Technical Commission

2025 FIDE Congress

Technical Commission Annual Report

Author: Technical Commission

Document type	Report
Subject of Report	2025 FIDE Congress, Technical Commission Annual Report
Document version	1.1
Date	27 November 2025

Contents

1. Introduction

The FIDE Technical Commission (TEC) is responsible for the development, maintenance and practical implementation of FIDE's technical standards – including the regulations for pairing systems and tie-breaks, the specifications for chess equipment, and the processes for the compliance, approval and endorsement of products used in FIDE-rated events. Following the integration of the former SPP Commission, TEC now serves as the central hub for all such technical matters, ensuring that the standards applied in top-level events are also available and usable in every FIDE tournament worldwide.

This Annual Report provides an overview of TEC's internal organisation, its meeting and communication structure, the budgetary tools needed to support its work, and the wide range of activities undertaken during the period since the 2024 Congress. It summarises ongoing and completed projects, endorsements and enquiries; summarises the main outcomes of the 2025 TEC Annual Meeting in Durres; and highlights those areas where further development and collaboration with other FIDE Commissions and external experts will be required in the coming year.

2. Internal Organization and Responsibilities

The FIDE Technical Commission (TEC) operates with a clear organizational structure, designed to ensure that each area of responsibility is managed by qualified individuals. The commission consists of 22 members, including the chairman, honorary chairman, secretary, councillors, and general members.

No.	Position	Surname	Name	Federation
1	Chair	Georgescu	Tiberiu	Romania
2	Honorary Chair	Filipowicz	Andrzej	Poland
3	Secretary	Du Toit	Hendrik	South Africa
4	Councilor	Ricca	Roberto	Italy
5	Councilor	Brustman	Agnieszka	Poland
6	Councilor	Pahlevanzadeh	Mehrdad	Iran
7	Councilor	Al Taher	Sultan Ali	UAE
8	Member	Akkour	Abdelfattah	Morocco
9	Member	Oen	Grant	USA
10	Member	Ni	Hua	China

11	Member	Nicula	Dinu-Ioan	Romania
12	Member	Prohorov	Olexandr	Ukraine
13	Member	Burstein	Almog	Israel
14	Member	Keles	Askin	Turkey
15	Member	Arasu	B.	India
16	Member	Milvang	Otto	Norway
17	Member	Mushaninga	Fungirayiini	Zimbabwe
18	Member	Held	Mario	Italy
19	Member	Nepando	Jolly	Namibia
20	Member	Karali	Tania	Greece
21	Member	Smith	Russell	Trinidad & Tobago
22	Member	Abramov	Sergey	Russia

The key internal organization is structured as follows:

- Chairman: Tiberiu Georgescu (Romania)
- Honorary Chair: Andrzej Filipowicz (Poland)
- Secretary: Hendrik du Toit (South Africa)
- Councillors: Roberto Ricca, Agnieszka Brustman, Mehrdad Pahlevanzadeh, Sultan Ali Al Taher
- Members: The TEC includes representatives from several federations around the world, each responsible for different facets of chess equipment and technical processes.

The commission is further divided into workgroups responsible for specific areas such as pairing regulations, board and piece standards, and digital transformation efforts. Each workgroup is headed by a department leader and tasked with executing projects and initiatives related to their area of focus:

Department Heads:

- SPP: Roberto Ricca (Italy)
- Critical TEC: Marion Held (Italy)
- Support TEC: Mushaninga Fungirayiini (Zimbabwe)
- Development TEC: Arasu B. (India)

- Marketing & Communication: Tania Karali (Greece)

TEC are also blessed with experts that are willing to assist with their expertise and knowledge:

Subject Specialists

- Tie breaks and Software Otto Milvang (Norway)
- SPP Pierre Dénommée
- SPP Jose De Jesus Garcia Ruvalcaba

In addition, the TEC implemented internal management procedures to ensure smooth operations, including frequent meetings and updates. The Management Board, comprising the chairman, honorary chair, and secretary, oversees the strategic direction of the commission and ensures that its projects align with FIDE's overall objectives. Furthermore, the Management Board meets biweekly, while department and workgroup meetings occur as needed to manage ongoing projects and endorsements.

This internal organization allows the TEC to efficiently handle multiple projects simultaneously while maintaining accountability and transparency in its decision-making processes.

3. Meetings & Communications

The FIDE Technical Commission management board has been diligently meeting every two weeks to ensure the continuous progress of its tasks and projects. Since the last report on November 2024 period, the board has convened 34 times, with each meeting lasting approximately two hours and typically held in the evening. These regular sessions reflect the commitment of the board members, many of whom have made personal sacrifices by dedicating their private time to FIDE's technical activities.

The commission acknowledges the hard work and dedication of its members, expressing gratitude for their continued contributions to the organization's objectives.

4. Budget

The 2025 Budget Proposal and Request submitted by the FIDE Technical Commission outlines the necessary funding for various software tools that are essential for managing and improving FIDE's technical projects, including endorsement processes, tie-break systems, and other tournament management functionalities.

4.1 Funding Request Overview

The TEC is requesting funding to cover annual licenses for several tools that are crucial for maintaining and improving the infrastructure supporting FIDE's technical projects. These tools include:

- GitHub Team: Version control and collaboration
- Cognito: Facilitate the online endorsement and acceptance security and user authentication
- Make: Automating workflows and integrating various services

4.2 Justification for the Tools

The requested tools are essential for ensuring that the Technical Commission can efficiently manage projects, collaborate with developers, and maintain secure, reliable systems. These systems will enhance the organization of tournaments, manage endorsements, and support ongoing development projects.

5. General Activities in Progress

5.1 FIDE-00113 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Proposal against cheaters during seminars

5.1.1 Summary

Ivan Syrovy, Chairman of the FIDE Arbiters' Commission, invites chairs and secretaries of FIDE commissions to nominate members for a working group tasked with developing a proposal for preventing cheating in online FIDE Arbiters and International Arbiters seminars. The group, open to lecturers, IT specialists, and teaching professionals, will collect real-world cheating cases (e.g., remote assistance or AI use) and recommend practical detection and prevention measures. Interested participants should respond by June 25th.

5.1.2 IA Arasu B appointment as TEC rep

5.2 FIDE-00132 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Arbiters Manual 2026

5.2.1 Summary:

Ivan Syrovy (Chair, FIDE Arbiters' Commission) requests support from all FIDE Commissions to prepare the Arbiters Manual 2026. The goal is to present a printed edition at the Chess Olympiad in Samarkand, Uzbekistan, with copies for Congress voting members, Olympiad arbiters and Fair Play teams,

commissions, and authors.

Since there are few regulation changes from 2025, the 2026 edition will focus on adding clarifying commentary/explanations.

Commissions are asked to nominate contributors and submit proposals.

5.2.2 Designated: IA Mario Held, IA Roberto Ricca and IA Arasu B.

6. Completed Activities

6.1 FIDE-00104 | TEC | Planning | 2025 Annual Meeting

6.1.1 The in-person meeting of the FIDE Technical Commission (TEC) was held in Durres during the World Youth U18 Championship (9–13 October 2025). The meeting handled the significantly increased workload since TEC absorbed the SPP Commission, and discussed complex topics (notably product certification, endorsement processes, and major technical projects on tie-breaks and pairing systems) face-to-face.

6.1.2 See 15.Annexure A - 2025 TEC Annual Meeting Minutes

7. Completed Endorsements

7.1 FIDE-00097 | TEC | Endorsement | Chess table

7.1.1 Summary:

The vendor reached out on behalf of a woodworking company in Connecticut, United States. They are looking to partner with FIDE to launch a new chess table product.

7.1.2 Conclusion:

TEC provided several options; however, no response has been received to date.

8. Endorsements in Progress

8.1 FIDE-00076 | TEC | Endorsement | idChess

8.1.1 Summary:

The vendor requested that FIDE TEC convene a Technical Commission in June to review the recent updates to the idChess platform, following TEC's earlier recommendations. He highlighted the current 2200 rating limit for using idChess

in tournaments and emphasized that, once the recommended improvements are verified, this restriction should be lifted. A presentation summarizing the status of each recommendation is attached. idChess requests a prompt review, estimating it will take no more than a week, and is prepared to provide any additional materials or support needed during verification.

8.1.2 Recommendation report will be submitted to Fide Management Board by 7 December 2025.

8.2 FIDE-00099 | TEC | Endorsement | SenseRobot AI Chess Robot

8.2.1 Summary:

SenseRobot is an AI-powered chess robot developed by SenseRobot Chess, designed to enhance the chess-playing experience through robotics and artificial intelligence. The robot is aimed at both casual players and competitive chess enthusiasts, offering features such as automated gameplay, training capabilities, and interactive chess matches. The product has already gained traction, with over 100,000 similar units shipped worldwide for other board games such as Chinese Chess and Go. The international version of SenseRobot is scheduled for release in April 2025, with crowdfunding campaigns currently active on Indiegogo and Kickstarter. The company seeks FIDE certification for the robot to strengthen its credibility within the chess community and assure backers of its compliance with chess standards. The team is prepared to demonstrate prototypes and provide relevant documentation for review.

8.2.2 FMB raised concerns with regards to children operating the equipment. Made a proposal to SenseRobot to define restrictions in marketing material.

8.2.3 A response from SenseRobot is currently pending.

9. “Parked” Endorsements

9.1 FIDE-00039 | TEC | Endorsement | SCF Chess Clock Development

9.1.1 Summary:

The representative of the Swiss Chess Federation’s Arbiters’ Commission is seeking guidance from FIDE TEC on the approval or recommendation of a new Swiss-made chess clock. The inquiry covers several points: the approval process and expected timeline, whether prototypes may be used in FIDE-rated events, whether an endorsement would allow the use of the FIDE logo, and a series of technical and UX requirements (including flag behavior at time control, rounding

at 0:00, display formatting for hours/minutes/seconds, switching to mm:ss under 10 minutes, and general best practices for clock design). There is also a request for recommendations on accessibility features, such as Bluetooth headset cues for visually impaired players. The representative is open to receiving answers directly or being referred to the appropriate specialist within TEC.

