

Notts News

Newsletter of the Nottinghamshire Chess Association

2005–06 No. 22 11 February 2006
<http://www.nottschess.org/> nottsnews@nottschess.org

Executive Committee Proposal

Andrew Walker

The NCA AGM asked the President, Treasurer and Secretary to consider the constitutional implications of moving towards an 'executive committee' structure, and to report back. We have met both informally and as an extension to a Finance Committee meeting, and propose as follows:

- ◆ The Finance Committee should be replaced by an Executive Committee.
- ◆ The EC should have regular meetings, should consider and set the NCA's budget, and should work to a calendar of meetings known to all and advertised at the start of the year.
- ◆ Officers of the NCA would be invited to submit proposals and to attend relevant meetings.
- ◆ The lead role in the EC would be taken by a new 'Executive Officer' of the NCA. The EO would have a general oversight of all activity within the NCA. Unlike the Presidency, the EO would not be subject to a three-year limitation.
- ◆ The Presidency should revert to being a largely ceremonial position.
- ◆ The EC, and specifically the EO, should be responsible for strategic thinking within the NCA, and especially for long-term planning. It would have power to co-opt, but membership should remain small and focused. The EO, President, Treasurer and Secretary would be ex-officio members, with perhaps two others.
- ◆ Officers of the NCA would primarily report to the EC rather than to the AGM; the EO would report to the AGM.
- ◆ There are no constitutional implications to any of the above; the AGM is already free to choose the officer/committee structure.
- ◆ As an interim measure, the Finance Committee has invited the President to attend its remaining meetings, and if a suitable person is found will also invite, on an informal basis, any potential EO. In addition to its existing role in respect of the NCA's finances, the FC will start to think more generally about strategy and planning.

The next meeting of the FC is scheduled for 23 March. If you have any views on the above, please let me know; and if you have proposals or matters that you think an EC should

Nottingham Rapidplay: 12 March
Nottingham Congress: 22–23 April

Both at Bramcote Hills Sport and Community College,
Moor Lane, Bramcote, Nottingham NG9 3GA

Entry forms from the NCA web site (<http://www.nottschess.org/>) or Congress Secretary Tony Wright (0115 917 2468)

consider at that meeting, please submit them to any member of the FC or to the President ASAP.

Midlands Inter-Association Primary Schools Championship

Nottinghamshire's teams built on their success in the friendly quadrangular tournament in January to win two of the three Midlands championships. What's more, because of a clash with a rearranged schools competition, all of the boys' High School players were unavailable – 18 players in all.

The Under 11 competition was a straightforward contest between Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire which swung back and forth throughout the day. Lincolnshire ultimately prevailed, but it was still a strong performance by the Nottinghamshire players.

Team	R1	R2	R3	Total
1 Lincolnshire	17	14½	16½	48
2 Nottinghamshire	15	16½	14	45½
3 Northamptonshire	8	9	10	27
4 Cambridgeshire	8	4	3½	15½
5 Shropshire	1	5	5	11

The same five counties contested the Under 9 title, and once again Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire came to the fore. This time Nottinghamshire took an early lead and never looked like losing.

Team	R1	R2	R3	Total
1 Nottinghamshire	10	9	7	26
2 Lincolnshire	7½	7	7	21½
3 Cambridgeshire	4	8½	5	17½
4 Northamptonshire	5	1½	7	13½
5 Shropshire	3½	4	4	11½

Only Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire (two teams) took part in the Girls championship. The Nottinghamshire Knights (our first team) took the title, but not before giving their coaches an almighty scare, seeing their apparently invincible 7½ point lead diminish to just a single point at one stage in Round 3. Fortunately a few late wins put them back on course.

Team	R1	R2	R3	Total
1 Nottinghamshire Knights	11	9	5½	25½
2 Lincolnshire	4	8½	10	22½
3 Nottinghamshire Rooks	3	½	2½	6

Yateley Manor tournament

Details are hard to come by, but I've been told that Lateefah Messam-Sparks (West Nottingham) qualified for the England Girls squad at this tournament.

National Club Championship

Graham Ladds

Both Newark teams are through to the last eight of the National Club Minor (average grade under 125). Newark B defeated Syston 3-1 with wins from Ross Blake, Alex Combie and Richard Myers.

Littlethorpe B (from Leicester) conceded the match against Newark A as they were unable to raise a team.

Derby & District League Cup and Plate

The finals of the Derby & District League Cup and Plate competitions were held on 7 February. Breadsall A won the Cup, beating Belper A 2½-1½. Notts League players Steve Burke (Ashfield) and Derek Jarvis (West Nottingham) were on the winning team. The Plate (for the less strong teams) was won by West Nottingham B, who drew 2-2 with Rolls Royce A but won on board count. Maurice Hill (Nomads) was part of the Rolls Royce team.

