

## Nominations

Kevin Burke (St Benildus) – President  
Sam O’Neill (UCD) – Leagues Controller  
Luke Hayden (Dublin) – Secretary  
Gordon Freeman (Gonzaga) – Treasurer

## Motions

1) That rule 6.13.5 be changed to –

“Note all players rated 1500 or below, including unrated players whose strength has been deemed to be 1500 or below, are deemed to have a rating of 1500. This means they can play on any board provided that no player with a rating of 1650 (ie 1500 + 150) or higher is placed on a lower board.” **(Executive)**

2) That the definition for eligible players in the William Brennan competition be changed to “Have an ICU rating of less than 1700”. **(Executive)**

3) That there be no change to the 150-point rule. **(Executive)**

*Note on motions 1, 2 and 3 – these relate to the changes in the ICU ratings system. There were two changes – to align ICU ratings with FIDE, and to correct the ICU ratings for rating deflation. It is not being proposed to change the ratings in the league rules for the rating deflation adjustment as no change was made to reflect rating deflation in the first place. So while a rating of 1200 is now  $1200 + ((2000 - 1200) * 0.6) = 1680$  and 1500 is now  $1500 + ((2000 - 1500) * 0.6) = 1800$ , the motions do not propose following suit.*

*The table below shows the impact of ratings deflation on the two rules, and shows that converting the 1200/1500 rating bands to the new ICU equivalents of 1680/1800 would simply keep the impact of ratings deflation. The ratings proposed would bring the % of players impacted more or less back to their old levels.*

	<u>May-04</u>	<u>May-14</u>	<u>May-23</u>	<u>May-24</u>
Total players	867	909	1373	1635
% < 1200	32.9%	35.6%	55.9%	4.2%
% < 1500				32.9%
% < 1680				58.0%
% <1500	60.3%	63.0%	73.6%	32.9%
% <1700				61.2%
% <1800				75.2%

*The compression of ratings may require a change to the 150-point rule (perhaps to change it to 100 points). While no such motion is proposed – in part due to an expectation that ratings may adjust somewhat over the coming 12 months, and also due to the risk that clubs may in advertently lose points by a captain keeping to the*

*long-established 150-point rule in the new season rather than a new band – a null motion is proposed to encourage a discussion and suggestions on the rule.*

4) That a new Cup rule 1.3 be inserted –

“As far as possible, multiple teams from the same club shall not be drawn in the same group. No such restrictions shall apply to knock-out rounds.” **(Executive)**

5) That the final day of the leagues be moved to a Saturday. **(Executive)**

6) That rule 6.15 be amended to read –

“A player playing a fourth (or subsequent) game for a team where there is a player rated 150 points or more on a lower team for the same club shall be considered an illegal player, *unless the higher-rated player is ineligible to play for the higher team by virtue of having already played for a different team for the same club in the same division.*” **(Executive)**

7) That all matches involving a provincial team takes place on a Saturday. **(Balbriggan Chess Club)**

8) Teams in the Ennis to consist of 7 players rather than 6 at present, the change to take effect in the 2025/26 season. **(Skerries Chess Club)**

*Note on motion 8 – This is to facilitate transition from Div 4 to 3 to 2, without a big jump. At present the O’Hanlon and Ennis have 6 player teams and the Heidenfeld has 8, which puts some teams off accepting promotion, especially from smaller clubs, as they have to find 2 extra players.*

*We would be equally happy if the Heidenfeld was reduced from 8 players to 7 players instead, with the same idea.*

*The change would take effect from the 2025/26 season to allow clubs time to adjust and plan ahead.*

9) Commencing from the 24/25 season, Division 5 games will be FIDE-rated. **(DCU Chess Club)**

*Useful data: 7 of the top 10 scorers from both Division 5 North and South in the 23/24 season had a FIDE rating, after 10 matches. Implementing this change would increase the stakes and attraction of Division 5 play for everyone. The FIDE rating of Division 4 has been a great change, and it seems to us to be a great idea to extend this change once more down the chain.*

10) Motion to enshrine Division 6 as the permanent bottom division, while accommodating any increase in the number of teams

- There will be no more than 6 Divisions. All references to Division 7 in the rules will be removed.
- There will be no more than 4 sections in Division 6. If there are up to 24 teams competing, they will be North and South. If there are 25 to 36 teams, they will

be North, South and Central. If there are 37 to 48 teams they will be North, South, East and West.

