-162	.71	.29	279-290	.84	.16	518-559	.97	.03
62-68	.59	.41	163-170	.72	.28	291-302	.85	.15	560-619	.98	.02
69-76	.60	.40	171-179	.73	.27	303-315	.86	.14	620-735	.99	.01
77-83	.61	.39	180-188	.74	.26	316-328	.87	.13	over 735	1.0	.00
84-91	.62	.38	189-197	.75	.25	329-344	.88	.12			

10.2 Determining the Rating 'R_u' in a given event of a previously unrated player.

10.21 If an unrated player scores less than one point in his first rated event, his score is disregarded.

First determine the average rating of his competition 'R_c'.

- (a) In a Swiss or Team tournament: this is simply the average rating of his opponents.
- (b) The results of both rated and unrated players in a round robin tournament are taken into account. For unrated players, the average rating of the competition 'R_c' is also the tournament average 'R_a' determined as follows:
 - (i) Determine the average rating of the rated players 'R_{ar}'.
 - (ii) Determine p for each of the rated players against all their opponents. Then determine d_p for each of these players. Then determine the average of these d_p = 'd_{pa}'.
 - (iii) 'n' is the number of opponents.

$$R_a = R_{ar} - d_{pa} \times n/(n+1)$$

Comment/proposal by MM

Do we need the iteration? I prefer the same procedure for round-robins and Swisses.

10.22 If he scores 50%, then $R_u = R_c$

10.23 If he scores more than 50%, then $R_u = R_c + 12.5$ for each half point scored over 50%

10.24 If he scores less than 50% in a Swiss or team tournament: $R_u = R_c + d(p)$

10.25 If he scores less than 50% in a round-robin: $R(u) = R(c) + d(p) \times n/(n+1)$.

The formulas are partially incorrect:

10.23 in round-robin R_c should be R_a .

10.25 should read $R_u = R_c + d(p) \times n/(n+1)$

Comment/proposal by MM

The asymmetry of the correction term in results under 50% and over 50% is not fair. The results should be cumulated (until at least 9 games) by calculating the average of all opponents so far, and the results against all opponents.

Example: A player scores 3 points out of 4 against 4 rated players with the average of 2100, his rating from this tournament is 2125, in the next tournament, he plays against 4 games again against the same average of players and scores 1 out of 4, from this tournament his rating is 1907, according to the present system, his cumulative rating would be 2016, it should be 2100, as it would be with the cumulative method.

NF

Agreed, subject to my comment on 10.3 below

SR

Agreed. This was written before the days of databases.

10.3 The Rating R_n which is to be published for a previously unrated player is then determined by taking the weighted average of all his R_u results. e.g. A player has R_u results of 2280 over 5 games, 2400 over 10 games and 2000 over 5 games:

$$R_n = [2280 \times 5 + 2400 \times 10 + 2000 \times 5] / 20 = 2270.$$

Comment/proposal by MM

I prefer cumulative calculation instead of weighted average.

NF

Cumulative is clearly better, except that it does not cope with 6.3, which I consider vital.

I suggest that an n game round robin R_u should be treated as a 50% result against n rated opponents, all rated R_u . This could then be mixed into the cumulative calculation.

SR

I don't understand.

10.31 Where a player's first result(s) is less than 1401, or the FIDE rating floor at the time of the event, the result(s) is ignored.

Comment/proposal by MM

Is this OK? If a player thinks he will get a low initial rating, it is better to lose on purpose to avoid bad initial rating. Use "floor", no exact figures, the same figures not 1400 and 1401, as it is now.

NF

I think the current rule is correct. If a beginner loses his first twenty competitive games these should not hang around his neck forever. As he improves, he could correct the damage once he was on the rating list, but he will never get on it.

For clarification, once an unrated player has achieved a rated result, a subsequent R_u below 1400 is NOT ignored – generally this is $R_c - 735$. Is this the intention?