League results

Division 1

West Nottingham 1 – University 2				
1	Levens, D.	(155)	0 – 1	Therrien, A. (197)
2	Grewal, B.	(177)	½ – ½	Somekh, J. (165)
3	Nguyen, M. N.	(–)	1 – 0	Thompson, I. (168)
4	Jarvis, D.	(153)	½ – ½	Clare, A. (163)
5	Mehton, A.	(153)	0 – 1	Emanuel, J. (164)
2 – 3				

West Bridgford 1 – Mansfield 1				
1	Richmond, R.	(188)	½ – ½	Tait, J. (194)
2	Walker, T.	(160)	½ – ½	Cantrill, C. (150)
3	Thompson, B.	(156)	0 – 1	Morrison, K. (159)
4	Hill, F.	(107)	0 – 1	Foreman, S. (143)
5	Budd, C.	(–)	1 – 0	Wagenbach, J. (133)
2 – 3				

University 1 – Newark 1				
1	Walker, A.	(169)	½ – ½	Wells, D. (153)
2	Lee, D.	(165)	1 – 0	Shutt, K. (159)
3	Billingham, J.	(155)	½ – ½	Ladds, G. (144)
4	Walters, K.	(140)	0 – 1	Blake, R. (133)
5	Chilton, J.	(128)	0 – 1	Combie, A. (126)
2 – 3				

Division 2

Bunkers 1 – West Nottingham 2				
1	Jennings, G.	(133)	0 – 1	Kingston, I. (144)
2	Brameld, K.	(142)	1 – 0	Keetley, M. (137)
3	Collins, J.	(102)	½ – ½	Collins, J. (136)
4	Harvey, K.	(138)	1 – 0	Hinton, G. (135)
5	Moore, M.	(88)	½ – ½	Nehra, P. (–)
3 – 2				

Radcliffe & Bingham 1 – Fiveways 1				
1	Day, T.	(154)	1 – 0	Flynn, D. (137)
2	London, N.	(133)	1 – 0	Bhayat, S. (127)
3	Toms, D.	(131)	1 – 0	Best, I. (116)
4	Murfet, G.	(131)	½ – ½	Thorsen, A. (104)
5	Taylor, M.	(126)	½ – ½	Bowen, L. (106)
4 – 1				

Division 3

Fiveways 2 – Mansfield 2				
1	Bowen, L.	(106)	1 – 0	Wagenbach, J. (133)
2	Thorsen, A.	(104)	0 – 1	Ze, C. (–)
3	Griffiths, D.	(106)	½ – ½	Oldham, B. (128)
4	Birks, D.	(93)	0 – 1	Smith, V. (119)
5	Dunne, D.	(99)	1 – 0	Epro, J. (93)
2½ – 2½				

Ashfield 3 – Nomads 2				
1	Cranmer, S.	(132)	1 – 0	Marriott, R. (131)
2	Sayer, R.	(109)	1 – 0	Troubridge, P. (104)
3	Lewis, T.	(109)	½ – ½	Cronshaw, D. (105)
4	Jackson, M.	(108)	½ – ½	Darby, L. (97)
5	Dyce, R.	(86)	½ – ½	Dawson, R. (81)
3½ – 1½				

Ashfield 4 – Gambit 3				
1	Morrey, A.	(108)	0 – 1	Edwards, R. (136)
2	Clarke, P.	(96)	0 – 1	Roper, K. (125)
3	Potter, C.	(87)	0 – 1	Carlton, A. (121)
4	Dyce, R.	(86)	0 – 1	Fillingham, I. (103)
5	Justice, E.	(76)	0 – 1	Gibson, G. (99)
0 – 5				

Division 4

Nomads 3 – Ashfield 5				
1	Exton, O.	(98)	1 – 0	McIntosh, S. (96)
2	Pynegar, H.	(75)	1 – 0	Wright, N. (87)
3	Ivas, A.	(–)	1 – 0	Todd, P. (85)
4	Dawson, R.	(81)	0 – 1	Norris-Hunt, T. (71)
5	Smith, P.	(87)	1 – 0	Beeby, F. (–)
4 – 1				

Bunkers 3 – Gambit 4				
1	Radford, T.	(74)	0 – 1	Harper, M. (107)
2	Chubb, A.	(66)	0 – 1	Hobson, B. (104)
3	Parham, S.	(62)	0 – 1	Padvis, D. (104)
4	Frings, M.	(71)	½ – ½	Groves, A. (76)
5	Blampied, D.	(66)	½ – ½	Gretton, M. (80)
1 – 4				

Division 5

West Nottingham 6 – Grantham 2				
1	Needham, M.	(–)	0 – 1	Smith, B. (86)
2	Ineligible player	(–)	0 – 1	Cumbers, C. (84)
3	Henegan, S.	(–)	0 – 1	Allgood, R. (83)
4	Williamson, O.	(–)	0 – 1	Smith, R. (–)
0 – 4				

