

Annex C.07 Table-Of-Changes

**TABLE OF
CHANGES****C.07 – PLAY OFF AND TIE BREAK
REGULATIONS**

Art.	REMOVED TEXT / NEW TEXT	Reason
2.1	The regulations of the tournament shall should specify whether tied participants will share the same place in the standings or, if not, a method for ranking them. If neither is done, choose 2.2.2 as the ranking method and apply 4.1.1.	<i>It was requested by ARB to specify a default behaviour in case the regulations of the tournament don't say anything (4.1.1 wording is shown below).</i>
2.2	The available methods of ranking tied participants are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2.1 Over-the-Board play-offs (see Article 3) • 2.2.2 Off-the-Board tie-breaks (see Article 4 onwards) 	<i>The numbering of 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 4.11 is necessary because 2.2.2 and 4.1.1 are now referenced in 2.1.</i>
4.1.1	If necessary, the Chief Arbiter shall complete the list by choosing additional tie-breaks from those listed in Article 5, and publish the list before the start of the tournament.	
5 7.6	Games Rounds one Elected to Play (GEREP)	<i>For the sake of consistency with terminology used elsewhere in these rules, "Rounds" is more accurate than "Games" (and the acronym change is consequential).</i>
13.3,1	Apply the Direct Encounter rule (Article 6), first using the primary score (MP or GP), then, if all the teams were still tied no ties were broken per this rule , using the secondary score.	<i>The current wording ("if all teams are still tied") could be interpreted as "if all teams still have the same number of points". The latter interpretation would fail in the case of a "partial" Direct Encounter (Article 6.3). Also, the partial DE could determine that some teams are no longer tied with the others (e.g. a team that has lost to all other tied teams), but these are not broken ties per this rule (i.e. 6.3), since the partial DE is only intended to break a tie for first place among tied teams (i.e. not for other positions).</i>
14.4.1	[14.1 Cut-1: Cut the Least Significant Value] It is the most used modifier, applicable in many tie-breaks. The most commonly used are: a) Buchholz Cut-1 (BH-C1, exclude the opponent's with the lowest score number of points) b) ARO Cut-1 (ARO-C1, exclude the opponent's with the lowest rating) c) Progressive Score Cut-1 (PS-C1, exclude the score achieved after the first round) d) Sonneborn-Berger Cut-1 (SB-C1, exclude the contribution (product) associated with the opponent with the lowest score - if there is more than one such opponent, exclude the lowest contribution associated with them one with which the worst result was achieved).	<i>For Buchholz, ARO and Sonneborn-Berger, the current Cut-1 rule specifies to cut an opponent and then repeat the calculation with one fewer element. While this is a good practical rule for those tie-breaks, since the request is to cut a value, and 16.5 (Cut-1 Exception) speaks of contributions higher/lower than the least significant value, mentioning opponents tends to be confusing. The proposed rule talks explicitly about the values to be cut.</i>

Annex C.07 Table-Of-Changes

14.1.2	<p>In team competition, all the Extended Sonneborn-Berger tie-breaks for teams (see Article 13.2) are calculated excluding one of the contribution (product) associated with the opponents, with the lowest primary MP score (MP for EMMSB and EMGSB), or GP score (for EGMSB and EGGSB) - if there is more than having the choice the one such opponent, exclude the lowest contribution associated with them which the worst result was achieved.</p>	<p><i>In addition to the same reasons that apply to 14.1.1, the current rule contains a misleading indication when trying to determine the least significant value. In fact, it says to use the primary score, but specifies that it could be MP for EMMSB/EMGSB and GP for EGMSB/EGGSB. This is not true because these four tie-breaks do not depend on the primary score, so either the indication to use the primary score or the specification is wrong.</i></p> <p><i>A quick check among the people who implement this rule in their software shows that, for instance, nobody uses the MP primary score to evaluate the least significant value in the case of EGGSB. This suggested that it would be better to remove the reference to using the primary score and be more precise in the following specification.</i></p>
14.5	<p>Limit: Change a Limit</p> <p>The most common modification is in Koya: the limit of 50% of the maximum possible tournament score can be either increased or decreased of half point at a time to let respectively less fewer or more participants opponents contribute to the evaluation of the tie-break.</p>	<p><i>"Fewer" is better English. As for "participants", it is not quite the right term, since this tie-break is based on the results of the opponents of those for whom the tie-break is being calculated.</i></p>
16.1.2	<p>available to play voluntary unplayed round ("VUR"): a any round in which a participant was played their game, or ended up without a game due to a pairing allocated bye, the opponent did not available arrive to play, i.e. or unforeseen circumstances that resulted in the award of a full point bye</p>	<p><i>In the current rules, there are two complementary definitions: available-to-play round (Article 16.1.2) and voluntary unplayed round (VUR, in the introduction to Article 16.5).</i></p> <p><i>After it was decided that one definition was sufficient, since VUR is used extensively in 16.5, it was decided to retain the VUR definition and to replace available-to-play round by designating those rounds as non-VUR (see 16.2.3 and 16.2.5).</i></p>
16.5.0	<p>A voluntary unplayed round ("VUR") is a requested bye or a forfeit loss (16.2.3 to 16.2.5).</p>	
16.2.3	<p>Requested byes that are followed by at least one available to play round that is not a VUR</p>	
16.2.5	<p>Requested byes that are either not either not followed only by VURs or in the last round of a tournament any available to play rounds</p>	