

# Anti-Cheating Guidelines

Prepared by the FIDE/ACP Anti-Cheating Committee  
and approved by the FIDE Presidential Board in Sochi (November 2014)

## *Table of Contents*

<b>Introduction</b> .....	2
<b>Section 1 - Commission Structure</b> .....	4
Members and Chair .....	4
Scope .....	4
Operation .....	4
<b>Section 2 - General and Legal Framework</b> .....	5
Introduction .....	5
Scope .....	5
Prevention .....	6
Standard Protection .....	7
Increased Protection .....	7
Maximum Protection .....	8
On-Site Inspections .....	9
The FIDE Internet-Based Game Screening Tool .....	9
<b>Section 3 - Complaints</b> .....	10
Part A: In-Tournament Reporting .....	10
Part B: Post Tournament Reporting .....	11
<b>Section 4 - Investigation</b> .....	12
<b>Section 5 - Sanctions</b> .....	13
System of Sanctions .....	13
Effects of Judgment, Preventive Suspension, Reinstatement .....	14
FIDE Rating List Publicity .....	14
<b>Section 6 - Recommendations for Arbiters</b> .....	15
Continuous Training .....	15
Initial Recommendations .....	15
<b>Annex A - Tournament Report Form</b> .....	18
<b>Annex B - Post Tournament Report Form</b> .....	19
<b>Annex C - Statistical Method</b> .....	20
I. Methods and Levels of Testing .....	20
II. Procedure For Using Statistical Results .....	20
<b>Annex D - Equipment</b> .....	22

## Introduction

In the past few years, the rapid development of information and communication technology has resulted in a limited number of well-identified instances of computer-assisted cheating, and also in an increased perception by the general public of the vulnerability of chess. FIDE and the Association of Chess Professionals (ACP) jointly identified this as a major cause of concern for the credibility of chess. To put it in simple terms, no one wants to be associated with a sport whose results can easily be affected by computer-assisted cheating. Accordingly in mid-2013 FIDE and the ACP set up the joint “FIDE/ACP Anti-Cheating Committee”.<sup>1</sup>

While the Committee was also asked to look at more traditional areas of malfeasance (such as rating fraud, fictitious tournaments, and result manipulation), it was soon agreed to focus on fighting computer-assisted play as the most important perceived threat to the integrity of chess. Of course, the Committee retains jurisdiction on the above-mentioned areas as well, but it will deal with them at a second stage of its development, since the current Rules of Chess are deemed to be sufficient to fight these frauds. Computer-assisted cheating has priority both in its threat, and in needed additions to the Laws of Chess and competition policies. Both FIDE and the ACP recognize the importance and urgency of this work.

This document contains the initial set of recommendations from the Committee. The first and most important recommendation is that FIDE establish a permanent Anti-Cheating Commission (ACC). The Commission shall operate with a view to prevent instances of cheating and to avoid the spreading of the related plague of false accusations. In order to achieve this result, it shall:

- monitor and constantly improve the anti-cheating system and regulations;
- create training for arbiters and organizers;
- perform sample checks on players and tournaments both on-site and remotely;
- receive complaints;
- investigate open cases;
- make recommendations to other FIDE Commissions and propose changes to the Laws of Chess, Tournament Regulations, Rating Regulations, and Title Regulations.

The Committee herein recommends new procedures for the reporting and investigation of suspected cheating incidents. These recommendations have been developed by involving other FIDE Commissions where needed, such as WCOG, Rules and Tournament Regulations, Qualifications, Ethics, Events, and Arbiters. In some cases action has already been taken by these Commissions in the area of anti-cheating, and these changes have been noted in this report.

The Committee recommends the implementation of a FIDE Internet-based Game Screening Tool for pre-scanning games and identifying potential instances of cheating, together with the adoption of a full-testing procedure in cases of complaints that involve allegations about the nature of moves played. These implementations shall meet the highest academic and judicial standards, in

---

1 This paper has been prepared by Klaus Deventer, Laurent Freyd, Yuri Garrett, Israel Gelfer (Chair), Konstantin Landa, Shaun Press and Kenneth Regan, and is the result, among many other interactions and meetings within the Committee, of two seminal meetings in Paris (October 2013) and Buffalo (April 2014), and follow-up meeting in Bergamo (July 2014) and Tromsø (August 2014). Valuable contributions came from other members of the Committee, including Nick Faulks, Miguel Illescas, and George Mastrokoukos, and external experts including Andrea Griffini, Yuliya Levitan, Bartłomiej Macieja, Takis Nikolopoulos, and Emil Sutovsky. All names are in alphabetical order only.

that their scientific methodology has been subject to publication and peer review, has a limited and documented error rate, has undergone vast empirical testing, is continuously maintained, and is generally accepted by the scientific community. Once in place, the Internet-based Game Screening Tool will be accessible to arbiters and chess officials and will be a useful instrument to prevent fraud. The testing procedures will adhere to privacy requirements as provided for by FIDE and ACC.