Long Eaton 2 – Bunkers 4				
1	Davies, N.	(104)	½ – ½	Frings, M. (71)
2	Moss, R.	(79)	1 – 0	Parham, S. (62)
3	Bentley, A.	(50)	1 – 0	Collins, A. (–)
4	Somers, M.	(–)	1 – 0	James, M. (0)
3½ – ½				

University 4 – West Nottingham 5

1 Bardsley, C.	(-)	1	- 0	Keetley, P.	(80)
2 Shalindra, F.	(-)	0	- 1	Needham, R.	(55)
3 Dimude, M.	(-)	0	- 1	Clegg, T.	(49)
4 Pym, J.	(-)	1	- 0	Gupta, Y.	(-)
		2	- 2		

League tables

Division 1

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Gambit 1	10	8	1	1	32½	17½	15	0	17
2 Mansfield 1	11	7	3	1	31	24	7	0	17
3 University 2	10	4	4	2	28½	21½	7	0	12
4 Newark 1	11	5	1	5	28	27	1	0	11
5 Ashfield 1	10	4	2	4	25½	24½	1	0	10
6 West Bridgford 1	11	2	4	5	25½	29½	-4	0	8
7 University 1	10	3	2	5	21½	28½	-7	0	8
8 Gambit 2	10	1	3	6	19	31	-12	0	5
9 West Nottingham 1	11	3	0	8	23½	31½	-8	-2	4

Gambit 1 – West Nottingham 1 is confirmed as a 5–0 walkover for Gambit following West Nottingham's appeal to the LMC. The LMC also confirmed the additional 2 point penalty for a default.

Division 2

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Bunkers 1	10	8	1	1	33½	16½	17	0	17
2 West Nottingham 2	9	6	1	2	27½	17½	10	0	13
3 Grantham 1	9	5	3	1	27	18	9	0	13
4 Nomads 1	9	2	3	4	19½	25½	-6	0	7
5 Radcliffe & Bingham 1	9	2	2	5	20½	24½	-4	0	6
6 Ashfield 2	9	2	2	5	19	26	-7	0	6
7 Long Eaton 1	9	4	0	5	22½	22½	0	-4	4
8 Fiveways 1	10	1	2	7	15½	34½	-19	0	4

Division 3

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Ashfield 3	10	7	0	3	30½	19½	11	0	14
2 Gambit 3	10	6	2	2	29½	20½	9	0	14
3 Bunkers 2	8	4	3	1	24	16	8	0	11
4 Mansfield 2	9	4	3	2	25	20	5	0	11
5 Fiveways 2	9	2	5	2	21½	23½	-2	0	9
6 Nomads 2	10	1	3	6	18½	31½	-13	0	5
7 Ashfield 4	10	1	2	7	18½	31½	-13	0	4
8 University 3	6	1	2	3	12½	17½	-5	-2	2

Division 4

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 Newark 2	9	9	0	0	32½	12½	20	0	18
2 West Nottingham 3	9	5	1	3	25	20	5	0	11
3 Gambit 4	10	4	3	3	26½	23½	3	0	11
4 Nomads 3	10	4	2	4	28	22	6	0	10
5 Radcliffe & Bingham 2	9	5	0	4	25	20	5	0	10
6 Ashfield 5	10	5	0	5	22	28	-6	0	10
7 West Nottingham 4	9	2	1	6	17	28	-11	0	5
8 Bunkers 3	10	0	1	9	14	36	-22	0	1

Division 5

Team	P	W	D	L	F	A	Df	Pn	Pt
1 West Bridgford 2	10	8	1	1	29	11	18	0	17
2 Long Eaton 3	11	7	1	3	22½	21½	1	0	15
3 Grantham 2	11	6	1	4	26½	17½	9	0	13
4 Long Eaton 2	11	6	1	4	26	18	8	0	13
5 University 4	9	5	1	3	19	17	2	0	11
6 West Nottingham 5	10	3	2	5	18	22	-4	0	8
7 Bunkers 4	10	3	0	7	17½	22½	-5	0	6
8 Gambit 5	9	2	2	5	15	21	-6	-2	4
9 West Nottingham 6	11	1	1	9	10½	33½	-23	0	3

League Management Committee Minutes

Minutes of the LMC meeting held at Gambit Chess Club on 17/10/2005

Present: Wallace Bryce (WB), Steve Burke (SB), Ian Fillingham (IF), Maurice Hill (MH), David Levens (DL), Alex Posazhennikov (AP), Drag Sudar (DS)

Previous meeting on 19/07/2005

The minutes of the previous meeting in July were approved.