- If there are going to be 49 to 60 teams in Division 6, a new Central section will be added to Division 5, with Div 6 teams filling the sections per their performance in the previous season, rearranged between sections as necessary.  
**(DCU Chess Club)**

*If implemented, this would future-proof the League, allowing for a large increase in the number of teams competing without increasing the amount of divisions. This would allow for smoother and faster on-boarding for new clubs, and this solution follows the precedent of grouping closer clubs together without disrupting competition. In a world where this motion is unsuccessful and a new club must start from Division 7, with the League as it currently is run, that's 3 straight years of excellent performances to get to FIDE-rated games, and then 3 more years to reach the top division, making it even more difficult to attract talent to new clubs.*

#### **11) Motion to create and insert a new Article 6.8**

6.8 By the end of the season, if the number of players who have been declared for a team and played at least one game for that team is the below the minimum of 8 in Divisions 1 and 2, below 6 in Divisions 3 and 4 and below 5 in all other Divisions, that team will be penalised 1 point for each missing player below the minimum.

#### **(DCU Chess Club)**

*Taken as a stand-alone provision, Article 6.7 allows and incentivises clubs to declare a full panel of strong players for their top team, who have little to no connection to Leinster chess, and who may never end up playing for the club that declares them. By doing this, the club's strongest players are freed up to play for their lower team(s) for several games at the start of the season, giving a competitive advantage. The 150 point rule does not prevent exploitation of this loophole.*

*This addition acknowledges the desire for the LCU and clubs to see who will be playing for each club, while making it harder to exploit the loophole of cynically declaring strong players who will never play a game while declaring a club's real players in divisions below their strength.*

*This solution has the benefit of not punishing teams that declare a player at the start of the season in good faith who never plays, as more than the minimum can be declared as the season goes on.*

*If this motion is unsuccessful, we may take Magnus up on his offer to play the O'Hanlon!*

#### **12) Motion to allow for direct seeding for strong new clubs into Division 5**

- After normal relegation places from Division 5 have been determined, an additional provisional relegation spot will be allocated to the next worst performing team from among all the sections.
- If a club without any teams in the League wishes to start their first year in Division 5 rather than the bottom division, they may be able to do so, if they can meet the following conditions by 31<sup>st</sup> August pre-season:

- 7 of their members who declare for the candidate team must have a mean rating higher than the combined mean rating of the top 7 scorers of the teams that were promoted to Division 5 the previous season.
  - The 7 players of the candidate team must have a mean rating higher than the combined mean rating of the top 7 scorers from each Division 5 team the previous year.
  - “Rating” in this proposal may refer to ICU rating or FIDE rating, whichever is higher for each player. The most recent rating list will be used.
  - No player who played for a team that was relegated the previous season may be one of the 7 members of the candidate team.
  - Where 2 teams qualify under these criteria, the one with the higher mean rating will be chosen to be seeded into Division 5.
  - The Executive will have veto power over the direct seeding of a team.
- (DCU Chess Club)**

*There are many reasons to keep strong teams out of Division 6. Several seasons have involved blowout wins where new teams are immediately promoted. This lowers the quality of the experience for them and their opponents.*

*This change would have a normalising impact on play, keeping matches more competitive for everyone, and not discouraging young or new players on Division 6 teams that suffer losses due to mismatches occurring due to new clubs needing to join from the bottom division.*

*The conditions listed are a considerably high bar to clear, which will hopefully avoid this feeling unfair to Division 6 teams that missed out on promotion, and the Division 5 team that is relegated.*

*The bottom 3 teams are relegated in Division 4, so there is precedent.*