9.1.2 Subject to endorsement process being published. Target date is 1 January 2026

9.2 FIDE-00042 | TEC | Endorsement | A&A Chess Sets

9.2.1 Summary:

The Vendor requested guidance on obtaining FIDE Endorsed Equipment status for their chess product line. They state the equipment complies with FIDE requirements, has been thoroughly tested, and they can supply specs and documentation. They understand endorsement permits use of the FIDE logo and seek the steps, requirements, and process details to proceed.

9.2.2 Subject to endorsement process being published. Target date is 1 January 2026

9.3 FIDE-00062 | TEC | Endorsement | Champion Swiss – Cabrera

9.3.1 Summary

The representative follows up on a previous request for the review and endorsement of the Champion Swiss pairing software, submitted to FIDE on January 7, 2025. They initially contacted the Pairing Software and Systems Committee (SPPC) in December 2024, but were advised to contact FIDE directly. They are seeking confirmation of receipt and guidance on the next steps for the evaluation process. They also provided details about the software's functionality and compliance with FIDE guidelines and expressed willingness to provide further information if needed.

9.3.2 Subject to endorsement process being published. Target date is 1 January 2026

9.4 FIDE-00078 | TEC | Endorsement | Junsd Chess Clock

9.4.1 Summary:

The vendor from Shenzhen JUNSD (a chess-clock manufacturer since 1995) inquired about the procedure for obtaining FIDE approval or certification for their clocks. They had contacted FIDE in 2019 but haven’t completed the final report (for reasons unknown). JUNSD indicated that they had since released additional models sold in multiple countries and were prepared to provide

samples, documentation, and to cover any audit fees. They included product materials (such as photos) and their website, asking for FIDE's guidance and support regarding the application process.

9.4.2 Subject to endorsement process being published. Target date is 1 January 2026

9.5 FIDE-00093 | TEC | Endorsement | CHESSpress - Tomasz Bittel

9.5.1 Summary:

A representative of CHESSpress informed FIDE that the company was approaching the final testing phase of its tournament management software, which is being developed in alignment with FIDE regulations. They sought certification for the software as well as authorization to integrate player ranking data from the FIDE website to enable real-time tournament updates. They also noted that the platform incorporates AI-based enhancements. The company requested guidance on the steps needed to obtain permission for using the ranking data and to begin the certification process, and expressed openness to further collaboration or inquiries.

9.5.2 Subject to endorsement process being published. Target date is 1 January 2026

9.6 FIDE-00098 | TEC | Endorsement | Notationary

9.6.1 Summary:

Notationary is an AI-driven web application that digitizes and analyzes handwritten chess notation. It uses OCR technology to interpret handwritten scoresheets, produces PGN files, offers real-time AI analysis powered by Stockfish, and connects to a chess database for study and preparation. The representative requested an opportunity to present Notationary via Google Meet and is seeking feedback or potential collaboration with FIDE TEC. However, the exact objective of the demonstration—whether endorsement, approval, or general input—was not clearly specified.

9.6.2 Subject to endorsement process being published. Target date is 1 January 2026

9.7 FIDE-00103 | TEC | Endorsement | PMChess – Ali Dehghani

9.7.1 Summary:

The CEO of Fanavaran Parsamehr Bushehr requests FIDE endorsement for a hybrid chess tournament management platform that supports both online and over-the-board play. The software claims:

Compliance with FIDE standards, real-time monitoring and fair-play detection, full player management, and result reporting.

Successful test events already conducted; team is confident it meets requirements for FIDE-approved hybrid events.

They ask FIDE for:

1. Guidance on the endorsement process,
2. Technical/regulatory criteria for approval, and
3. Any additional documentation/procedures needed.

9.7.2 Subject to endorsement process being published. Target date is 1 January 2026

10. Projects Completed

10.1 FIDE-00040 | TEC | Projects | TRF Revision

10.1.1 Summary

- Why update TRF16: Modern tournaments (rapid, hybrid, online) and varied tie-breaks/pairings aren't clearly covered, creating inconsistent reporting.
- Team events support: New format standardizes team-specific needs (partial lineups, board order changes, forfeits, complex tie-breaks).
- Real-time data (ITDX): Defines mandatory fields/structures so pairing engines, broadcast, and rating systems can exchange data during events—not just after.
- Clarity & uniformity: Removes ambiguities (e.g., special byes, partial results) to ensure consistent implementations across FIDE events.
- Future-proofing: Adds record types (prohibited pairings, acceleration, nonstandard scoring) to accommodate new formats/tech without ad-hoc patches.

10.1.2 Approved by FMB - 2025-05-12

10.2 FIDE-00124 | TEC | Projects | Clarification and Potential Adjustment of Team Pairing System (C.04.6)

10.2.1 Summary

There is an inconsistency in the team pairing system (C.04.6) due to changes made in the latest version. Specifically, the rules around the assignment and modification of TPN (Team Pairing Numbers) seem contradictory. Article 1.1.2

states that the Chief Arbiter makes decisions on TPN assignment, overriding certain rules, while Article 1.1.3 suggests that once defined, the TPN should remain fixed, unless the Chief Arbiter decides otherwise. This creates a conflict since the system initially allowed overriding Article 2 and now contradicts itself in terms of flexibility. Additionally, the restructuring of articles from two separate ones to a combined version caused further confusion. Minor inaccuracies also remain that could be addressed with an update.

10.2.2 Approved by FMB - CM3-2025/17

10.3 FIDE-00105 | TEC | Projects | 2025 C.04 Amendments

10.3.1 Summary:

While the number of changes may seem extensive at first glance, the actual pairing rules remain unchanged - aside from clarifying two potential ambiguities in the FIDE (Dutch) rules and correcting an error in the Burstein rules. More significant changes are found in Sections C.04.1 and especially C.04.2. In C.04.1, the key modification allows a pairing system to make exceptions to the "three-peat" colour rule in any round. This adjustment supports Team Pairing and Double Swiss systems but does not affect standard tournament operations, as pairing systems remain under TEC's jurisdiction. The revisions in C.04.2 are more substantial. This section has always been a shared responsibility (for instance, C.04.2.1 was developed in collaboration with QC and is arguably more within their domain than ours). The section has been slightly reorganized, with some articles relocated. Our aim was to consolidate the pairing rules under C.04.2.2 and C.04.2.3 (TEC's responsibility) while keeping the so-called Competition Rules in C.04.2.4. This serves as a preparatory step for their eventual migration to the actual Competition Rules (C.05).

A new pairing system "Double Swiss" was added to manage tournaments where players play two games per round against each other, alternating colours (Section C.04.5).

10.3.2 Approved by FMB - CM3-2025/17

11. Projects in Progress

11.1 FIDE-00030 TEC Projects Endorsement Processes

11.1.1 Summary:

The FIDE SPP Commission was incorporated into the FIDE Technical

Commission. Inevitably, the responsibilities of both commissions are scattered across various sections of the FIDE Handbook. To address this anomaly and other related issues, the FIDE Technical Commission has undertaken the following initiatives:

- Streamline and clarify the endorsement process for chess equipment.

- Address the outdated and unclear sections in the handbook that currently fail to adequately guide the processes of Compliance, Approval, and Endorsement.

This document outlines the proposed changes as part of the "restructuring" initiative. It serves as a guide and functions as the "Table of Changes" or, more precisely, a record of modifications. Additionally, it introduces the FIDE Technical Commission Manual, commonly referred to as the TEC Manual. Submitted to FMB

11.2 FIDE-00088 | TEC | Projects | FIDE Duch Rules

11.2.1 Under review

11.2.2 In the publication workflow for the TEC website

11.3 FIDE-00090 | TEC | Projects | Team Pairing System

11.3.1 Under review

11.3.2 In the publication workflow for the TEC website

11.4 FIDE-00119 | TEC | Projects | FIDE Olympiad for People with Disabilities Ranking

11.4.1 Summary

In response to a FIDE Management Board request, the Technical Commission (TEC) has reviewed the “Rankings” applied at the 2023 FIDE Olympiad for People with Disabilities. Our evaluation identified two principal areas for improvement:

- Standardization of Tie-Breaks: We recommend enumerating only the C.07-approved tie-break methods by their official codes, with cross-references to the full regulations.
- Elimination of Non-Standard Procedures: Any methods not defined in C.07—or those that are redundant—should be omitted to ensure consistency and software compatibility.

TEC was tasked with proposing a revised “Rankings” framework for future

"People with Disabilities Olympiads."

11.5 FIDE-00123 | TEC | Projects | Add default time controls to specifications

11.5.1 Summary

During the scrutiny of the C.02 documents in "General Rules and Technical Recommendations for Tournaments" by the commissions, we received two requests to add default time controls to the specification for clocks.

1. Increasingly common time limits in FIDE events:
    a. 45+10 (rapid)
    b. 45+30 (standard)
2. FIDE World Championship and Candidates
    a. 120 minutes for the first 40 moves, followed by 30 minutes for the rest of the game with an increment of 30 seconds per move starting from move 41

11.5.2 Consult GSC and EVE on the long-term viability of these time controls.

11.5.3 A study is conducting on how does the 45+30 experiment impact this.

11.6 FIDE-00125 | TEC | Projects | Display minimum number of moves on scoresheet.

11.6.1 Summary

During the scrutiny of the C.02 documents in "General Rules and Technical Recommendations for Tournaments" by the commissions, we received a request to display a minimum number of moves on the scoresheet.

11.6.2 Consulting with relevant commissions

11.7 FIDE-00137 | TEC | Projects | Management of individual prizes in team competitions

11.7.1 Summary

A new, dedicated section was added to the Tie-Break (TB) regulations to govern individual prizes in team events ("medals"). We suggest:

Include the current Olympiad criterion (the main/only one used there) plus at least one rating-free equivalent to TPR (the long-standing goal).

Define additional candidate criteria (to refine/replace or supplement existing practice):

(a) Number of games played OTB (optionally counting forfeits).

(b) Valid Presence (VP, with threshold X) — a binary check (e.g., ≥70% of rounds as default).

(c) Performance (TPR or PTP), applied only if VP is satisfied; optional cuts.

(d) Average tied to a common TB (e.g., Buchholz/Sonneborn-Berger) if missed games aren't already treated as unplayed.

(e) Team Placement effect (players from better-placed teams ranked ahead/behind).

