Instruction for the jury members and the contact of the PWCE II

1. The PWCE-II is an official FMJD World Championship

The Executive Board of the FMJD has delegated the organization and control of the PWCE-II to the CPI.

The CPI gives more detailed (expert) Instructions to the jury, including the RI/RIE (the International Rules for problems and end for end games), as it was done for the PWCP-II. This Instruction for the PWCE-II helps avoiding conflicts and evaluating results objectively.

When one or more jury members do not follow the instructions, the contact will explain this to the jury member involved. When the Instruction is not clear to the jury member the contact will ask the CPI to explain the application of the rule for this particular case.

All this is organized in order to protect the rights of the participants. The organization and the rules must be as clear as possible and in the case that they are not fully clear the participant should have the benefit of the doubt.

The jury also benefits from a clear organisation. They know what they can expect from the contact and the CPI. The independence of the jury concerning the level of the scores for the participating competitions is within these rules fully guaranteed.

The role of the contact is also further clarified in this way.

2. The first step, reaching unanimity about eliminations.

After publication of the participating compositions the contact will get a large number of remarks from participants, jury members and others. The jury members have to decide what the value of these remarks is and in particular if these remarks have to lead to elimination of the participating composition concerned.
The contact will keep record of the remarks received and the names of those who made the remarks. When remarks are published the name of the person who made the remark is published as well, unless the same remark is made by many persons.

The policy of the CPI is that participating compositions can only be eliminated (0 points) based upon objective criteria. These objective criteria are mentioned in the RI (second solution, not winning, already published, etc.). The jury members are in principle free to give any score they prefer, but not free to eliminate participating compositions for not objective reasons. When a composition is accepted, the minimum to be given is 10 points (maximum 100).

As a result of this policy the CPI insists that the jury members reach unanimity about eliminations. When the reasons given are objective and referring to the RI it should not be difficult to complete the list of eliminations at an early stage of the competition.
Another reason for this approach is that it stimulates the jury members to apply the RI in a consistent way.

The third and even more important reason is that the CPI wants to protect the interest of the participants and wants to avoid the unsatisfactory situations concerning eliminations at many former contests. Also to avoid ridiculous differences e.g. where one jury member gave 0 points, without explanation, for the composition that later was declared to be the winner as a result of the high scores of the three other jury members. It also happened that compositions are eliminated though they are correct and more original than compositions that are accepted.

When the jury members reach full unanimity about the eliminations, the CPI will assume that the jury members have applied the rules correctly and those participating compositions will be eliminated for the provisional result.

When the jury members do not reach unanimity about elimination of one or more of the participating compositions they first get the opportunity from the contact to convince the other jury members based upon specific articles of the RI. It should be unlikely that he jury members do not reach a common opinion, but if it happens the contact will ask the CPI for a decision and the CPI will instruct the jury members.
The CPI will first check if the acceptance is not against the RI, the Instruction, and the Regulations. Is this not the case then the principle of the CPI FMJD mentioned above applies. The participant has the benefit of the doubt. In other words the participant cannot be convicted with elimination of his composition, when it is not proven that his composition is against the rules.

Most of the cases of elimination mentioned in the RI are fully clear. This was insufficiently the case with what is called resemblance.

The RI are extended with paragraph 2.1.1 with the following text:

2.1.1. Resemblances (with a participating composition).
A distinction is made between resemblances relevant for elimination (0 points) and resemblances only relevant for the score by the judges.
A resemblance is relevant for elimination when the initial position is fully identical or when the solution is nearly identical. For end games the solution is considered nearly identical when the notation of the majority of the Black and White moves is identical, before a known end game is reached. In all other cases a jury member is not allowed to give 0 points.
A resemblance is relevant for scoring when the end game has important aspects in common with the participating composition. The jury member decides whether the resemblance has a negative influence on the score, or no influence, or even a positive influence when the participating composition is much better than all the resemblances found.
The CPI will give explanation to the jury members of these rules or other aspects of this instruction when required.

3. The categories.
Compositions in accordance with Category D will also meet the conditions of other categories. Participants are free to choose the category in this case, but are not allowed to participate with the same composition in both categories.

4. Internal communication

The jury members are free to consult experts about the originality of the participating compositions, but with a copy to the contact and the other jury members.
The jury members should not discuss eliminations outside the jury and the contact. They should not discuss scores at all.
For the CPI the most important rule is that there should be no discussions at all outside the jury and the contact. For the CPI it is unacceptable when jury members and/ or CPI members comment during the PWCE on public Internet or with emails with distribution lists outside the jury and the contact.

These simple rules support clearer and more efficient decision processes and protect the image of the CPI FMJD.