SR

It was intended. The albatross rule is a good one. The only occasion where it is odd is where an unrated player has several tournaments in the same rating period. Thus $1200 \times 5 + 1500 \times 5 + 1440 \times 5$ leads to 1470×10 .

10.32 R_n for the FIDE Rating list (FRL) is rounded off to the nearest 1 or zero.

10.33 Only $R_n \geq 1401$, or the FIDE rating floor at the time of the event, are considered.

Comment/proposal by MM

Use "floor", no exact figures, the same figures not 1400 and 1401, as it is now.

10.4 If an unrated player receives a published rating before a particular tournament in which he has played is rated, then he is rated as a rated player with his current rating, but in the rating of his opponents he is counted as an unrated player.

10.5 Determining the rating change for a rated player:

Comment/proposal by Stewart Reuben

10.51 For unrated players, R_u as determined in 10.22 is used. In Swisses, R_u is not used to determine ratings of other unrated players.

10.52 For each game played against a rated player, determine the difference in rating between the player and his opponent, D . A difference in rating of more than 350 points shall be counted for rating purposes as though it were a difference of 350 points (compare 10.55).

SR

The purpose of this rule is now purely social, not statistical, due to each game being rated separately. It encourages higher rated players to be willing to play against much lower rated opponents. It could be changed to 400 points or deleted if that is what is wanted. There is a similar rule in the Title regs and these should coincide.

10.51. For each game played against a rated player, determine the difference in rating between the player and his opponent, D .

A difference in rating of more than 350 points shall be counted for rating purposes as though it were a difference of 350 points (compare 10.54).

Comment/proposal by MM

Increase it to 400 or remove the limit totally.

NF

This is tricky. Prof. Elo believed that his formula is fair even for games between badly matched opponents, but strong players evidently do not agree, perhaps this is a "risk-adjusted" assessment. If we remove the limit they will certainly refuse to play in mixed rated events (such as the Bermuda Open!). Personally I think a 400 maximum can be justified, but I am not a strong player.

(a) Use table B.02.10.1 (b) to determine the player's score probability PD .

(b) $\Delta R = \text{score} - PD$. For each game, the score is 1, 0.5 or 0.

(c) $\Sigma \Delta R \times K =$ the Rating Change for a given tournament, or Rating period.

10.52. K is the development coefficient.

$K = 25$ for a player new to the rating list until he has completed events with a total of at least 30 games.

$K = 15$ as long as a player's rating remains under 2400.

$K = 10$ once a player's published rating has reached 2400, and he has also completed events with a total of at least 30 games. Thereafter it remains permanently at 10.

There is some confusion about when the K is changed, there have been cases where player has had erroneously games rated, resulting his K to be changed, the correction has been difficult. The wording does not clearly say whether the coefficient changes in the middle of a period, or only after the rating has been published.

Comment/proposal by Stewart Reuben

Varying K is currently under review.

Comment/proposal by MM

Minimum K should be 20 (see Elo's theoretical document), K should be dependent of the number of games the player has played (Elo's theory). K could be dependent on the rating at the start of the tournament.

K may vary based on playing speed, see comment after 1.1.

10.53 R_n is rounded off to the nearest 1 or 0

Comment/proposal by Stewart Reuben

10.54 Scheveningen tournaments/matches are not rated if more than one unrated player participates.

Comment/proposal by MM

This is already in 6.4

10.54. Determining the Ratings in a round-robin tournament.

Where unrated players take part, their ratings are determined by a process of iteration. These new ratings are then used to determine the rating change for the rated players.

Comment/proposal by Stewart Reuben

10.55a Where this is the first event for an unrated player who scores 0 or ½, then the results of this player are ignored.

Comment/proposal by MM

See my comment in 6.1.

What follows shows the methodology.