This document presents a set of recommendations for arbiters and for the Arbiters Commission, the most important of which is recourse to “Continuous Training” on anti-cheating. The intended purpose of the recommendations is to prepare arbiters to adapt to the changes introduced by the new Anti-Cheating (AC) framework. This recognizes the swift pace of information technology, the sheer variety of alleged mechanisms in recent years, and the need to be informed by new case developments.

Last, the Committee wishes to share with the General Assembly and FIDE Officers the notion that the task it has been assigned is sensitive and extremely complicated, and one in which no previous skill has been acquired by FIDE — or indeed any other party. While the Committee feels that the proposed regulation will contribute to tackle cheating and reinforce confidence in all interested parties, it also understands that future adjustments will be needed to fine-tune the system in light of the experience of the first period of operation. Also, the changing environment in which the ACC will be operating calls for necessary prudence. Thus, the outcomes of the present proposal shall need constant monitoring and possibly a thorough revision in the course of the next few years. One major area of improvement, for example, could be National Federation involvement in the AC effort, which however at this stage has not been addressed at all.

Hopefully, the Committee has provided FIDE with a carefully balanced starting point for developing a comprehensive AC framework that will prove increasingly successful in assuring long-lasting confidence to the game of chess.

## **Section 1 – Commission Structure**

The FIDE/ACP Anti-Cheating Committee recommend the formation of a permanent FIDE Commission called the FIDE Anti-Cheating Commission.

### **A. Members and Chair**

The Commission should consist of 7 members who will be appointed every 4 years. The composition of the Commission shall be as follows:

- Three (3) members of the commission shall be recommended by FIDE;
- Three (3) members of the commission shall be recommended by the Association of Chess Professionals (ACP);
- One (1) member is required to be a technical expert in the area of computer-assisted cheating and shall be jointly nominated by FIDE and the ACP.

The Commission Chair shall be recommended by the FIDE President, and approved by the FIDE General Assembly.

### **B. Scope**

The Commission shall be responsible for defining the regulations concerning anti-cheating in Chess. Where necessary the Commission shall make recommendations to other Commissions concerning this topic and propose changes to the Laws of Chess, Tournament Regulations, Rating Regulations and Title Regulations.

The Commission shall have the power to carry out on-site inspections at any FIDE-rated events.

The Commission shall be responsible for investigating breaches of AC regulations, as defined in Section 3 of this report, and to present such cases to the FIDE Ethics Commission.

### **C. Operation**

The Commission shall meet physically at least once a year to review and possibly amend its regulations. The Commission shall also publish annual reports on its activities, including statistics on the number of cases of breach of AC regulations investigated and found to be proven/unproven.

## Section 2 - General and Legal Framework

### A. Introduction

The ACC recognizes that computer-assisted cheating poses a major perceived threat to the integrity and credibility of chess, and that immediate action is required to adjust the existing Laws of Chess and Regulations accordingly.

While the ACC believes that cheating is not as widespread as one could think, it also acknowledges the prime importance of assuring that the players, the public, the sponsors, and all other stakeholders perceive the game as clean. In order to achieve this goal, a common effort by chess officials/regulators, organizers, players, and arbiters is required. Chess officials need to rank anti-cheating efforts high in their priorities; players need to give up part of their convenience and privacy to protect their own interests; and arbiters need to acquire a more pro-active attitude to their role and duties.

Changes shall be introduced to the Laws of Chess and to the FIDE Statutes to create and enable the Anti-Cheating Commission, to establish a legal basis for anti-cheating sanctions, to introduce a possibility of personal searches during tournaments, to empower the investigation and separated judgment of complaints, and to empower and train arbiters to tackle cheating.