(f) VP + TPR-equivalent — highlighted as most important since it avoids rating unreliability and works at all levels.

Timing: He supports adding the section once (f) is finalized. This returns to the earlier objective discussed in Golem and TSPP:1037/1038—developing a robust rating-independent TPR equivalent—and calls for making good on that earlier commitment.

11.8 FIDE-00145 | TEC | Projects | Probability for the outcome of a chess game based on rating

11.8.1 Summary:

Tournament simulations are powerful tools to explore the properties of pairing systems and tiebreaks. In 2015 I wrote "Probability for the outcome of a chess game based on rating" [1] which was a statistical analysis of 53 305 tournaments between 2010 and 2014. A remarkable observation is that the probability for the outcome of a chess game based on rating did not follow the probability given in the rating regulation in FIDE handbook [2], in tables 8.1.

In 2023 FIDE Qualification Commission did an analysis of the rating system, and built on Jeff Sonas proposal [3], the entire rating system was compressed 1. March 2024. This means that after the compression the expected score for a player meeting another player shall match the tables in FIDE handbook.

11.8.2 See https://tec.fide.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/Statistical_model_for_chess_tournament_simulations.pdf

12. Projects “Parked”

12.1 FIDE-00032 | TEC | Projects | Tournament Entry Portal

12.1.1 Summary:

The Tournament Entry Portal represents a pivotal initiative by the International Chess Federation (FIDE) to modernize and streamline the process of tournament entry and management. This digital transformation aims to replace the current manual and disparate systems with an integrated, efficient, and user-friendly online platform. The project is motivated by the need to address existing challenges in tournament organization, enhance the experience for players and organizers, and align with FIDE’s strategic objectives of promoting chess globally through the adoption of modern technology.

12.2 FIDE-00067 | TEC | Projects | Hilton Pairing System – Alex Holowczak

12.2.1 Summary:

It was shared with us background and use-cases for the “Hilton Pairing System,” a team format where different boards face different opponents each round—useful for one-day events with many teams. The system relies on pre-computed pairings defined by three parameters: number of teams (t), players per team (p), and rounds (r); teams pick a letter at the start to map onto those pairings, and most game points wins. A key constraint is that p should be even (odd t and p together cause byes). He cites UK examples:

(1) Birmingham League three-way playoffs (t=3, p=6, r=1),

(2) 4NCL triangular matches to avoid byes on odd-team weekends (t=3, p=6, r=2)—accepting color imbalance (e.g., 4W–2B), and

(3) EPSCA county championships for juniors (typically t variable, p=20, r=3; moving toward p=12 and r=4–5).

was suggested that FIDE consider endorsing the system to promote accurate software implementations and reduce reliance on complex manual spreadsheets.

13. Completed Enquiries & Proposals

13.1 FIDE-00053 | TEC | Projects | Valuation of Tie-breaks and Pairing Systems

13.1.1 Summary:

The Valuation of Tie-breaks and Pairing Systems project is focused on developing tools that will allow FIDE to evaluate and compare the effectiveness of different pairing systems and tie-break methods used in chess tournaments.

Project Brief

This project is particularly challenging due to its technical nature. The goal is to create tools or frameworks that can systematically compare various pairing systems and tie-break mechanisms, which are integral to determining tournament rankings. Initial discussions were held with a university researcher in Rome, but progress has stalled. The Technical Commission has expressed a desire to explore alternative routes, such as hiring external experts or finding a contractor to develop the tools. This approach is viewed as potentially more productive than relying on internal commission members who have not contributed significantly.

Framework for FIDE Approval

A framework to request FIDE's approval for this project has been completed. The next step involves presenting this framework for consideration and formal approval from the FIDE Management Board. Define the need and the objective.

13.2 FIDE-00075 | TEC | Proposals | Improving rules and algorithm for Swiss System - Eduard Dryer

13.2.1 Summary:

The proposal to improve the rules and algorithm of the Swiss System aims to address certain inefficiencies and fairness issues in the current Swiss pairing system used in chess tournaments. The project is ongoing, with a focus on refining the rules to ensure fairer outcomes and reduce predictable pairings in the early rounds of tournaments

1. Ongoing Debate

   Discussions are still underway within the Technical Commission, focusing on the merits and challenges of proposed changes. The debate centres around the impact of the suggested algorithm modifications on tournament dynamics and the overall player experience.

2. Proposal Overview

The proposal suggests the following key improvements to the Swiss System:

- Proposal 1: Awarding 0.5 points for unpaired players, instead of the current 1 point, to avoid unfair advantages and anomalies in tournaments with an odd number of participants.
- Proposal 2: Introducing an additional draw option for the first and second rounds to reduce large disparities in player ratings. This adjustment aims to ensure fairer matchups by pairing players more evenly in the early stages of a tournament.

13.3 FIDE-00095 | TEC | ENQUIRY | ChessNoteR Reassignment

13.3.1 Summary

An Australian National Arbiter, owns two ChessNoter digital notation devices and is seeking clarification on their use. He inquires whether it is legal under FIDE regulations for his children to use these registered devices to record their game notations, despite the devices being registered under his and Casey Goh's FIDE IDs. Since Australian arbiters may not have clarity on the ruling for digital notation devices, he is considering reaching out to the FIDE Technical Commission for approval. The devices in question are old Nexus Android devices with stripped-down software designed solely for chess notation.

13.3.2 Reply Summary

The FIDE Technical Commission clarifies that, under the Laws of Chess and Rules Commission guidance, players may not bring their own electronic scoresheet devices to tournaments. Scoresheets, paper or electronic, must be the organizer's prescribed ones and are considered the organizer's property (Laws 8.1.1 and 8.3). Since adherence to the Laws is required for rating (B.02), privately owned e-scoresheets are generally inadmissible and could jeopardize rating; an arbiter might exceptionally authorize a device at their own risk in minor events, but not in title events. Device ownership/registration (player vs. relative) is irrelevant; any allowance depends on the device's capabilities and compliance, at the arbiter's discretion.

13.4 FIDE-00107 | TEC | ENQUIRY | DGT LiveChess Cloud Format

13.4.1 Summary

We acknowledge the speed advantage of the DGT cloud updates compared to PGN files and seek clarity on its practical use, including whether the format is free and

open for adoption by third-party scripts. PGN remains the standard due to its openness and comprehensive documentation. Further work is needed to define how the DGT cloud format can be adopted and appropriately documented for broader use.

13.5 FIDE-00122 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Improving the Swiss Pairing System

13.5.1 Summary

Wissam Pheng, a recent EPFL graduate in mathematical engineering, has conducted a master's thesis on enhancing the Swiss System of Pairings for chess tournaments. He identifies shortcomings in accurately ranking players beyond first place and has devised two new approaches:

- Poster_New_Pairing_System: minor, statistically supported tweaks shown via simulations
- Report_Pheng_New_Pairing_System: an AI-based system with promising early results that needs further refinement

He offers to present his findings in person at FIDE headquarters (he's based in Lausanne) and is keen to discuss these proposals.

13.5.2 Response Summary

We acknowledge Mr. Pheng's message and forwards it to the FIDE Technical Commission leadership and others who may evaluate it. He cites C.04.1 Article 9 (pairing rules must be transparent and explainable by a human), stressing that any Swiss System improvements must be human-applicable and understandable. Proposals like alternative scoring in early rounds could be of interest; however, pairing methods based on opaque, algorithmic weighted matchings are, for now, outside TEC's scope.

13.5.3 Even the proposal has potential, more depth analysis is necessary

13.6 FIDE-00126 | TEC | ENQUIRY | *Emanuele Canazza Opening*

13.6.1 Summary

A group of chess players reports a proposed new opening line—1.e4 c6 2.d4 d5 3.c3—and requests to name it the Canazza Gambit, after its creator Emanuele Canazza (FIDE ID 23470194). They are seeking confirmation/approval of the name.

13.6.2 Conclusion:

Replied that we do not endorse chess openings.

13.7 FIDE-00127 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Swiss-Manager bug in handling Buchholz Cut-1 with VUR (Article 16.5.1)

13.7.1 Summary

Initial Concern: Possible Swiss-Manager bug in handling Buchholz Cut-1 with VUR (Article 16.5.1).

Clarification: Swiss-Manager is correct; the real problem is with the regulation itself.

Core Issue: Forfeit wins and pairing byes unfairly inflate tie-break scores, yet current rules prevent them from being cut in Cut-1.

Proposed Solutions:

Extend Article 16.5.1 so all unplayed rounds (not just VURs) can be removed by Cut-1.

Eliminate the clause comparing with the “least significant value” to simplify and ensure fairness.

Motivation: Prevent distorted standings in FIDE-rated events, especially scholastic and open tournaments where tie-breaks decide medals/qualifications.

13.7.2 Reply Summary:

An explanation was provided outlining TEC’s rationale for the updated handling of forfeits and byes in tie-break calculations. Statistical analysis indicated that the new approach produces outcomes very similar to previous methods while offering greater simplicity and transparency—ensuring that “what appears on the crosstable is what applies.” Concerns were acknowledged regarding the possibility that early forfeits or PABs may occasionally benefit stronger players; these cases are considered statistical outliers, though their psychological effect is recognized. TEC is examining potential refinements, pending the availability of stronger analytical tools, to ensure that any adjustments do not introduce new forms of unfairness. It was also noted that an alternative proposal had been evaluated previously and rejected because it would disadvantage players who did not choose to receive a forfeit or PAB. The necessity of retaining the rule that

prevents reductions below the least significant unit—particularly for Sonneborn–Berger—was emphasized, as this avoids incentivizing forfeits or absences.

13.8 FIDE-00128 | TEC | ENQUIRY | TRF26 Character Encoding

13.8.1 Summary

The CFC (Chess Federation of Canada) Webmaster, is seeking clarification on the character encoding requirements for the TRF25 file format, as the CFC is considering adopting it for their updated ratings system. He is concerned whether the TRF25 specification supports UTF-8, which can handle non-Latin characters, or if it requires a fixed-byte encoding like ISO-8859-1 or ASCII. He asks if FIDE's back-end systems can handle non-Latin characters, such as Chinese, and accented Latin characters like "é". He requests clarification on which encoding is supported, as it affects file compatibility.