Comment/proposal by MM

The example assumes that iteration is still used.

player	Rate	W	p	dp	Rc	Ru	Rc new	Ru new	D	PD	We	Kchg
A	2600	8	.89	351	2320		2336		234	.79	7.11	+8.9
B	2500	7	.78	220	2331		2354		156	.71	6.39	+6.1
C	U	7			2348	2411	2351	2414				
D	2400	6	.67	125	2342		2344		56	.58	5.22	+7.8
E	U	6			2348	2386	2348	2386				
F	2150	4	.44	-43	2370		2359		-209	.23	2.07	+28.95
G	2300	3	.33	-125	2353		2353		-53	.43	3.87	-13.05
H	U	2			2348	2150	2337	2139				
I	U	1			2348	2032	2305	1989				
J	2300	1	.11	-351	2353		2353		-53	.43	3.87	-43.05

$R_{ar} = 2600 + 2500 + 2400 + 2150 + 2300 + 2300$ divided by 6

$R_{ar} = 2375$

$d_{pa} = 351 + 220 + 125 - 43 - 125 - 351$ divided by 6

$d_{pa} = 29.5$

$R_a = 2375 - 29.5 \times 9/10$

$R_a = 2348$

For Player C $R_u = 2348 + 5 \times 12.5 = 2411$

For Player E $R_u = 2348 + 3 \times 12.5 = 2386$

For Player H $R_u = 2348 - 220 \times 0.9 = 2150$

For Player I $R_u = 2348 - 351 \times 0.9 = 2032$

However, Player I is more than 350 points below players A, B, C, D, E.
Player H is more than 350 points below A.

Player C, I	counts as 2061.2061-2032=29.29/9=3	Rc(new)=	2351
Player E, I	counts as 2036	Rc(new)=	2348
Player H, A	counts as 2500	Rc(new)=	2337
Player I, A, B, C, D, E,	counts as 2382	Rc(new)=	2305

Then the ΔR for each of the rated players for each game is determined using R_u (new) as if an established rating.

NF

While the above example is well-known and highly instructive, I have never felt that it really belongs in the Regulations. The comments which follow certainly do not.

SR

I feel the whole thing I valuable. People become very confused without a worked example. I am by no means certain that is still the system due to individual games being rated.

MM

Maybe the example should not be a part of the regulations, although it does not harm.

F was a poor choice of player for the tournament. He dragged down the average rating too much. If a player rated 2380 or higher had replaced him, C would achieve a better rating even with one point less.

This is because, for unrated players with plus scores the average rating of the field is extremely important. Had I's expected score been so poor, he should not have been chosen, everybody suffered.

11.0 Reporting Procedures

11.1 Results should be submitted as in B.01.7. Article 7.2 is ignored where irrelevant.

Comment/proposal by MM

The article refers to a non-existing article in B.01.

See my earlier comments on dead lines.

11.2 The principal information to be reported for a round robin tournament can be found on the FIDE website. It consists of:

11.21 Identification of the event, including exact dates of beginning and end.

11.22 Specification of the time limit.

11.23 The complete cross-table. This must list the players in final rank order, together with full first names, titles, federation affiliation and rating. Any change from that appearing on the current FRL, such as a change in name following marriage, must be carefully annotated. For each player, his results against each opponent must be given as 1, 1/2 (or 0.5) or 0. Any result arising from an unplayed game shall be marked with "+", "-" or "=" where a full point, zero or half a point have been awarded respectively. An explanation must be given where appropriate. Any unusual circumstances in the event must also be described.

Comment/proposal by Michal Krasenkov

Add articles

"11.24 For events mentioned in 2.3 – a link to the website with the games played in the event."

"11.25 For events mentioned in 2.3 – evidence of the tournament (posters, newspaper paragraphs etc; in electronic format – scans, links to articles on the web etc.)."

This is to comply with my proposal on 2.3 and B.01 Art.1.4 (see above).

11.3 The principal information to be reported for a Swiss or team tournament is conveniently grouped on forms 2 and 3, to be found in the FIDE Handbook or on the web site. It consists of the material listed in 11.2. and also the colour played in a given game. A full cross-table of the event must also be included.

11.31 Alternatively a computer generated table can be submitted as a rating report. This must show R_{ar} , n and W . For unrated players where n is less than 3, zero should be entered in the R_{ar} column.