Rather than try to define “cheating” and “cheater”, the ACC opted to define concrete criteria for identifying violations and ensuring fair play. The proposals itemized herein should prevent all known ways of computer-assisted cheating, and make other ways prohibitively difficult. A second set of measures for on-site and remote screening of games, together with tools for statistical analysis and guidelines for interpreting their results, will provide further assurance and helps to arbiters. The statistical tools will use predetermined criteria for identifying any deviations beyond virtually all normal play, and for recognizing when alleged deviations are not significant.

Last, a set of sanctions, both discretionary and automatic, both on-site and ex-post-facto, will be developed.

Thus, this new anti-cheating framework will result in necessary changes to the Laws of Chess, recommendations to arbiters, the setting-up of a permanent FIDE Anti-Cheating Commission, and the establishing of a complaint, review, and appeal process for breaches of AC regulations.

### B. Scope

Recommendations from this Committee are intended to cover all FIDE-rated events. However the Committee recognizes that there are substantial differences between different types of events, and has therefore identified three categories of tournaments:

**(A) Events that require maximum levels of protection:**

FIDE Level 1 events (as defined in the FIDE Competition Rules)  
Round-robins with an average rating of 2600 or more (2400 for Women’s events);  
Events with prize funds in excess of EUR 100,000.

**(B) Events that require increased levels of protection:**

FIDE Level 2 events (as defined in the FIDE Competition Rules)  
Events with prize funds in excess of EUR 20,000;  
Round-robins with an average rating of 2400 or more (2200 for Women’s events);  
All tournaments that offer title norms.

(C) Events for which standard levels of protection may suffice:

FIDE Level 3 events (as defined in the FIDE Competition Rules)

Further the ACC strongly recommend for National Championships, National Teams Championships, and National Junior/Youth Championships that organizers adopt a level of protection one level above that required for an equivalent non-championship event.

Anti-cheating measures will vary across categories in order to take account of the different economic impact of such measures, as well as to accommodate amateur players likely to take part in many FIDE rated tournaments. The list of measures is specified under “Prevention” below.

With a view to creating a sufficient unbiased database of games and to make statistical analysis even more accurate, all games played on or after 1.1.2012 are subject to potential screening by the ACC. This will enable AC statistical analysis to apply to a wider sample of games, 18 months prior to the announcement of the establishment of the FIDE/ACP ACC. Any player coming under investigation for games played after the adoption of the ACC regulations will be potentially subject to screening of his earlier games going back to 1.1.2012. Games played on or before 31.12.2011 will not be subject to the jurisdiction of the ACC.

### C. Prevention

The FIDE Laws of Chess that have come into force on 1 July 2014 include augmented provisions explicitly forbidding the use of external information during a game. Specifically, the law –

*11.3.a. During play the players are forbidden to use any notes, sources of information or advice, or analyze any game on another chessboard.*

– is now supplemented by laws pertaining to electronic devices:

*11.3.b. During play, a player is forbidden to have a mobile phone and/or other device capable of processing or transmitting chess analysis<sup>2</sup> in the playing venue. If it is evident that a player brought such a device into the playing venue, he shall lose the game. The opponent shall win. The rules of a competition may specify a different, less severe, penalty.*

The new laws also empower the arbiter to ensure that the above rule is adhered to:

*The arbiter may require the player to allow his clothes, bags or other items to be inspected, in private. The arbiter or a person authorized by the arbiter shall inspect the player and shall be of the same gender as the player. If a player refuses to cooperate with these obligations, the arbiter shall take measures in accordance with Article 12.9.*

Tournament organizers are also free to introduce their own regulations and conditions for events, provided they are in accord with the Laws of Chess.

Accordingly, the Committee feels that three levels of protection are desirable: standard protection, increased protection, and maximum protection. These levels of protection are to correspond with the three types of tournaments identified in Section 2.B. Upon request from a tournament organizer and based on good cause, the ACC may grant a waiver from the requirements enumerated below. The waiver request must be submitted in advance and describe adequate anti-cheating measures that are tailored to the tournament’s size and budget. The organizers are not limited on the number of waivers they can submit.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Committee recommends that the current wording of this paragraph be changed from “electronic means of communication” to “other device capable of processing or transmitting chess analysis”.

Tournaments that are found not to materially comply with AC requirements shall not be rated.

