

# WCSC/ECSC Rules & Solving rules, proposals

## [PR9] Proposal for Changes/Update to the WCSC/ECSC Rules

### 1.Toilet-break restriction for rounds shorter than 60 minutes

#### Rationale

46th World Chess Solving Championship, Batumi 2023: a non-favourite solver left the hall for the toilet in every round and later finished inside the top ten and raise unnecessary suspicions.

Walking during play distracts other competitors and, in rounds under 60 minutes, is neither necessary nor sporting.

Because effective supervision outside the hall is impossible, especially when team-mates or helpers can freely move close to the playing zone and potentially pass information to the solver in the corridor or restroom, it is prudent to forbid re-entry during rounds whose solving time does not exceed 60 minutes.

Proven in practice: this restriction was applied at the ECSC 2025 in Athens, worked smoothly, and demonstrated its effectiveness; it is therefore timely to formalise it in the official rules.

#### Proposed wording in the time-table of § 1.2

*(full text with the new sentence highlighted in bold)*

*1.2. It consists of 6 rounds over two days, with 3 rounds each day according to the following table:*

<i>Round 1</i>	<i>3 twomovers</i>	<i>20 minutes solving time</i>	<b>Once leave the game zone, its not possible return.</b>
<i>Round 2</i>	<i>3 threemovers</i>	<i>60 minutes solving time</i>	<b>Once leave the game zone, its not possible return.</b>
<i>Round 3</i>	<i>3 endgames</i>	<i>100 minutes solving time</i>	<b>1 exit to the toilet available</b>
<i>Round 4</i>	<i>3 helpmates (h#2, h#3, h# &gt;3)</i>	<i>50 minutes solving time</i>	<b>Once leave the game zone, its not possible return.</b>
<i>Round 5</i>	<i>3 moremovers (at least one 4# and one &gt;4#)</i>	<i>80 minutes solving time</i>	<b>1 exit to the toilet available</b>
<i>Round 6</i>	<i>3 selfmates (s#2, s#3, s# &gt;3)</i>	<i>50 minutes solving time</i>	<b>Once leave the game zone, its not possible return.</b>

## [PR10] 2. Proposal to amend § 9.1 of the WFCC Solving Rules

### Rationale

During the 33rd Chess Solving Championship of Slovakia 2025 the jury awarded only 2.5 points out of 5 for study № 9 to solvers who had provided a single, fully correct main line.

Current wording of § 9.1 says that “in all other problems and studies only one solution is to be given.” . The published stipulation for study № 9 did not state that two main lines were required.

Nevertheless, the jury treated the study as if two main lines were obligatory, causing an inconsistent and, in the protester’s view, unfair scoring decision.

The incident created uncertainty for solvers and directors alike. To prevent similar misunderstandings and to guide future juries unambiguously, the rules should spell out that:

Requiring more than one main line is permissible, but must be declared in the stipulation, and if no such declaration is made, one correct main line is sufficient for the full five points.

The following addition to § 9.1 achieves this clarity without altering the scoring philosophy of the WFCC.

### Proposal to amend § 9.1 of the WFCC Solving Rules

*(full text with the new sentence highlighted in bold)*

*9.1. In helpmate(s) for which more than one single solution is indicated the solver has to give all requested single solutions for a complete solution. In all other problems and studies only one solution is to be given. **If two (or more) main lines are required, this must be stated explicitly in the stipulation. Unless the stipulation explicitly states otherwise, one correct main line in a study earns the full five points.***

**Submitted by:** Arvydas Mockus (LTU), 2025.06.17

## [PR11] Proposal to Reform the World Solving Cup (WSC) Scoring System

I propose that the Solving Committee reconsiders and submits for approval a **reform of the WSC points system** by:

1. **Reducing the bonus points** awarded at the World and European Championships (WCSC and ECSC Opens), and
2. **Increasing the fixed points** granted for national championships in lower-category countries.