A column for $W-W_e$ should also be included (i.e. the rating increment before application of K). For an unrated player who meets at least 3 rated opponents, his R_u should be given even if this is less than 1601.

Comment/proposal by MM

Use the floor, now 1400.

A federation wishing to submit results in this form should consult the Rating Administrator beforehand so that there can be test runs of the program.

NF
So far as I can see, 11.1 to 11.3 are now meaningless. We just need to say that full information should be supplied as required by FRS.

11.4 Results of all international competitions must be submitted for rating unless the original invitations have made it clear the event was not to be FIDE rated. The chief arbiter must also announce this to the players before the tournament starts.

NF
What is an international competition? Any event in which players from more than one federation take part?

SR
I think anything that is announced as FIDE Rated is international. We could delete 11.4 as well.

11.5 Each national federation shall designate an official to coordinate and expedite qualification and rating matters. His name and details must be given to the FIDE Secretariat.

12.0 Monitoring the Operation of the Rating System

12.1 One of the functions of Congress is to establish the policies under which FIDE titles and ratings are awarded. The function of the rating system is to produce scientific measurement information of the best statistical quality to enable Congress to award equal titles for equal proficiencies of players. Thus the rating system must be properly scientifically maintained and adjusted on both a short and long term basis.

12.2 The rating scale is arbitrary and open ended. Thus only differences in ratings have any statistical significance in terms of probability. Thus if the composition of the FIDE Rating pool were to change, the rating scale could drift with respect to the true proficiency of the players. It is a major objective to ensure the integrity of the system so that ratings of the same value from year to year represent the same proficiency of play.

NF

12.2 is no more than a pious hope. A constant upward drift in FIDE ratings is clear, and it is impossible to define "the same proficiency of play".

SR

There is clear evidence that this is untrue. It is much easier to become a strong player now. There is nothing terribly wrong with pious hopes anyway!

12.3 Part of the responsibilities of the Rating System Administrator is to detect any drift in the rating scale.

13.0 The requirements for the FIDE Rating System Administrator

13.1 A sufficient knowledge of statistical probability theory as it applies to measurements in the physical and behavioural sciences.

13.2 Ability to design the surveys described under 12.3.; to interpret the results of the surveys; and to recommend the Qualification Commission whatever measures are needed to preserve the integrity of the rating system.

13.3 To be able to advise and assist any FIDE member federation in the establishment of a national rating system

13.4 To display a level of objectivity comparable to that of an FIDE Arbiter.

SR

Is 13.1-4 this followed?

14.0 Some comments on the Rating system

14.1 The following formula gives a close approximation to tables 10.1a/b.

$P = 1/(1 + 10^{-[D/400]})$. However the tables are used as shown.

.SR Is there any point to this anymore?

14.2 Tables 10.1a/b are used precisely as shown, no extrapolations are made to establish a third significant figure.

14.3 K is used as a stabilising influence in the system. When K = 10, the rating turns over in approximately 75 games, K = 15, 50 games, K = 25 it is 30 games.

14.4 The system has been devised to enable players to verify their ratings readily.

15.0 Rapid Ratings

- a. Players who have reached a minimum ELO of 1600 shall be rated under the rapid rating list.
- b. The value of the K factor shall be determined by the rating administrator.
- c. To differentiate the ratings from rapid chess games from ratings obtained from normal chess games, the ratings from rapid games shall be denoted by the first 3 digits.

Comment/proposal by Stewart Reuben

The regulations for this type of chess are under review currently.

Comment/proposal by MM

See my comment in 1.1.

16.0 Inclusion in the Rating Lists.

- 16.1 To be included in the FRL or FIDE Rapidplay Rating list, a player must be a member of national chess federation which is a member of FIDE. That is, the federation must not be temporarily or permanently excluded from membership.
- 16.2 It is the responsibility of national federations to inform FIDE if players should not be included in the FRL, FRRL.
- 16.3 Any player excluded either from rating list because he is unable to obtain membership of a national federation, may apply to FIDE for special dispensation to be included.