**1) Standard protection - to apply to tournaments identified in Section 2.B.**

- i) Arbiters should remind players of the existence of the new AC regulations;
- ii) Organizers must clearly and carefully designate areas for players (the “Playing Area”) and for spectators. Organizers and arbiters shall prevent getting any chess information from outside the “Playing Area”. Organizers shall try, in so much as possible and reasonable, to avoid contact between players and spectators. If possible, provide separate refreshment/ toilet/ smoking areas for players and spectators;
- iii) Recommendation to adopt at least one security measure from Annex D;
- iv) Recommendation to send all available games in PGN format for screening by the FIDE internet-based Game Screening Tool. Obligation to send norm-related tournament games in PGN format for screening by the FIDE Internet-based Game Screening Tool;
- v) Organizers are required to identify the anti-cheating measures used, when registering the tournament with the FIDE QC. Organizers applying for waivers from implementing anti-cheating measures must do so to the ACC, at least 4 weeks before the start of the tournament;
- vi) Enforcement of the new Law 11.3.b will be implemented in a milder version to take account of the fact that many amateur players will take part in a tournament after work or other social activities. It may become inconvenient or impossible for them to leave all devices out of the playing venue. The ACC therefore recommends to RTRC to change 11.3.b to match the following policy:

*“In tournaments open to amateur players, the prohibition to introduce electronic devices in the playing venue may, and indeed should be waived. However, under no circumstances a player shall be allowed to carry a mobile phone or other device capable of processing or transmitting chess analysis, whether switched on or off, working or not, on his body during play. This includes, but is not limited to, carrying a device in a bag or in the pocket of a jacket. Any player found carrying such a device shall immediately be forfeited his game, with rating points calculated. A second offense during the same tournament shall imply an immediate ban from the tournament, with the player’s name forwarded to the ACC for further investigation.”*

**2) Increased protection - to apply to tournaments identified in Section 2.B.**

- i) Arbiters should remind players of the existence of the new AC regulations;
- ii) Organizers must clearly and carefully designate areas for players (the “Playing Area”) and for spectators. Organizers and arbiters shall prevent getting any chess information from outside the “Playing Area”. Organizers shall try, in so much as possible and reasonable, to avoid contact between players and spectators. If possible provide separate refreshment/ toilet/ smoking areas for players and spectators;
- iii) Each tournament should adopt at least one security measure from Annex D. Additional security in the form of metal detectors/X-ray machines, scanners, electronic jamming devices, manned by qualified security staff, subject to applicable restrictions in each individual jurisdiction, is recommended;
- iv) Recommendation to send all games in PGN format for screening by the FIDE inter-

net-based Game Screening Tool. Obligation to send in norm-related tournament games in PGN format for screening by the FIDE Internet-based Game Screening Tool;

- v) Organizers are required to identify the anti-cheating measures used, when registering the tournament with the FIDE QC. Organizers applying for waivers from implementing anti-cheating measures must do so to the ACC, at least 4 weeks before the start of the tournament;
- vi) Enforcement of the new Law 11.3.b will be implemented in a milder version to take account of the fact that many amateur players will take part in a tournament after work or other social activities. It may become inconvenient or impossible for them to leave all devices out of the playing venue. The ACC therefore recommends RTRC to change 11.3.b to match the following policy:

*“In tournaments open to amateur players, the prohibition to introduce electronic devices in the playing venue may, and indeed should be waived. However, under no circumstances a player shall be allowed to carry a mobile phone or other device capable of processing or transmitting chess analysis, whether switched on or off, working or not, on his body during play. This includes, but is not limited to, carrying a device in a bag or in the pocket of a jacket. Any player found carrying such a device shall immediately be forfeited his game, with rating points calculated. A second offense during the same tournament shall imply an immediate ban from the tournament, with the player’s name forwarded to the ACC for further investigation.”*

- vii) Organizers are strongly encouraged to provide secure storage facilities for electronic devices;
- viii) Organizers and arbiters are encouraged to carry out screening tests during the event via the FIDE Internet-based Game Screening Tool.

### **3) Maximum protection - to apply to tournaments identified in Section 2.B.**

- i) Arbiters should remind players of the existence of the new AC regulations;
- ii) Organizers must clearly and carefully designate areas for players (the “Playing Area”) and for spectators. Organizers and arbiters shall prevent getting any chess information from outside the “Playing Area”. Organizers shall try, in so much as possible and reasonable, to avoid contact between players and spectators. If possible provide separate refreshment/ toilet/ smoking areas for players and spectators;
- iii) Each tournament should adopt at least one security measure from Annex D. Additional security in the form of ACC-certified metal detectors/X-ray machines, scanners, electronic jamming devices, manned by qualified security staff, subject to applicable restrictions in each individual jurisdiction, is recommended;
- iv) Obligation to send in all tournament games in PGN format for screening by the FIDE internet-based Game Screening Tool. For the Rapid and Blitz events, it is recommended that all tournament games be sent in PGN format for screening by the FIDE Internet-based Game Screening Tool;
- v) Organizers are required to identify the anti-cheating measures used, when registering the tournament with the FIDE QC. Organizer applying for waivers from implementing anti-cheating measures must do so to the ACC, at least 4 weeks before the start of the tournament;
- vi) Organizers and Arbiters are responsible for Integral application of Law 11.3.b. In case of breach, the arbiter shall take measure in accordance with article 12.9.f and forfeit the player;

