

LDCL Agenda

1. Welcome – Ben Graff (League President)
2. Apologies for absence – Julian Summerfield (League Secretary)
3. Minutes of the last meeting – Julian Summerfield (League Secretary)
4. Presentation of Trophies – Ben Graff (League President)
5. Finance report – Tom Darling (League Treasurer)
6. Registration Officer report – Gordon Christie (Registration officer)
7. Rule changes – All
8. Composition of teams for next year - Dave Thomas (Fixture Secretary)
9. AOB

LDCL Proposed Rule Changes – For AGM Consideration

Committee Proposal - Championship tie break provisions – Rule 3

Rationale

Rule 3 says that if teams are tied for the championship, there are various tie-break mechanisms that shall be utilised (game-point difference, head to head scores from the team matches, followed by a play-off.) The rule also says that these provisions “will be applied in this order to settle relegation tie-breaks.” However, this provision could be more explicit.

Textual change

Amend the end of rule 3 to read:

These tie-break provisions will also be applied in this order to settle “championship, divisional titles, promotion and relegation scenarios.”

Shirley Proposal

Provisions governing playing up for a higher team – Rule 7f

Rationale

We believe that the fact that playing up on bottom board does not count advantages some teams, but disadvantages others. It also gives teams with large squads the ability to flex their board orders such that players remain eligible for longer. We are proposing the following amendment that would give a larger quota, but would mean that playing up on any board counted toward a players quota.

Textual change

7f - currently reads:

A player who has been validly registered for a team, is entitled to play up for a higher team, but once having played for any combination of teams more than twice will be re-registered for the lowest of

such higher teams. Playing up on bottom board for the team immediately above that which they are registered for, does not impact on a player's quota of playing up games. No player may play for a lower team than that for which they have been registered."

We are proposing this is amended to:

A player who has been validly registered for a team, is entitled to play up for a higher team, but once having played for any combination of teams more than five times on any board will be re-registered for the lowest of such higher teams. No player may play for a lower team than that for which they have been registered."

Committee Proposal – Equipment – Rule 10

Rationale

We currently say that in Division 1 and the Open KO Digital clocks must be supplied, and analogue clocks should only be used in exceptional circumstances. This was a compromise a few years ago, when digital clocks weren't as ubiquitous as they are now. We should amend the rule to drop the reference to Division 1 and the Open KO so that we say that we expect that digital clocks should be supplied, and analogue clocks can only be used in exceptional circumstances.

Textual change

Amend rule 10 to read:

"The home team shall be responsible for the provision of sets and boards and for arranging for clocks to be made available. Digital clocks should be supplied and will be used. Analogue clocks may only be used in exceptional circumstances, where no digital clock is available."

Proposal to amend rule 14b – Penalties for playing a team in the wrong board order – Proposer Mark Page (Kenilworth)

Rationale

The one issue which has bugged me this year has been the draconian nature of Rule 14b and the application of penalties for board order infringements. This, of course, was occasioned by the Kenilworth B v Shirley A match, where a 3.5-0.5 win for Kenilworth B became a 0-4 loss because Boards 3 and 4 were a mere 7 rating points wrong. It seems totally disproportionate that such a minor error should attract such a harsh punishment. The rule very nearly saved Shirley A from relegation, which would have been very unjust to other clubs fighting to stay up, and threatened to cost Kenilworth B a shot at the title.

I feel it would be far more equitable if the punishment for a board order infringement was to lose the board on which the infringement occurred, and any below it. As this will mean the non-offending team scores at least 2 game points (ie boards 3 and 4 as a minimum), it will still represent a considerable punishment, but the non-offending boards of the offending team will have their games counted when determining the match result. The best an offending team can do is to draw the match 2-2, and even that requires wins on Boards 1 and 2 and an offence on Boards 3 and 4. (In a 3 board match, the offending team will inevitably lose the match.)

Considering there is no penalty for defaulting boards (even top board), which is a far more serious offence in my opinion, I think the punishment for a marginal board order infringement really needs to be scaled down.

Textual Rule Change

So I would propose to reword the relevant part of Rule 14b as follows:-

"Any breaches of this rule will be referred to the Committee and, if proven, will result in the loss of the board on which the offence was committed and any boards below. The results of all boards higher than that on which the infringement occurred will stand and be counted towards the match score. In such cases all individual results will still be submitted for grading."

Committee Proposal -Board order/ Grading bands – Rules 14 and 15

Rationale

Currently we have a 75 point range of tolerance in terms of grading order flexibility for adults and 150 points for juniors. Many clubs have highlighted that 75 points can be difficult to calculate. It is proposed that we simplify our provisions in this area by making the new range of tolerance 100 points for both adults and juniors. If junior players are treated exactly as adult players the mention of juniors in the final bullet point of rule 24 might be redundant – but we should still discuss separately in the context of that rule change whether it might still have a purpose.

Textual change

Rule 14b “75 point rule” reference changes to “100 point rule”

Rule 14d – clause relating to juniors 150 point points to be deleted.

Rule 15 – the second paragraph of the provisions in relation to substitutes to be amended to reflect the previous 100 point tolerance, rather than the current reference to 75 points.

Rule 24 - in the final bullet point delete the words *or junior*.

Committee Proposal - Team withdrawal – Rule 20

Rationale

The Committee has a strong presumption that if a club wishes to drop a club during the season, it should be their lowest team, but we want to further strengthen this presumption.

Textual change to Rule 20.

Add the following:

“Any other withdrawal will be at the discretion of the LDCL Committee, but with a strong presumption that the lowest team will be withdrawn, except in exceptional circumstances.”

Board Elimination for determining tied KO team matches – Rule 22

Rationale

Our board elimination provisions for the Kos are not as clearly set out as they could be.

Textual change

Add the following words after “board elimination” to the first paragraph of rule 22:

“Boards will be progressively eliminated from the bottom if a match is tied, until a result is achieved. Should all games be drawn, a replay will be needed.”

Committee Proposal Stanley Gibbins trophy – Rule 23

Rationale

Rule 23 fails to take into account that a player may play for a higher team than that in which he is registered without playing for a team in a higher division.

Textual change

In the sentence:

Cup matches and games for higher or lower division teams than the player usually plays, and defaulted games, do not count.

delete the word *division*

Committee Proposal Definition of a junior – new Rule 25

Rationale

We currently do not define what a junior is and it would be helpful to do so. We propose a new rule 25 to clarify this point.

Textual change

“Anyone who is under 18 on the 1st of September in which an LDCL season starts, will be classed as a junior for the whole of the LDCL season.”