13.8.2 Reply by Commission

Problem: TRF-26 doesn't define what "position" means—byte position vs character position—and doesn't specify the character encoding, making fixed-position fields ambiguous (e.g., "Günter" has 6 characters but variable byte length across encodings).

Current practice: FIDE has effectively accepted UTF-8 for years; FIDE rating server, JaVaFo, Vega, Swiss Manager, etc., handle UTF-8. Tournament Service uses ISO-Latin-1 but outputs FIDE-transliterated names in TRFs.

Constraint with fixed-width TRF: Positional formats work reliably only if all characters are single-byte (or if a variable-length text field is the last field). That's not the current situation, so ambiguity persists.

Two options proposed:

Define UTF-8 in TRF-26 and state that positions are character positions (reject non-UTF-8 files).

Add a mandatory encoding declaration at file start when non-ASCII is used, e.g., `@@@ Encoding: utf-8`, and require readers to process accordingly or error on unsupported encodings.

Recommendation: Option 2 (explicit encoding header), as it is clearer and interoperable.

13.9 FIDE-00130 | TEC | ENQUIRY | International Approval Process for Chess Clock

13.9.1 Summary

A Hungarian company seeks information on how to obtain international approval for its chess clock. They request details on the application form, fees (application and testing), terms and conditions, full application procedure, and the estimated approval timeline, with the intention to apply as soon as possible.

13.9.2 The new regulations are in progress to be published

13.10 FIDE-00131 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Clock Certification Process

13.10.1 Summary

A chess clock manufacturer asked how to obtain FIDE certification for their clocks. They request the steps in the process, the applicable standards/requirements, and the approximate certification costs.

13.10.2 The new regulations are in progress to be published

13.11 FIDE-00133 | TEC | Proposals | Modernize Chess Notation with Technology

13.11.1 Summary:

Mr. Mitesh Honest proposes modernizing chess notation in tournaments by replacing handwritten scoresheets with technology. He suggests using electronic boards or AI sensors to auto-record moves, and issuing players digital tablets or smart pens as official scoresheets (printable and signable afterward), with backups and arbiter oversight. Claimed benefits: fewer errors, saved time, fair and transparent records, and better spectator experience via real-time updates. He advocates a gradual transition to preserve tradition while embracing innovation.

13.11.2 Reply Summary

FIDE's Technical Commission (with the Critical TEC Dept.) appreciated Mr. Honest's proposal to modernize notation. They note FIDE already permits electronic scorekeeping (e.g., Monroi, Clono, ChessNoteR) and is evaluating video-capture systems. However, the choice of paper vs. devices rests with event organizers, who must weigh needs, budget, and reliability. Because secure, fail-safe recording is essential (especially for norm validity) and adds cost,

FIDE supports but cannot mandate electronic systems for all events.

13.12 FIDE-00138 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Dutch Pairing Algorithm - Thomas Tscherrig

13.12.1 Summary

Thomas is about to release a web-based tournament program implementing the latest Dutch pairing and asks

(1) the official process to obtain FIDE approval/certification, and

(2) whether sample tournaments exist to test compliance with the 2026 update.

13.12.2 Reply Summary

A response was provided noting the recently approved C.04 rules, which will take effect on 1 February 2026, together with a link to the corresponding decision document. It was clarified that FIDE does not approve individual “algorithms”; instead, complete Tournament Handler Programs (THPs) will be evaluated under the forthcoming Compliance–Approval–Endorsement (CAE) framework. Web-based THPs will need to be testable in a controlled environment with offline capability (for example, via a virtual machine), following the model used in the COPP endorsement report. Applicable fees will be introduced once the CAE procedures are formally published. For examples of tournaments already implementing the 2026 updates, the inquiry was directed to the appropriate member of the TEC/SPP team.

13.13 FIDE-00140 | TEC | ENQUIRY | TRF16 Rejected

13.13.1 Summary:

Mr. Christer Nilsson reports that a TRF file is being rejected and asks why. The referenced help link doesn’t explain the error, and he can’t find a general TRF test/validation tool on the FIDE site (they use Swiss Manager but want a tool-agnostic checker). He also notes positively that FIDE appears to accept successive TRF submissions containing all played games, which could enable more frequent Elo updates in future. He requests guidance and, ideally, a validator.

13.13.2 Reply Summary

A review of the submitted TRF file indicated that the syntax appeared to be correct. The issue was therefore considered likely to originate from the FIDE rating server rather than from the file format itself, and it was recommended that

the national rating officer be contacted for the precise error message. One possible cause identified was the absence of a FIDE ID or date of birth for one of the players, as unrated players must have a date of birth recorded in the YYYY/MM/DD format. It was also noted earlier that file rejections typically stem from either TRF syntax problems—which can be checked using the TEC tie-break server—or from rating-server validation checks. Special characters in player names may also generate errors. Additional side points were raised regarding a non-functioning link and a separate discussion about the fairpair.se system.

13.14 FIDE-00141 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Time Control Details in TRF26 and PGN Format

13.14.1 Summary:

Mr. Klaus Bärthel inquires whether the time control details requirement in the TRF26 document is the same as the one specified in the PGN format document. He suggests that it would be helpful to mention this in both documents for clarity.

13.14.2 Reply Summary

They are very similar but not identical, PGN lacks a single combined code for cases where White and Black have different time controls, which TRF26 accounts for.

13.15 FIDE-00144 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Buchholz Handling for First-Round Forfeits

13.15.1 Summary

- The sender cites Yerevan Open (link provided) where three top seeds received first-round forfeits (opponents no-show).
- Under prior practice, a first-round forfeit counted as ~4/9 Buchholz in a 9-round event (0 for round 1, then 0.5 per subsequent round).
- They report a new rule (effective Aug 2024) where the Buchholz contribution for the no-show opponent equals the winner's own final score.
- They argue this is illogical and unfair: it grants a free point, rest time, no rating risk, and an inflated tiebreak that can decide prizes.
- Request: revert to the previous method (e.g., 4/9 Buchholz for a 9-round event) and cancel the new interpretation.

13.15.2 Summary Reply

- TEC discussed the “first-round forfeit/bye inflates Buchholz” issue in Albania and agreed on a fix to propose in the next tie-break update (targeted for Feb 1, may slip).
- Interim workaround (allowed by current rules 16.4 and 16.6): for any unplayed round, cap the dummy opponent’s score at **the scheduled opponent’s adjusted score** (for forfeits) or at **half the number of rounds** (for byes).
- Suggest coordinating with Swiss-Manager (Heinz) to add this temporary option so it can be applied immediately.
- Formal rule amendment will follow in the upcoming revision; author is available for clarifications.

14. Enquiries & Proposals in Progress

14.1 FIDE-00111 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Endorsement ChessNoteR N5X

14.1.1 Summary

The sender, previously involved in the endorsement of ChessNoteR N6 and N9, has obtained US Chess certification for the ChessNoteR N5X, a smaller model with a fingerprint sensor running the same OS and software (v2.3.2). They’re seeking FIDE endorsement for the N5X in the same manner. They ask if any further information or assistance is needed.

14.1.2 Reply Summary

• Supervision & Fair-play: Using phone-sized devices is harder for arbiters to monitor; verifying that moves are actually being recorded is more difficult than with larger e-scoresheets.

• Display Size Concern (key theme): Several arbiters find phone screens impractically small, especially for juniors/seniors. Multiple requests to set a minimum screen size; one concrete proposal is ≥ 7 inches.

• Policy & Practicalities:

- Many events forbid players’ own devices; if e-notation is allowed, organizers should provide the device.
- Cost vs paper, potential software freezes/battery failures, and user difficulty cited as risks.

• Battery/Endurance Requirements: Rather than quoting battery capacity, require a standardized “hours of operation from 100% charge” test and publish results.

• Approval Scope (hardware vs software):

- If N6/N9 were endorsed, some see no reason to block a successor; however:
- Concern over endorsing specific old phone models (e.g., Nexus 5/6 are dated). Preference to endorse the software (like Clono) across compliant devices, not a single handset.

• Progressive View: Smaller devices are likely the future; TEC should not stand in the way. Proper usability/accessibility testing is recommended.

• Support Offered: Colleagues with UX/UI and QA experience volunteer to test if given software access.

• Action Requests to TEC:

- Define a minimum display size and resolution
- Specify operational-time endurance testing
- Consider software-centric endorsement (device-agnostic) while maintaining fair-play controls.

Based on the above comments, we request the following to move forward:

1. Testing of the N5X is required.
2. TEC have a meeting at the FIDE World Youth U14, U16 & U18 Championships 2025 in Durres, Albania from 3 – 16 October 2025.
3. To save costs, we request you to send a device (or more) to the tournament with somebody attending it and traveling from the USA. Alternatively, courier it to a TEC committee member in Europe who will then bring it to the tournament for testing.
4. We will then test it together at the tournament and present it to some of the top arbiters for an opinion.

14.2 FIDE-00129 | TEC | Proposals | KoroChess

14.2.1 Summary

The Author introduces a new chess variant called KoroChess, which aims to offer a fresh strategic experience while preserving classical chess principles. The variant features a symmetrical setup for pieces, where players can freely arrange back-rank pieces within a symmetrical rule, creating diverse starting positions. The movement and rules remain consistent with standard chess. Kamali requests FIDE's acknowledgment of KoroChess as an official variant or guidance on how to gain international recognition. He has also provided detailed documentation with rules, diagrams, and examples for review.

14.2.2 Full regulations pending.

14.1 FIDE-00142 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Updates and Clarifications to C.04.4.2 (Burstein System) -

14.1.1 Summary:

It was observed that certain explanations were missing and that some key distinctions from other pairing systems were not sufficiently highlighted. With additional input and building on earlier revisions, a new version was submitted containing proposed additions and remarks (marked in red) for the commission's review, with the aim of aligning the document with FIDE's approval standards for pairing systems.

14.1.2 It was requested the annotated version and we will proceed with inclusion in the TEC Manual, noting that publication is scheduled for 12 months from now.