---

3      The issue has already been addressed by RTRC on their meeting of 5 Aug. 2014.

- vii) Organizers are strongly encouraged to provide secure storage facilities for electronic devices;
- viii) Organizers and arbiters are encouraged to carry out screening tests during the event via the FIDE Internet-based Game Screening Tool;
- ix) Integral application of the new Law 11.3.b. In case of breach, the arbiter shall take measure in accordance with article 12.9.f and forfeit the player.

Organizers of events designated for increased and maximum protection may consult with the ACC on finding adequate AC measures that are tailored to the tournament's size and budget. The ACC's decision following contact by the organizers is final.

## **D. On-Site Inspections**

All members of the ACC shall be vested with the power to perform on-site inspections at any FIDE-rated event. The costs associated with all ACC inspections authorized by the ACC Chair shall be borne by FIDE. Inspections by the ACC can be made without advance notice to the organizers and arbiters. Organizers and arbiters shall assist ACC members during their inspections, if so requested.

## **E. The FIDE Internet-Based Game Screening Tool**

FIDE will supply an Internet-based Game Screening Tool, which will be accessible to all authorized FIDE officials (IO, IA, ACC members) and National Federations. It shall be hosted on a FIDE-dedicated webpage and will enable authorized parties to upload games in PGN format for a "fast test" that will identify potential outliers in a tournament. By "screening" it is understood that this provides only a preliminary test with no judgment value, except that it may be cited while rejecting allegations and declining to proceed to a manual full test.

The results of the screening test are to be kept confidential and are only meant to assist the Chief Arbiter in identifying cases that may call for further measures to assure that players are adhering to the rules. If requested, the ACC shall provide assistance to the Chief Arbiter in determining such measures. It should be reminded that only a "full test" can confer reliable statistical evidence on whether the outlier is receiving external help, so that the results of the "fast test" are not applicable for positive dispositions of complaints.

The Internet-based Game Screening Tool will require the following investment from FIDE:

- 1) a multi-processor computer capable of processing a very high number of games per hour;
- 2) adequate storage capacity;
- 3) a dedicated user-friendly Internet-based Graphical User Interface;
- 4) a specific certified software for processing games approved by the ACC;
- 5) instructions for use (administrators and end users);
- 6) one or more system administrators;
- 7) a password system for limiting external access;
- 8) a contract with a provider of server facilities; and
- 9) ordinary and extraordinary software maintenance at all times.

Such hardware will also suffice to run full tests monitored by the ACC

## Section 3 - Complaints

Handling complaints is a sensitive phase of the anti-cheating effort. The ACC acknowledges that a proliferation of complaints from players is not desirable. In order that complaints are grounded on direct evidence rather than hearsay, the ACC undertakes to formulate requirements that must be met by anyone submitting an allegation of breach of AC regulations. This applies both for the in-tournament and the post-tournament complaint procedures itemized here described below, while the ACC also proposes that a sanction system be put in place to deter serial submission of unfounded accusations.

For these reasons, during a tournament the arbiter shall have a duty to require submission of a written record of each and every allegation of breach of AC regulations by a FIDE-rated player. Therefore, a person cannot “informally” tell an arbiter that they suspect that another player is in breach of AC regulations. This also applies to any other person having a FIDE Identity Number. Instead, a formal complaint must be filed. All written complaints and any written communications related to such complaint(s) shall be duly recorded by the arbiter and subsequently presented to the ACC.

### Part A: In-Tournament Complaints

Potential breaches may be observed during play directly by a tournament arbiter. They can also be reported to the arbiter by a player, a spectator or, indeed, the ACC (e.g., based on statistical analysis or on-site inspection).

If the report is based on possible breaches of Article 11.2 or 11.3a, then the arbiter shall investigate the breach in the usual manner, with reference to Article 12.9 for possible penalties.