**Minimum number of scoring tournaments remains six.**

## Proposed Points Allocation

Categories	Average rating of ten best solvers	1 pl.	2 pl.	3 pl.	4 pl.	5 pl.	6 pl.	7 pl.	8 pl.	9 pl.	10 pl.	11 pl.	12 pl.	13 pl.	14 pl.	15 pl.
1	>=2600	28	26	24	22	20	18	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	2	1
2	>=2550	26	24	22	20	18	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	2	1	
3	>=2500	24	22	20	18	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	2	1		
4	>=2450	22	20	18	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	2	1			
5	>=2400	20	18	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	2	1				
6	>=2350	18	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	2	1					
7	>=2300	16	14	12	10	8	6	4	2	1						
8	>=2250	14	12	10	8	6	4	2	1							
9	>=2200	12	10	8	6	4	2	1								
10 to 14	<2200	10	8	6	4	2	1									

### Purpose of the WSC

The primary goal of the World Solving Cup is to **encourage participation in national solving tournaments in different countries**, thereby promoting international mobility and broader engagement among solvers.

### Why the current system is failing

#### 1. Disproportionate point distribution between categories kills competition intrigue

- The World Championship awards 46 points, whereas a champion of a low-category country earns only 2 points.
- This is a clear imbalance that demotivates participation in smaller countries.
- Winners in strong tournaments win by large margins, leaving no real intrigue or close competition.

#### 2. The current system discriminates against weaker countries

- It is far more beneficial to place 1st or 2nd in a strong tournament than to win four national championships in low-category countries.
- The points system undervalues consistent participation and the significance of victories.

#### 3. The system no longer aligns with the idea of a World Cup

- The WSC should be won through victories and participation across multiple countries and stages, not simply by duplicating the winners of WCSC/ECSC Opens.
- A player who wins 5–6 national championships should have a real chance to win the WSC.

#### 4. Low-category countries lose the ability to attract top players

- For example, legendary GM Limontas no longer attends—even when sponsored—because 1–2 points have no impact on the standings and offer no motivation. The absence of famous names harms the sport's prestige, growth, and visibility.
- A minimum of 10 points would change solver behavior and restore motivation.

#### 5. Organizers in weaker countries lose motivation to host WSC tournaments

- Hosting events that have no real impact on the WSC standings becomes a pointless effort.
- In the long run, this will reduce the number of WSC tournaments and the willingness of countries to host them.

## 6. A 10-point minimum for any tournament victory would encourage travel to various countries

– All events would become meaningful, encouraging solvers to explore new destinations and strategically plan their season.

## 7. More players would appear in the WSC standings

– With a 10-point minimum system, at least six solvers in every tournament would receive points.  
– This would increase the number of ranked players, motivation, competitiveness, and overall visibility.

## 8. Statistical models show inequality

– Even a player who wins six different WSC stages (in smaller countries) might not achieve a prize position under the current rules.

### Proposed Benefits of Reform

- **Restores balance:** Encourages top solvers to compete in more than just WCSC/ECSC Opens.
- **Makes all countries matter:** Smaller federations and their tournaments would have real impact on the WSC, encouraging broader international participation.
- **Stimulates participation:** More countries will attract international solvers, improving local quality and visibility.
- **Reinforces the true idea of a World Cup:**  
A solver who wins multiple national championships should be ahead of a player who never wins but places 4th–6th in one or two strong events. The title of World Cup winner should reflect broad international success — not isolated high placements.

Submitted by: Arvydas Mockus (LTU), 2025.05.27

## [PR12] Proposal to Add a Protest Regulation to the WSC Rules

The World Solving Cup tournaments are now among the most prestigious WFCC-rated events. They attract many titled solvers, count for the official rating list and award valuable Cup points. However, the problem is that in different countries we encounter arbiters of very different skill levels, and mistakes occur. Players sometimes do not receive points even after solving the tasks, and later they do not know where to turn or what protest procedure to follow.