14.2 FIDE-00143 | TEC | ENQUIRY | Drawing of Lots in Round-Robin Tournaments

14.2.1 Summary:

Mr. Mateusz Nowak inquires whether drawing of lots is strictly required for pairing in round-robin tournaments, highlighting the issue of higher-rated players often having an unfair advantage with more white pieces, while lower-rated players are disadvantaged with more black pieces. He argues that this practice contradicts the idea of random pairing and believes that drawing of lots should be mandatory in all FIDE-regulated round-robin tournaments, not just top tournaments. He seeks confirmation of his thinking from the FIDE Technical Commission.

14.2.2 Reply Summary

Mr. Marco Biagioli agrees that Chapter C.05 is a hybrid: the general regulatory text belongs under the Rules Commission, while the annexes (Varma and Sonneborn-Berger) fall under TEC. He proposes removing those annexes from C.05 and relocating them to a TEC-managed chapter, noting this aligns with an earlier discussion with TEC..

15. Summary

During the reporting period, the FIDE Technical Commission consolidated its expanded mandate and delivered tangible progress across all major areas of responsibility. TEC refined its internal structure into departments and workgroups, maintained a high rhythm of management board meetings, and secured access to key software tools (such as collaborative development and workflow platforms) to support endorsement processes, technical projects and digital transformation initiatives. Across general activities, endorsements and enquiries, the volume and diversity of requests from federations, organisers, manufacturers and software developers confirmed the growing demand for clear, consistent and transparent technical guidance from FIDE.

Several strategic projects were completed, including the revision of the TRF standard, clarifications and corrections to the team pairing system and C.04 amendments, and preparatory steps towards restructuring the handbook sections relating to technical regulations and endorsements. In parallel, important projects remain in progress: finalising the new Compliance–Approval–Endorsement framework, addressing ranking and tie-break issues in specialised events, refining time-control and scoresheet specifications, and supporting research into the valuation of pairing systems and tie-break methods. TEC also handled a substantial number of product-related and regulatory enquiries, many of which will feed directly into future handbook updates and the TEC Manual.

The 2025 TEC Annual Meeting in Durres provided a crucial opportunity to address complex topics face-to-face, in particular the handling of unplayed games in tie-breaks, the future structure of the tie-break regulations, and the practical evaluation of new electronic notation devices and software. The outcomes of these discussions, together with the work recorded in this report and its annexes, position TEC to finalise the endorsement regulations, continue the clean-up and consolidation of the handbook, and strengthen its cooperation with other FIDE Commissions. Overall, TEC remains committed to providing robust, transparent and implementable technical standards in support of FIDE's global mission and the needs of arbiters, organisers, players and commercial partners.

Annexure A - 2025 TEC Annual Meeting Minutes

2025 Annual Meeting

Durres, Albania

9 – 13 October 2025

Summary

Author: Technical Commission

Document type	Minutes
Subject of Report	2025 Annual Meeting Minutes
Document version	1.0
Date	24November 2025

Contents

1. Session 1: Oct 10, 2025

1.1 Summary

The session covered meeting logistics, the project schedule, active and pending projects, team-pairing and tie-break systems, the electronic scoresheet, document versioning, and rule-interpretation issues.

Key topics included:

- Structure of upcoming sessions and agenda.
- Team-pairing proposals and the Baku acceleration method.
- Updates to tie-break rules and identification of priority issues.
- Evaluation of the electronic scoresheet design and its practical tournament implications.
- Document-versioning methods and consolidation practices.
- Interpretation issues concerning existing rules and terminology.
- Planning for the upcoming release of amended tie-break rules.
- Discussion of linguistic consistency, terminology standardization, and handbook clarity.
- Review of tie-break proposals, tournament-specific constraints, and rating-based anomalies.
- Planning for subsequent sessions due to time constraints.

interpretation.

1.2 Details

1.2.1 Agenda and Scheduling

The meeting reviewed session timing, website structure, THP checklists, endorsement processes, and both current and deferred projects, including the electronic scoresheet and ID-based chess systems.

1.2.2 Team Pairing and Tie-Break Systems

The discussion addressed team-pairing format proposals and the Baku acceleration method for future Olympiads. A previously requested study on system adoption remains pending. Minor tie-break amendments were reviewed, although opinions varied on their practical value.

1.2.3 Electronic Scoresheet

The electronic scoresheet was assessed for compliance and usability. Concerns were raised about verification during tournaments and general practicality.

1.2.4 Tie-Break Prioritization

A tie-break issue involving disproportionate advantages caused by forfeits was identified as a high-priority matter requiring immediate attention. Tie-break rules were designated as the first agenda item for the next session, followed by PCL and other sections.

1.2.5 Document Versioning

The group examined internal document-tracking methods, including build-number systems and alternatives based on appended initials. The goal was to prevent version proliferation and ensure a clear lineage for documents produced by multiple contributors.

1.2.6 Terminology and Rule Clarity

Significant attention was given to the inconsistent use of “games” vs. “rounds” in the handbook. The coexistence of both terms caused confusion across events.

A decision was taken to standardize all references to REP — Rounds in which one Elected to Play, replacing previous abbreviations and terminology.

1.2.7 Direct Encounter Interpretation

Sections dealing with direct-encounter standings were reviewed to avoid misapplication of tie-breaks before considering all relevant subsections. A consolidation of related paragraphs was proposed.

1.2.8 Tie-Break Modifications

A proposal to convert certain tie-breaks (7.2, 7.3, 7.4) from absolute numbers to percentages was discussed. Questions were raised about the bases of calculation when scheduled and played games differ.

1.2.9 Function and Philosophy of Tie-Breaks

The group briefly explored the strategic purpose of certain tie-breaks, including mechanisms intended to discourage pre-arranged draws.

1.2.10 Buchholz Usage

Clarifications were made that Buchholz-type tie-breaks apply only to Swiss tournaments, not round-robins or direct-elimination formats. Improved wording was proposed to ensure this is explicitly understood.

A related adjustment was accepted for the terminology “average of opponents’ book scores,” ensuring clarity and readability.

1.2.11 Rating-Based Tie-Breaks

Anomalies involving rating-based tie-breaks in round-robin events were identified, especially regarding how unplayed games are treated. Restricting such tie-breaks to Swiss tournaments or adding clarifying exceptions in specific paragraphs was considered.

1.2.12 Continuation Planning

Due to time constraints, it was agreed that discussions would resume in a later session, with particular focus on where to insert new wording regarding rating-based tie-breaks and unplayed games.

1.3 Suggested next steps

- Finalize the current set of amendments.
- Incorporate the high-priority issue requested by FIDE into the version intended for the 2025 release.
- Replace the abbreviation GE with REP throughout the manual.
- Update the wording of REP to “Rounds in which one Elected to Play,” with capitalization consistent with the acronym.
- Further review the proposal to convert select tie-breaks from numerical counts to percentages.
- Refine the Buchholz section to clearly state its exclusive applicability to Swiss tournaments, with unambiguous phrasing.

- Prepare precise wording to ensure that certain paragraphs (e.g., 15.2 and the introduction of the relevant section) do not apply to rating-based tie-breaks, and integrate these clarifications into the appropriate structural location.

2. Session 2: Oct 10, 2025

2.1 Summary

The session focused on clarifying rules related to unplayed rounds, forfeits, and predetermined pairings; evaluating proposed tie-break mechanisms in team tournaments; refining terminology within Articles 7, 10, 13, and 15; and exploring scoring-system implications across different tournament formats. Additional discussions addressed the treatment of non-standard scoring systems, the definition of match points in double-Swiss formats, adjustments to tie-break calculations involving forfeits, and the development of a unified scoring framework. The group also reviewed logistical items and planned further work on wording, device testing, and structural updates.

2.2 Details

2.2.1 Revisions to Article 15.2

Proposed adjustments focused on how forfeit wins and losses are handled in tournaments with predetermined pairings. The rule was confirmed to belong within Article 15.2 rather than Article 10. Unplayed rounds in such events are treated as regular games, except when rating-based tie-breaks are involved.

2.2.2 Tie-Break Rules in Articles 13.3.1–13.3.2

Proposals relating to “board count” and “top board rank” in team tournaments were examined. These methods were acknowledged as complex and rarely used, yet were ultimately approved despite concerns regarding implementation and their limited presence in the main tie-break tables.

2.2.3 Team Tournament Tie-Break Philosophy

Concerns were noted that certain team tie-breaks emphasize individual rather than collective performance. While formally mandatory, their relevance to team-oriented evaluation was questioned.

2.2.4 Revisions to Article 15.1

Clarifications were added to the definition of an “unplayed round.” The group agreed to incorporate the expression “paired or not paired” in parentheses at the end of the definition to avoid ambiguity in predetermined pairing events.

2.2.5 Terminology in Article 10.3

The terminology “participant” versus “player” was reviewed in the context of rating-based tie-breaks. It was suggested that rating-based tie-breaks be explicitly linked to individual tournaments to prevent unintended application in team formats.

2.2.6 Article 7 — Tie-Break Systems

Proposals to convert the systems in Articles 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4 into percentage-based forms were not accepted, as this would introduce a new tie-break type. These sections remain unchanged.

2.2.7 Article 7.7 — Mixed Scoring Systems

A new proposal examined tie-break behaviour when events use non-standard scoring (e.g., 3-1-0). It was noted that standard tie-breaks can unintentionally favour players with more draws under certain point systems, conflicting with formats intended to penalize excessive drawing.

2.2.8 Standard Scoring Framework

The standard score system was discussed as awarding more value to players with higher accumulated standard points, regardless of how intuitive the system feels. Event organizers choosing to use this system should align their scoring preferences with its principles.

2.2.9 Predictability and Variants of Scoring Systems

It was noted that different scoring systems (e.g., 3-1-0, 3-2-1-1) can lead to non-intuitive tie-break outcomes. The standard score system was seen as a useful individual tie-break option depending on tournament goals.

2.2.10 Retiring Obsolete Tie-Breaks

A review of rarely used tie-breaks was proposed. Any retirement process should rely on a documented methodology rather than simple frequency counts, acknowledging the need to reduce unnecessary tie-break options.

2.2.11 Naming Convention for Standard Point System

Concerns were raised about terminology suggesting universal standards. A more descriptive naming convention was recommended to ensure clarity about how points for wins, draws, and losses are assigned.