If the complaint is specifically about possible breach of AC regulations, then the Chief Arbiter shall, in the first place, identify the complainant and invite him/her to fill out a Complaint Form (Appendix A). The Chief Arbiter shall inform the complainant about the penalty for filing a false complaint. The complainant shall provide to the arbiter the reasons why the complaint is being made, and shall sign the form on completion. However, if the complainant is tense, the arbiter shall record the name of the complainant and ask for his/her signature, and only at a later time require him/her to fill in the form, but no later than the end of the round. If the complainant fails to fill out the Complaint Form by the aforementioned deadline, then the complainant can receive a warning by the Chief Arbiter, whereupon his name will be added to a special “Warning database” maintained by the ACC.

Upon receiving a complaint, the arbiter shall take steps to investigate it, whenever possible in coordination with the ACC, using his/her judgment in how this investigation is to be carried out. Any additional information that the arbiter gathers shall be added to the report.

The report shall be forwarded to the FIDE Office at the completion of the tournament, who shall pass it on to the ACC. All information in the report shall remain confidential until an investigation is completed by the ACC. In case of breach of privacy requirements by complainants or the Chief Arbiter or any other person with knowledge of the complaint before the investigation is completed, the ACC reserves the right to publicize the details of the investigation and shall refer all offenders to the Ethics Committee.

On completion of the investigation the ACC shall issue an official report, explaining its process and decisions.

If the complaint is manifestly unfounded (i.e., not based on substantial evidence<sup>4</sup>), the complainant can receive a warning by the ACC, whereupon his/her name will be added to a special “Warning database” maintained by the ACC. Upon receiving a second warning within a period of six months, the complainant shall be sanctioned (three months suspension for first violation, six months suspension for further violations).

## **Part B: Post-Tournament Complaints**

Potential cheating may also be reported after a tournament has been completed, based, for example, on new findings (e.g., signs of improper use of devices, confessions, statistical evidence). In general, a Post Tournament Complaint (PTC) should be based on very substantial evidence, and complainants are required to illustrate their case in great detail for the ACC to consider it. PTCs can be filed only by interested parties such as players, Federations, and chess officials. The ACC may also open a case based on its own post-tournament findings.

The complainant shall submit a Complaint Form (Appendix B) to the ACC. The complainant shall list the grounds for the complaint, including any statistical analysis that may have been carried out to support the claim, specifying all direct and circumstantial evidence he/she may have collected.

All information in the PTC shall remain confidential until an investigation is completed by the ACC. On completion of the investigation the ACC shall issue an official report, explaining its process and decisions.

Policies on actions in case of breach of privacy requirements, and on warnings and sanctions for manifestly unfounded complaints, are the same as for in-tournament complaints.

---

<sup>4</sup> Substantial evidence is preponderance of the relevant evidence that a reasonable person, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find that a contested fact is more likely to be true than untrue.

## Section 4 - Investigation

Investigation of alleged breaches of AC regulations can be initiated:

- 1) By an in-tournament complaint and in-tournament report from the Chief Arbiter/ Organizer of a tournament;
- 2) By a post-tournament complaint; or
- 3) As a result of self-originated investigation by the ACC.

Each investigation will be carried out by an Investigatory Chamber (IC) made up of three members, in accordance with Art. 2.5 of section A08 of the FIDE Handbook. All members of the IC shall be appointed by the FIDE Presidential Board in consultation with the ACC and EC. It is desirable that IC members are experts in the fields of AC and/or law.

The IC shall look at both the physical and observational evidence presented in the complaint and/or report. They will also look at the statistical evidence gathered as part of the investigation. They can also gather additional evidence in the course of their investigation, for example by running statistical tools or requesting additional information from the tournament organizers/arbiters or the players. Players, organizers, arbiters, national federations and other interested parties are all required to cooperate with the IC with a view to facilitate its work.

The IC shall investigate each and every case within a maximum of 60 days from the receipt of the complaint and/or report. If the investigation by the IC supports the claim of violation of AC regulations, the IC shall submit its report to the ACC, and a meeting will be convened as a matter of urgency. Members of the ACC will be called to vote upon the IC report within 7 days from receiving the report. As the result of the meeting, a decision will be reached about whether the evidence establishes that a violation of AC regulations has occurred. If the ACC determines that the violation did occur, this case will be formally presented to the FIDE Ethics Commission for judgment.