Over the last few months I noticed two such errors.

- In the Finnish championship Grand Grandmaster MartynasLimontas had to leave for home earlier; when he got back he found out that he had not received 1 point, and he did not know how or to whom he should protest.
- Robert Włodarczyk, in the Slovak championship, solved a study according to the given conditions and should have received 5 points but got only 2.5. An official protest was sent to the Solving Committee; it remained unresolved and without any official reply.

According to rule 11 the WSC Director has the right and the duty not to include a tournament in the WSC standings if irregularities occurred, but he hesitates to take drastic action or lacks clear instructions. **(11. The WSC Director decides should a tournament be included in the WSC in case of exceeding deadline for the registration and for the announcement of the tournaments (items 3 and 4). He decides the same in ten days after the tournament ends in a case of exceeding deadline for sending results of the tournament (item 10) or any other irregularity.)**

Failing to correct blatant mistakes and to restore the players' points is a very dangerous precedent, which would later have to be applied uniformly in every case — even if, for example, an arbiter

maliciously refused to award 60 points out of 60. Such a result would have to be accepted, just as we accepted cases where players lost 1 or 2.5 points.

During the 2023/2024 season I travelled to 13 stages and saw various differences in the interpretation of the same rules: in one place points were given, in another not, in identical situations. Therefore we need a single WSC arbiter who would decide all disputed situations and interpret them uniformly. This should be done by the WSC Director himself, or by a judge appointed at the start of the season from the FIDE Solving Judges list (<https://www.wfcc.ch/Titles/sj/>).

Why this is a problem?

Fair-play risk: wrong scores may stay in the rating list and Cup standings. Loss of trust: solvers feel unprotected, tournament directors have no clear guidelines, and the Solving Committee entirely inactive because there is no official protest procedure.

Why a formal WSC protest regulation is needed?

1. Clarity: every solver must know where and when to appeal.
2. Speed: Fixed deadlines for the tournament director and WSC Director.
3. Authority: a binding chain of action (director → WSC Director) ensures corrections are enforced.
4. Deterrence: if a director refuses to act, the event is automatically declared unrated and outside the Cup—preventing abuses.
5. Consistency: by having a single protest procedure for all WSC tournaments, we avoid situations where each director or country handles protests in its own improvised way without clear rules.

## Proposed new § 12 – Protests

### **12. Protests**

**12.1** *A solver may lodge a written protest if he/she believes WSC tournament results were scored incorrectly or the rules were violated.*

**12.2** *The protest must be submitted to the tournament director **within two (2) days** after the end of the tournament.*

**12.3** *The tournament director shall reply in writing **within one (1) day** of receiving the protest.*

**12.4** *If the solver is not satisfied, the protest may be appealed to the WSC Director **within four (4) days** after the end of the tournament.*

**12.5** *The WSC Director shall examine the protest—or delegate it to a pre-season-appointed WFCC arbiter from the official FIDE Solving Judges list (<https://www.wfcc.ch/titles/sj/>)—and shall issue a decision **within five (5) days**. If the protest is upheld, the WSC Director instructs the tournament director to correct the results.*

**12.6** *If the tournament director refuses to make the correction, the WSC Director **must** declare the tournament unrated and not recognised as part of the World Solving Cup.*

(The time limits are aligned with the existing deadlines: the tournament director sends results to the WSC Director within three days, and the WSC Director finalises the event within ten days. Adjustments are possible, but should remain inside that window to avoid amending other clauses.)

By adopting this short, precise addition, we close a critical gap, protect solvers, and give directors and the WSC Director clear guidance for all future events. Rating & Cup integrity – guarantees that only correctly-scored results enter the WFCC rating list and World Solving Cup standings, thereby preserving the proportional distribution of Cup points and long-term rating fairness.

**Submitted by:** Arvydas Mockus (LTU), 2025.06.27