2.2.12 Clarity in Tie-Break Definitions

Tie-break definitions should clearly express their intended purpose. Terminology such as “number of draws” or “number of fewer losses” was proposed as clearer alternatives to vague naming conventions.

2.2.13 Application in Various Formats

The system converting wins, draws, and losses into 1–0.5–0 was reaffirmed as format-agnostic and applicable to both individual and team competitions, including double-Swiss formats.

2.2.14 Double Swiss — Match Point Definition

A consistent definition was proposed for match points in double-Swiss events:

- 1 point if the score exceeds one point,
- 0.5 point if the score equals one point,
- 0 points if the score is below one point.

This avoids contradictions across differing scoring methods.

2.2.15 Handling Unplayed Games and Disqualifications

Unplayed games in formats involving two games per round (e.g., double-game formats) were clarified to yield a 0–2 result. Wins, draws, and losses are defined strictly by comparison of scores: greater than, equal to, or less than the opponent’s score.

2.2.16 Unified Scoring Definition

A universal scoring wording was proposed:
“The number of games or matches won, plus half the number of games or matches drawn.”

This formulation avoids dependency on specific scoring systems and applies uniformly across formats.

2.2.17 Upcoming Deadlines — Rule Change Constraints

Given the December rapid-play events, it was recognized that large-scale rule changes cannot be implemented globally on short notice due to significant software and operational impacts. Article 16.6 may allow temporary accommodations.

2.2.18 Forfeits, Unplayed Games, and the Minimum-Score Rule

A proposed approach addresses the tie-break impact of forfeits:

- For unplayed games with a scheduled opponent, the assigned score is the minimum of the two players' scores.
- For player-requested byes, a reference value ("Mr. 50%") is applied.
  This is intended to prevent strong players from gaining unintended advantages due to opponent absence.

2.2.19 Handling Full-Point Byes and Pairing-Allocated Byes

Full-point byes (allocated due to pairing issues such as odd-number rounds) remain exceptions: the player retains their own score. Half-point byes requested by players remain half-point results even if pairing anomalies occur.

2.2.20 Device Testing

Two devices provided for testing will be evaluated:

- One retained internally using the VCL spreadsheet.
- One forwarded to the arbiters' commission for independent assessment.
  Testing will occur in non-tournament environments.

2.2.21 Meeting Planning

Remaining wording tasks (including Article 7.7) require individual work. Sessions were scheduled to continue after dinner and resume the next morning in a new meeting room.

2.3 Suggested next steps

- Rewrite section 6.4 to specify use of the “Mr. 50%” value for byes and finalize wording for the Article 7.7 definition.
- Test one device internally using the VCL spreadsheet; provide the second device for external testing by the arbiters’ commission.
- Prepare a proposal to transfer the non-Swiss tournament section to the appropriate organizational body

3. Session 3: Oct 11, 2025

3.1 Summary

The session focused on:

- Evaluating a new electronic scoresheet-type device against the VCL checklist and current regulations.
- Deciding not to endorse the device due to screen size, usability, and analysis-function concerns.
- Identifying gaps and ambiguities in the VCL checklist and the need for urgent revision.
- Clarifying the regulatory status of the VCL document.
- Discussing strategic options for Olympiad pairing and acceleration systems.
- Outlining a long-term plan for an open-source pairing and tie-break server (REST API), including licensing, FIDE integration, and performance considerations.

3.2 Details

3.2.1 VCL Checklist and Device Endorsement

- The VCL checklist and endorsement of a new electronic chess device were reviewed.
- It was noted that the VCL checklist discussion is highly technical and may require a dedicated follow-up session.

3.2.2 Electronic Device Evaluation

- The device’s advantages included clear input and straightforward operation.
- Issues identified:
    - Very small screen and difficult readability, especially for visually impaired or older users.

    - Precision required for touch input.
    - Limited ability for arbiters to access and review game logs during play.
    - Presence (or potential presence) of an analysis feature, conflicting with current expectations for electronic score devices.
- Isolation of the device from external networks during games was considered a technical positive, but post-game data availability for arbiters remained problematic.

3.2.3 Regulation Gaps and Previous Endorsements

- Existing regulations for electronic score devices were recognized as incomplete at the time of earlier endorsements, creating inconsistencies.
- Certain regulatory requirements (e.g., visibility of moves, log access, prohibition or limitation of analysis) had not been fully reflected in earlier decisions.
- The current VCL checklist does not explicitly handle parameters such as screen size, analysis features, or visibility at distance, leaving room for interpretation.

3.2.4 Proposed but Rejected Endorsement Approach

- One approach considered:
    - Endorse the device under current rules and precedents.
    - Simultaneously recommend an urgent revision of electronic scoresheet regulations and commit to re-evaluating all endorsed devices within about one year.
- This approach was ultimately not adopted.

3.2.5 Decision on Device Endorsement

- The prevailing view was that the device should not be endorsed, primarily because of:
    - Insufficient screen size and readability.
    - Practical difficulties for arbiters.
    - Concerns around the analysis capability and its alignment with fair-play expectations.
- The decision emphasized that both hardware characteristics and functional features must meet regulatory and practical standards.

3.2.6 VCL Checklist Deficiencies

- The current VCL checklist was found to be:
    - Ambiguous in several points.
    - Missing explicit criteria for important aspects such as minimum screen size, visibility, and analysis constraints.
- Certain items (e.g., readability at distance, onboard instructions/manuals) would likely not be satisfied by the device in question.
- An urgent revision of the checklist was deemed necessary to remove ambiguity and ensure consistent evaluation of future products.

3.2.7 VCL and Regulation Interplay

- It was clarified that:
    - The VCL is considered an integral part of the regulations.
    - Any new requirements introduced in the VCL should first have a basis in the main regulations, but in practice the VCL currently acts as the operative regulation after a previous regulation was abolished.
- The working assumption for the moment is that the VCL has regulatory force until a new formal regulation is adopted.

3.2.8 Strategic Direction for Olympiad Pairing / Acceleration

- A strategic discussion was held on:
    - Designing a standardized Olympiad pairing system using acceleration, team-pairing frameworks, and updated tie-breaks.
    - Preparing a study to support adoption of such systems.
- It was noted that:
    - Current Olympiad tie-breaks are not fully aligned with the standard FIDE framework, representing an opportunity to harmonize.
    - First rounds are often “low-value” competitively, motivating the use of acceleration, but any system must avoid unintended distortions.

3.2.9 Acceleration Systems — Advantages and Risks

- Past implementations of acceleration (e.g., strong forms that “push” encounters several rounds ahead) were assessed as problematic.

- An alternative, more controlled system (e.g., grouping teams in A/B/C categories with tailored point assignments) was discussed as a way to reduce negative side effects.
- Ethical aspects were raised:
    - Over-aggressive acceleration can reduce lower-ranked teams' chances of playing top opposition.
    - Multiplying the impact of early-round games may conflict with perceived fairness.

3.2.10 Strategic Focus for Future Pairing Systems

- A strategic choice was identified:
    1. Re-implement and formalize the existing Olympiad system within the current tie-break framework, or
    2. Propose a new, standardized system.
- History of contentious debates around new pairing systems was acknowledged, underlining the need for careful positioning and consensus-building.

3.2.11 Promotion of Team Pairing Systems and Data Needs

- The need to promote a defined, standard team pairing system was discussed, including:
    - Producing concise explanatory material (e.g., a short bulletin) describing its advantages.
    - Ensuring at least one Tournament Handling Program (THP) implements the system to demonstrate feasibility.
- It was noted that:
    - The pairing method is relatively standardized (e.g., Dutch system), but the distribution and popularity of tie-break systems are poorly documented.
    - With TRF 2026 approaching, improved data on which tie-breaks are in use would be valuable, even if statistics alone will not promote less popular systems.

3.2.12 FIDE Infrastructure and THP Reality

- Concerns were raised about:
    - Instability in existing rating and IT infrastructures (frequent rating changes, performance issues).

    - Limited capacity and motivation among THP developers to incorporate new rules quickly.
- This context reinforced the need for:
    - A small but robust central service that can reliably perform pairing and tie-break calculations.
    - Clear, stable interfaces and documented behaviour.

3.2.13 Open-Source Pairing and Tie-Break Project

- An open-source project was proposed with the following features:
    - Core pairing and tie-break engine running as a REST API.
    - Community-driven contributions (code/time) granting free access.
    - Non-contributors paying a usage fee.
- Key points:
    - Existing tested code (covering a large number of historical tournaments) already exists and is licensed under a permissive license but needs adaptation.
    - The goal is not merely to publish source code, but to maintain a performant service, suitable for use by THPs and potentially endorsed by FIDE.

3.2.14 Licensing and Collaboration Model

- Several license models were considered (e.g., MIT, Apache, GPL):
    - Once released, the license cannot realistically be tightened later.
    - The choice of license affects:
        - How commercial users can integrate the code.
        - Whether and how contributors can be acknowledged or compensated.
- Legal questions were noted, especially regarding:
    - Enforcement across jurisdictions.
    - Detecting unauthorized use when the system is exposed only via an API.

3.2.15 Integration with FIDE and Tournament Programs

- The plan outlined for integration:
    - The pairing/tie-break server would be tested within the technical structure before external deployment.
    - THPs could either:

        - Implement and certify their own internal pairing logic, or
        - Call the central API, which would be pre-validated for correctness.
- This creates a uniform reference implementation for pairings and tie-breaks and simplifies CAE (Compliance–Approval–Endorsement) processes.

3.2.16 Technical Implementation Plan

- Next steps for the technical part include:
    - Adapting the existing pairing engine code for a REST environment.
    - Allocating servers and creating a database-backed API service.
    - Implementing logging and anonymized test data to comply with legal and privacy requirements.
    - Setting up pre-production environments to verify stability before production deployment.

3.2.17 Tie-Break and Pairing Amendments

- It was noted that:
    - Certain new direct-encounter rules must be implemented before they can be recommended or promoted.
    - Most programs have already implemented the new tie-break rules, but there is a need to confirm this and update internal records.
- For events such as Olympiads for players with disabilities, rating-based tie-breaks can be unreliable. Non-rating-based alternatives with comparable fairness properties are of interest but constrained by available resources and timelines.