To assist the ACC in performing post-tournament analysis, the Committee recommends that the FIDE Qualification Commission augment its requirements to mandate:

- The submission to FIDE of complete game files for Type A events; for National Individual and Team Championships, this provision shall only apply where possible;
- The submission to FIDE of complete game files of the medal winners (1<sup>st</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup>) of World and Continental FIDE Youth and Junior events (and recommend submitting all games from each event); and
- The submission to FIDE of complete game files of players earning title norms in all events.

Norms for title applications shall be considered valid only after a PGN file containing all of the applicant's games in the relevant events has been submitted and screened.

## Section 5 - Sanctions

Given the need to resolve allegations of AC breaches in as little time as possible, the Committee feels that it is appropriate that the FIDE ACC be the body that presents cases to the FIDE Ethics Commission. This is in the interest of the players, who will then be entitled to an equally fast judgment procedure.

### A. System of Sanctions

After the investigation has concluded and the EC has determined that a breach of AC regulations has occurred, the EC will impose sanctions according to the following policy.

#### 1. Imposition of sanctions.

The ACC recommends the following sanctions:

1<sup>st</sup> Offense – up to 3-year suspension from all FIDE rated events (up to 1 year if the defendant is under the age of 14 years at the time of the offense; up to 2 years if the defendant is under the age of 18 years at the time of the offence)

2<sup>nd</sup> Offense – up to 15-year suspension from all FIDE rated events.<sup>5</sup>

When a player is found in breach of AC regulations, he/she shall be subject to revocation by FIDE of all FIDE titles and norms.

#### 2. Effect on the games of the tournament where a breach of the anti-cheating regulations has occurred.

The ACC recommends that for events where a breach of anti-cheating regulations has been proven (either during the tournament itself, immediately after the end of the appeals procedure, or upon waiver of appeal by the defendant), the FIDE Qualifications Commission should implement the following policies: All games by the offender in the tournament shall not be rated, with exception that in cases where a forfeit was assessed during a game, pending the further process, the rating of the game as a victory for the opponent shall stand. Additionally the following shall apply:

In an individual Round Robin event, all games by the offender shall be counted as having been lost, and counted as unplayed wins for all opponents. The tournament shall remain valid for norms.

In an individual Open tournament, the offender shall be excluded from the final ranking. Each of the offender's games shall be considered a loss, but the score for the opponent shall remain unchanged. All games shall be reported as unplayed.

In a Team event, the team of the offending player shall be excluded from the final rankings. The results for the opposing teams shall remain unchanged. Each of the offender's games shall be considered a loss, but the score for the opponent shall remain unchanged. All games shall be reported as unplayed.

Any title norms that would have been achieved by the offender shall be disregarded.

#### 3. Further remedies.

In case the offender has received a prize, he/she shall immediately return the prize to the tourna-

---

<sup>5</sup> Currently the maximum suspension that can be handed down by the FIDE Ethics Commission is 3 years. The Committee recommend that the FIDE Statutes be changed to allow the Ethics Commission to hand down the penalties recommended above.

ment organizers. Failure to do so shall be considered as a second violation of anti-cheating regulations and lead to immediate sanctioning.

## **B. Judgment Procedure, Preventive Suspension, Reinstatement**

After receiving the final report from the ACC the FIDE Ethics Commission shall hear the case and render judgment in accordance with its own statutes. The ACC request that the EC hears the prosecutor and the defendant within 30 days, and deliver judgment within 75 days of the report being forwarded to the EC. Under exceptional circumstances, this term can be extended for a further 45 days. Sanctions issued by the EC on the grounds of an ACC report are effective immediately upon their publication.

Upon forwarding its report, the ACC may also ask the EC Chairman to rule for a preventive suspension. The preventive suspension shall enter into force from the date of the ruling until the date of judgment, or the 75th day after the ACC report was forwarded to the EC, whichever is first. Under exceptional circumstances, the preventive suspension can be extended for a further 45 days.

A player who is handed a suspension of more than 5 years may apply for reinstatement after 5 years from the date of the suspension, and every 5 years after that. Applications for reinstatement are to be heard by the FIDE Ethics Commission.

## **C. FIDE Rating List Publicity**

Suspended players shall be excluded from the published FIDE Rating List and not be visible from the FIDE website for the duration of their suspension. It is the Arbiter's duty to check that all players wishing to compete in an event are not subject to ACC sanctions. In case of doubt, arbiters are required to contact FIDE Offices in order to obtain the status of the player.