Rules D1 and D2 – Submission of results

Neil Graham had asked the LMC to clarify how results could be sent to the records secretary. Earlier in the season he had sent a result by email but was informed this was in breach of rules D1 & D2 and that the AGM in July 2005 had decided to leave unchanged the current method of submitting results.

The LMC confirmed that the rules require the match result to be sent on a result card signed by a representative of each team. It is acceptable to email a scan of a result card containing both signatures. To be able to use any other method of submitting results someone will have to propose a change to the rules.

Rule E7 – Penalties for defaulted matches

University 3 defaulted its first match, away to Ashfield 4. The University 3 captain, Phil Jacobs, wrote to DS explaining the circumstances and asking that no penalty be applied.

The LMC decided the circumstances were within the club's control (see rule E9) as there had been enough time between the start of term and the date of the match for the club to organise a team. Therefore the 2 point penalty would be applied. The LMC recognized that this was Phil Jacob's first match as captain and therefore agreed to waive the £10 fine if University 3 does not default another match this season.

Rule B8 – Exemption from quick play finishes

Having had a previous request for exemption from quick play time limits (QPTL) for D. Toms (DT) rejected at the July meeting, Radcliffe & Bingham again requested exemption, this time claiming a medical reason.

The following is a brief summary of the points made at the meeting.

DS reminded the LMC that the July meeting had agreed the following:

- ◆ Most of the six exempt players should not be exempt
- ◆ It would be unfair to remove exemptions that had already been granted
- ◆ In future all requests would be treated on their own merits

There was general agreement that competitive chess is stressful and players can be in time trouble not only near the end of the game but also at any time control (in adjudication time limits (ATL) it is possible to have more than one time control)). Effective clock management is the player's responsibility, especially if he knows that he struggles when short of time.

MH and WB wondered whether players who suffered from medical conditions that they felt could affect them in time trouble should think about whether they should be playing at all.

The meeting noted that quite a few players had conditions similar to DT's but happily played to QPTL.

The meeting also noted that as a player gets older it becomes more difficult to maintain the same level of grade. Most players would eventually have to face this fact, especially those with higher grades, as for them the reduction in grade can be larger than for others.

DS said that all players should play to the same rules and adapt their game and their time management as required. He half expected someone to request exemption from having to make the first time control!

IF felt that this LMC, because of previous LMCs' decisions, had little choice but to grant exemption. However, he was concerned with the wording of the rule and would prefer to see adjudication abolished.

SB said that the LMC should follow precedent and grant exemption. It would be wrong for this LMC to ignore decisions made by previous LMCs, even if some current members disagreed with those earlier decisions.

DL said that if this claim were taken in isolation, he would be against granting exemption. However, he felt that there probably was some precedent and therefore the LMC might have to grant exemption.

DS said there was no precedent as no player was exempted for the same reasons claimed by DT. He felt that the LMC should not be bound by poor decisions made by previous LMCs that went against the original intention of the rule he had proposed in 1994 (to grant exemptions on the ground of physical incapacity).

SB asked DS if he knew why previous exemptions been granted. DS replied that, according to the records:

- (a) 2 for physical disability
- (b) 1 for blindness
- (c) 1 for angina

- (d) 1 without a reason
- (e) 6 for being 'old'

DS said that the player with angina had stopped playing competitive chess as he found that playing to the adjudication time limits (ATL) did not reduce his stress during the game. He added that at least two of the players currently exempt from QPTL play in county matches and congresses seemingly without any difficulty. One of those had exploited a loophole (before it was closed in 2004) to choose whether to play to QPTL or ATL in the NCA league. As DS's original intentions when proposing the rule change in 1994 was that exemptions should be granted to players who had genuine difficulties with pressing the clock, he felt that some players had taken advantage of previous LMC members' generosity in granting them exemptions.

There was a discussion as to whether anybody at all should have exemption. It was noted that many physically disabled and blind people played to QPTL in leagues and congresses, and that the Derby & District Chess League had never had ATL yet this had not prevented players with physical disabilities from playing. One of the two players exempted in 1994 currently plays in the DDCL.

IF noted that some players brought helpers along to press the clock for them.

DL felt that the rule had been taken advantage of and it should be changed to only grant exemption for those with genuine problems such as blindness or cerebral palsy etc.

SB said the current rule was badly worded as it left open to interpretation what was considered to be valid grounds for exemption and so it needed to be changed.

AP said he agreed with DS.

SB IF and DL voted to grant exemption.

WB AP and DS voted not to grant exemption.

MH had the casting vote and found the decision difficult but eventually decided not to grant exemption.

The request was refused by 4 votes to 3.

The LMC decided that the rules had to change either to exempt players only on the grounds of physical disability or to abolish ATL. The LMC would put forward a proposal for consideration at the RRM. If the proposal is rejected the LMC would seek advice from the AGM (to which it reports) as to what it should consider as valid grounds for exemption.

The meeting closed at 9:15 p.m.