3.2.18 Algorithm Performance Concerns

- The existing weighted-matching pairing algorithm, while correct, can become very slow for large events (e.g., over 100 players, up to ~2,000 players).
- Potential mitigations include:
    - Algorithmic optimization.
    - Use of scalable compute infrastructure (e.g., cloud resources).
- Performance and scalability therefore form part of the design requirements for the future REST API service.

3.3 Suggested next steps

Endorsement Documentation

Prepare and finalize internal material summarizing the decision not to endorse the evaluated device and the rationale based on size, usability, and analysis features.

VCL Checklist Revision

- Revise the VCL checklist to:
  - Address missing items (e.g., screen size, readability, analysis capabilities).
  - Eliminate ambiguous wording in English.
- Align checklist content with current and planned regulations for electronic devices.

Business Case and Resourcing

Develop a business plan for obtaining resources (e.g., statistical support) to analyze tie-break and pairing systems and support evidence-based rule changes.

Strategic Presentation on Device and Regulations

Prepare a structured briefing for the relevant decision-making body on:

- The device evaluation outcome.
- The need to update electronic scoresheet regulations.
- The planned re-evaluation of all endorsed products once new rules are in place.

Design of Tie-Breaks for Special Events

Design or adapt a tie-break system, consistent with the standard framework, for use in Olympiads or similar events for players with disabilities, where rating-based methods may not be appropriate.

Open-Source Project — Governance and Roadmap

- Schedule further working sessions with the open-source subgroup.
- Define the scope, architecture, and roadmap for the REST-based pairing and tie-break server.
- Decide on the preferred open-source license and contribution model.

Technical Implementation of REST API

- Convert the existing pairing engine into a REST-compatible service.
- Provision servers and databases.
- Implement logging and anonymized test data handling.
- Set up pre-production and production environments.

Documentation and Minutes Review

Review previous meeting minutes and technical documents to:

- Confirm the current status of pairing and tie-break system implementations.
- Identify remaining gaps or misunderstandings.

Open-Source Recognition and FIDE Integration

Define how contributions to the open-source project will be recognized and how the project will be aligned with FIDE endorsement and CAE processes.

Follow-Up Meeting

Organize a follow-up session to:

- Validate the revised VCL checklist.
- Review initial technical progress on the REST API project.
- Decide on the next wave of regulatory and technical proposals.

4. Session 4: Oct 11, 2025

4.1 Summary

The session focused on:

- Evaluating accelerated pairing systems and their practical drawbacks.
- Clarifying the mechanics of different acceleration approaches.
- Defining measurable objectives for tournament design (number of rounds, behaviour of critical rounds).
- Proposing a methodology to evaluate tournament systems using simulated events and distance to “true” standings.

- Highlighting the need for statistical analysis and real-world data (e.g., accelerated Baku tournaments) to assess system performance, especially in relation to tie-breaks and progressive scoring.

4.2 Details

4.2.1 Tournament Rules and System Testing

- It was noted that generating test tournaments is essential for validating pairing systems, particularly in events with large rating gaps between participants.
- Previous accelerated systems were often “tweaked” and non-standard, leading to limited or no rigorous testing.
- Some mathematically optimal systems exist but lack real-world trials and may be perceived as unattractive or unintuitive from a practical or psychological standpoint.

4.2.2 Mechanics of a Sample Accelerated System

- A sample accelerated scheme was described where:
    - In the initial rounds (e.g., first three rounds), top teams receive extra “virtual” points in the standings.
    - Afterwards, the field is regrouped and the extra points are progressively reduced.
    - The virtual bonus is fully removed by a later round (e.g., round seven).
- Critical rounds occur where the acceleration is reduced or removed, creating situations in which weaker teams may suddenly face much stronger opposition.

4.2.3 Alternative Acceleration Proposals and Psychological Effects

- An alternative system in which assigned points are never removed was judged problematic due to the perceived unfairness for lower-ranked teams that do not receive such bonuses.
- Another model discussed multiplies early-round results (e.g., triple points in round one, quadruple in round two, then normal scoring), intentionally benefiting stronger teams and making early rounds highly decisive.
- These approaches raise concerns about fairness, perception, and the psychological impact on lower-rated teams.

4.2.4 Tournament Objectives and Measurement Criteria

- Two main design objectives were identified:
    1. Determining the optimal number of rounds for a given event.
    2. Defining the desired statistical “shape” of critical rounds (e.g., round 4, round 7), where acceleration parameters change and pairings between strong and weak teams become more likely.
- To compare systems, it is necessary to define clear performance parameters (e.g., how well final rankings approximate “true strength”), especially where only a subset of rounds is accelerated.

4.2.5 Tournament as a Measurement Process

- A tournament was characterized as an imperfect measurement device, attempting to estimate relative playing strength even though each game involves two unknowns.
- A proposed methodology:
    - Generate many artificial tournaments with known “true” ratings.
    - Run different pairing/acceleration systems on these fixed rating sets.
    - Compare final standings to the true ranking using a metric such as Euclidean distance.
- This provides a quantitative basis for deciding which system better preserves the ranking implied by the underlying ratings.

4.2.6 Statistical Analysis and Tie-Break Behaviour

- Statistical analysis was highlighted as essential for evaluating pairing and tie-break systems.
- Progressive scoring was cited as an example:
    - It can perform well statistically in certain formats.
    - However, it tends to reward strong early performance disproportionately, which may favour higher-rated players within the Swiss structure.
- This creates a trade-off between statistical discrimination and perceived fairness.

4.2.7 Use of Real-World Data

- A data-driven approach was proposed:
    - Collect and analyse data from accelerated Baku-style tournaments, focusing on the last several years.

    - Examine how different accelerated structures affected standings, pairings, and tie-break outcomes in practice.
- While simulated tournaments offer control over variables, real-world data provides evidence of how systems behave under actual organizational and competitive conditions.

5. Session 5: Oct 12, 2025

5.1 Summary

The session focused on:

- The need for a roadmap with clear milestones and a dedicated session for revising the handbook text.
- High-level plans for the commission website and confirmation that the budget proposal is prepared.
- Commission membership concerns and the idea of launching a monthly newsletter.
- The endorsement process and the role of Verification Checklists (VCLs), including their relationship to regulations and how they will be integrated into the technical manual.
- Discussion on which areas need VCLs (e.g., electronic devices, hybrid tournament tools) and which do not (e.g., mechanical clocks, paper scoresheets, unless requested).
- Terminology and scope questions around “streaming”, as well as structuring VCLs for cameras, video capture, streaming and broadcasting.
- Classification of electronic boards under the streaming/video-capture umbrella and the status of electronic scoresheet VCLs.
- The need for specific VCLs for hybrid tournament management and how to coordinate them.
- Timelines for publishing documentation and VCLs, including having them online and accessible, and sending communication to product owners once the endorsement process is finalized.
- Technical and structural issues related to the website (e.g., URL structure) and general planning for future meetings.

5.2 Details

5.2.1 Roadmap and Handbook Work

- A roadmap is needed to:
    - Define target outcomes for tournament and system work.
    - Specify milestones and implementation steps.
- A full session dedicated to revising and “grinding” the handbook text was identified as essential, separate from more strategic discussions.

5.2.2 Website and Platform Constraints

- The commission website will likely stay within a WordPress framework, which imposes structural limits.
- Existing practices of other commissions using WordPress will be used as reference.
- The main challenge is agreeing on structure and navigation within these constraints.

5.2.3 Budget Proposal

- A budget proposal has been prepared, with figures ready.
- It needs to be documented in formal format and submitted for confirmation/approval within the commission.

5.2.4 Commission Membership and Newsletter

- Concerns were expressed about the lack of new members over recent years and the loss of at least one member.
- A regular newsletter was identified as a missing communication tool.
- A monthly newsletter was proposed, with an initial target around early November, to summarize activities and decisions and support visibility and recruitment.

5.2.5 Endorsement Process and VCLs

- The endorsement process is being aligned with a structured set of Verification Checklists (VCLs).
- There is a need to:
    - Finalize documentation of the endorsement process.
    - Determine responsibility for drafting each VCL (e.g., THP, devices, boards) and ensure cross-checking by relevant domain experts.
- The intention is to move from ad-hoc decisions to a systematic and documented evaluation path.

5.2.6 Mechanical Clocks and Paper Score Sheets

- Mechanical clocks:
  - Recognized as largely obsolete in the endorsement context.
  - No immediate need for a dedicated VCL, unless a specific endorsement request is submitted.
- Paper score sheets:
  - Requirements exist, but there is no separate endorsement or VCL.
  - A VCL would only be created if a concrete request arises.

5.2.7 VCLs vs. Regulations

- The relationship was clarified as follows:
  - Regulations: the “law” — define requirements and principles.
  - VCLs: the measurement tool — operationalize how to test compliance and verify products or systems.
- VCLs should:
  - Contain all testable elements derived from the regulations.
  - Allow both evaluators and applicants to self-verify.
- If a VCL is incomplete or ambiguous, it can be corrected quickly by the commission, without requiring a full management-board procedure, unlike regulation changes.

5.2.8 VCL Implementation and Access

- VCLs will be referenced in the technical manual, with links to online forms (e.g., via Cognito) instead of static PDFs.
- The plan includes:
  - Having some VCLs operational as examples before the new rules take effect.
  - Making all relevant VCLs available online by 1 December.

5.2.9 Definition of “Streaming”

- The term “streaming” was reviewed:
  - Technical IT definitions can be broad (any continuous data delivery).
  - Common media usage typically refers to audio/video.
- It was concluded that “streaming” is more inclusive than “broadcast” and does not necessarily imply live-only content.

- Terminology must reflect actual regulatory intent (e.g., handling recorded vs. live content).

5.2.10 Cameras, Video Capture, Streaming, Broadcasting

- The general topic “cameras, video capturing, streaming, and broadcasting” was considered too coarse and in need of clearer structure.
- Suggestions included:
  - Defining a main category “streaming”.
  - Using subentries such as “game streaming” and “video streaming” where appropriate.
- New VCLs under this topic will either be:
  - Combinations of existing checklists, or
  - Entirely new specifications, requiring continuous updates as technology evolves.

5.2.11 Electronic Boards and Electronic Scoresheets

- Electronic boards will be managed under the broader “cameras/video capture/streaming/broadcasting” heading, given their role in transmitting game information.
- A VCL for electronic scoresheets already exists in the handbook and requires only minor updates to stay aligned with current regulatory and technical practices.

5.2.12 Hybrid Tournament Management

- Hybrid tournaments (combining online and over-the-board elements) require multi-layered evaluation.
- For such systems, at least three different VCLs may be needed (e.g., device, software platform, and connectivity/security aspects), which must be evaluated in coordination.
- Clear cooperation between responsible evaluators is required to ensure a coherent overall assessment.

5.2.13 Fair Play Detection Tools

- Fair-play rules are defined by another commission and not directly managed here.
- For any fair-play detection tool submitted for evaluation:
  - The relevant fair-play regulations must be obtained and followed.

- The technical evaluation should remain aligned with those external rules rather than inventing separate criteria.

5.2.14 Timeline for Documentation and Terminology Changes

- Documentation and VCLs are targeted to be available online by the end of the upcoming weekend, as an internal working goal.
- There was debate about how extensive requested changes should be, including replacing terms such as “certified” with “approved” at the request of another body.
- While some regarded this as minor, others viewed it as requiring careful review to avoid unintended legal or procedural implications.

5.2.15 Products Parked for Endorsement

- Several products are awaiting endorsement, including:
  - Tournament and analysis tools (e.g., hybrid/ID-based systems, notation-digitization tools).
- Once the endorsement process and VCL framework are finalized and published:
  - A communication will be sent to all relevant product owners with a link and instructions to begin or resume the formal process.
- Another product already completed the process earlier, after an initially complex pathway.

5.2.16 Website Structure and URL Issues

- The current website suffers from “dated” URL strings and structural legacy issues in WordPress, complicating integration with the handbook and technical documentation.
- A restructuring or compromise solution is needed:
  - Either adjust how the handbook is published.
  - Or redesign parts of the website structure within WordPress constraints.

5.2.17 Organizational and Logistic Planning

- Practical matters (tax day, travel schedules, meeting planning) were briefly reviewed to ensure smooth logistics.
- A more proactive approach was suggested for future meetings, including selecting locations and logistics earlier to avoid last-minute arrangements

5.3 Suggested next steps

Endorsement and Handbook

- Further develop and consolidate the endorsement handbook, integrating VCL usage and CAE-related procedures.
- Remove or de-prioritize outdated organizational-structure items from the internal agenda where no longer needed.

Communication and Newsletter

- Launch a monthly commission newsletter, starting as soon as practicable, to report on decisions, ongoing work, and calls for contributions.

Terminology and Manual Headings

- Update headings related to “video capturing” in the manual to terminology centered on streaming or video streaming, with clearly defined scope.

Roadmap Proposal

- Prepare and discuss a roadmap proposal (with milestones and objectives) in a follow-up session, covering tournament systems, handbook revisions, and VCL deployment.

VCL Actions

- Verify the status of the electronic board VCL and update if required.
- Continue work on VCLs for priority areas (e.g., THP, electronic scoresheets, streaming/boards, hybrid tournament management).
- Ensure VCLs are linked via online forms from the technical manual and that all priority VCLs are online by the targeted date.

Communication to Product Owners

- Once the endorsement framework is finalized and published, notify all currently parked product owners that the process is open, including clear links and instructions.

6. Session 6: Oct 12, 2025

6.1 Summary

The session focused on final adjustments to the technical product-compliance framework. Key topics included replacing the term *"certification"* with *"acceptance,"* updating online form URLs, clarifying the distinction between *product acceptance* and *endorsement*, and defining acceptable promotional communication for vendors. Three main work items were identified:

1. Reviewing all documents for terminology and reference accuracy.
2. Updating the technical manual.
3. Establishing clear communication rules for vendors regarding the use of the term *"accepted."*

6.2 Details

6.2.1 Terminology Changes in Product Compliance

- It was noted that the term *"certification"* was considered too formal and too similar to *"endorsement."*
- The preferred term going forward is "acceptance," requiring an update of the acronym from TCPC to TAPC across all documents.
- This terminology change is intended to be internal and procedural rather than altering any substantive process.

6.2.2 Endorsement and Marketing Requirements

- Endorsement is tied to a formal marketing agreement. Products may reference FIDE only if such an agreement exists.
- This requirement will be explicitly reflected in the updated documents, ensuring that endorsement and marketing rights remain aligned.

6.2.3 Online Form Access and URLs

- Some URLs in online forms and the handbook were inaccessible.
- All URLs will be updated, including the main handbook link, based on updated information received earlier in the day.

6.2.4 Technical Manual and Fees

- A request was made to view the technical manual, as it contains references to applicable fees.
- Completion and publication of the manual is the next step once the terminology and reference updates are finalized.

6.2.5 Authority for Endorsement

- Endorsement is to be performed exclusively by the designated council.
- Documents will be updated to clearly reflect that endorsement is a paid service and not automatically available.

6.2.6 Distinction Between Acceptance and Endorsement

- The difference between the two terms was clarified:
  - Acceptance: technical compliance confirmation, not for marketing use.
  - Endorsement: a formal, commercially contracted right to promote a product as endorsed.
- Products may not be advertised as *"accepted"* unless endorsed.

6.2.7 Product Usage in Tournaments

- It was confirmed that changing *"certified"* to *"accepted"* does not alter where such products may be used.
- Usage rules remain the same for relevant tournament categories.

6.2.8 Vendor Communication Guidelines

- Vendors pay for the right to list products as accepted for particular tournament levels and must follow communication rules established by the organization.
- Clear guidelines will be drafted to standardize how vendors may describe acceptance or endorsement.

6.2.9 Three Main Documentation Tasks

The following work items were identified:

1. Review all documents for outdated terminology, errors, and formatting issues.
2. Update the technical manual, which is considered the most extensive task.

3. Define vendor communication rules, specifying permissible references to acceptance.

6.2.10 Stylesheet Preferences

- A suggestion to use the handbook stylesheet for consistency was considered.
- It was noted that the handbook stylesheet is restrictive, and a more flexible format is preferred.

6.2.11 Updating Dates and Minor Corrections

- Document dates will be updated immediately before submission.
- Comments not discussed during the meeting were already addressed and resolved.

6.2.12 Foreword and Introduction Sections

- A foreword (typically written by the organization's president) and a separate introduction section are planned.
- The introduction text will use other manuals within the organization for reference when drafting.

6.2.13 Acronym Clarifications

- There was confusion about a reference to *"three"* in the acronyms section.
- It was clarified that this referred to Article 3 of the C.02.12 document.
- Full references will be used consistently across the manual.

6.2.14 Reference Format for Articles

- A proposal to use symbolic shorthand (e.g., brackets) for internal article references was discussed.
- All references have already been converted to full references following earlier feedback, and reverting would involve substantial additional work.

6.2.15 SDPC and TCPC Alignment

- The acronym SDPC ("Self-Declaration of Product Compliance") was corrected in several locations.

- Multiple references to numerical codes such as C010208 will be replaced with full document names to avoid ambiguity.
- A misplaced paragraph copied from the SDPC section had been incorrectly placed in the TAPC (formerly TCPC) section.
- It was removed to maintain a clear separation of steps within the process.

6.2.16 Process Symmetry and Wording Uniformity

- Ensuring consistent wording across sections describing SDPC and TAPC steps was discussed.
- Although considered a stylistic matter, harmonization will be implemented where straightforward.

6.2.17 Clarification on Endorsement Conditions

- Holding a TAPC does not guarantee endorsement.
- Endorsement requires a separate commercial agreement.
- This clarification may be placed as its own article for better visibility.

6.2.18 Versioning of Requirements and VCL Compliance

- Compliance is assessed based on VCL requirements active at the time of SDPC submission.
- A concern was raised about scenarios where endorsement is requested long after acceptance, with intervening regulatory changes.
- The risk of such gaps will be noted for future review.

6.2.19 Formatting and Syntax Considerations

- Markdown formatting automatically generates hyperlinks in PDF or web formats, but not in Word documents.
- This behavior was clarified to avoid confusion when drafting.

6.2.20 Clarifying “TCP Process Will Be Initiated”

- A reference to the definition of the TCP/TAPC process will be added for clarity.

6.2.21 Merging Articles

- A suggestion to merge articles from different documents was considered unnecessary because the two sections serve different purposes.
- However, inconsistent terminology (e.g., “Feed” vs. “Tech”) will be corrected.

6.2.22 Clarification on “Defect”

- The technical manual provides a simpler, more operational definition of “defect,” whereas the handbook provides a formal version.
- The manual’s definition is intended as a practical supplement, not a replacement.

6.2.23 Organization of Processes (Chapter 3)

- A proposal to reorganize all product-specific processes into dedicated sections rather than keeping them all in Chapter 3 was discussed.
- Because of the impact on numbering and references, restructuring was postponed to a future version.

6.2.24 Chapter 4 – Educational Material

- The chapter currently titled *“Educational Matter”* will be removed for now.
- Educational material will eventually be placed in a separate document or dedicated section on the website.

6.2.25 Mandatory Tie-Breaks and Tournament Reports

- Tie-break rules and tournament reports (TRF 06) should not be embedded in the manual.
- They will be made accessible as separate downloadable files linked from the technical website.

6.2.26 Document Finalization and Review

- The document will be finalized and shared for review before an upcoming meeting with the relevant council.
- A final pass will be completed before circulation.

6.2.27 Reintroducing Chapter 4 as a Link Hub

- Chapter 4 may be reintroduced as a section containing download links and document descriptions to avoid leaving the chapter empty.
- One or more existing documents may be included to establish structure for future items.

6.2.28 Potential New Member

- A potential candidate with a technical background was discussed positively as a possible addition to the group.
- The topic will be revisited after the main documentation work is complete.

6.3 Suggested next steps

- Remove the mandatory tie-break rules section from the document.
- Replace the in-document text of Tournament Reports (TRF 06 and TRF 16) with external links on the technical website.
- Finalize and circulate the updated document for review.
- Hold a meeting with the relevant council next week to present the updated version.
- Remove the educational-material chapter for now, with future placement to be decided later.
- Review and confirm the changes implemented in the latest document version.