If the Chief Organizer knowingly accepts into a tournament any player who is excluded from the FIDE Rating List based on ACC sanctions, this tournament will not be rated, and any title norm awarded shall be disregarded.<sup>6</sup>

A player who knowingly enters a tournament while suspended as a consequence of an ACC ruling shall be deemed to have committed a further offence.

---

<sup>6</sup> The ACC recommends that the QC implement a system for displaying the current status of a sanctioned player in the Player Database, for example by adding a sanction flag to be displayed for the period the player is suspended. The Player Database shall record the initial and final period of the sanction for each player, but not display it. However the ACC acknowledge that privacy concerns are an issue, and may prevent the implementation of this recommendation.

## **Section 6 – Recommendations for Arbiters**

The adoption of ACC regulations will require a substantial effort to FIDE and its arbiters. In particular, the role of arbiters in chess will need to be rethought, and the resulting shall be the product of close interaction between the ACC and the Arbiters Commission.

### **A. Continuous Training**

The ACC feels that Continuous Training is desirable for all FIDE-Titled arbiters. In the medium term, the ACC, together with the Arbiters Commission, should organize special Anti-Cheating Training Sessions aimed at FIDE Arbiters. The ACC recommends that the Arbiters Commission only raise the classification of Arbiters that have completed Anti-Cheating Training, as part of regular Arbiter Training or through special courses. Such training is vital for successful application of AC regulations.

### **B. Initial Recommendations**

While waiting for the new training system to be developed, the ACC wishes to issue the following initial recommendations for arbiters. It should be understood that if an arbiter feels a need for support from the ACC, he/she is strongly encouraged to contact the Commission to obtain consultancy about a particular situation.

#### **1. How breaches of AC regulations may occur during the game:**

- An arbiter should know how to recognize behaviors and devices involved in cases in the past. The definition of cheating according to Article 11.3.a of the Laws of Chess includes i) accepting information by another person (spectator, captain, co-player, etc.); and ii) getting information from any source of information or communication (such as books, notes, etc., or any electronic device). It the arbiter's duty to take care of situations that may yield suspicions of cheating during the entire duration of the round.
- The use of a mobile phone hidden in a pocket is forbidden according to Article 11.3.b of the Laws of Chess. To find hidden mobile phones and other electronic devices the use of hand-held metal detectors and other equipment (see Annex D) is highly recommended in all tournaments. Arbiters should exercise caution and delicateness in asking for and carrying out a check with hand-held metal detectors. If a metal detector gives a signal it is important to clarify the reason, if necessary by an inspection of the player and his/her belongings as described in Article 11.3.b of the Laws of Chess.

#### **2. Applicable precautions:**

- The arbiter must have a discreet control of the players that are leaving the playing area very often, for their contact with other players, spectators and other persons, according to Article 12 of the Laws of Chess.
- The arbiter should be aware that in some cases a player can get information from a third party. The arbiter should prevent any contact between players and spectators such as talking and/or giving/receiving signals.

- The arbiter should never tolerate the use of chess programs in the playing venue. Finding that a player or spectator is using a chess program in the playing area calls for immediate action in conjunction with the Chief Arbiter.
- Organizers are free to assign extra arbiters to the specific task of preventing cheating.
- During a tournament, the arbiter is encouraged to use the FIDE screening tool with PGN games, since that tool can identify cases needing further attention or, more likely, show that a player is not to be considered suspicious based on his or her games.

### **3. Screening games for precaution and information:**

- During a tournament, the arbiter is encouraged to compile games in PGN format and submit them to the FIDE screening tool. As emphasized above, the screening test is not a cheating test and gives no statistical judgment, but its information is useful to have beforehand in case any suspicions are voiced or situations may be developing.
  - In early rounds (such as 1-3 of a 9-game event) there will always be outliers because the total number of relevant moves is small, but any cheating player will likely be among them.
- However, in later rounds, a persistent outlier may be grounds for contacting ACC, calling for a full statistical test, and for “unobtrusive” actions such as increased watchfulness of the player. See Appendix C for more on screening and full-test procedures and interpretation.

### **4. How to deal with suspicious behavior:**

- In case of a suspicious behavior, the Arbiter must always follow the player on his or her way out of the playing venue (to the bar, toilets, smoking area etc.), in order to avoid any contact of the player with other persons and any use of external sources of information or communication.
- In multiple cases, there has been use of mobile phones in the toilet. Therefore the arbiter should note how often a player leaves the playing area and if this is significant take appropriate measures trying to find out the reason. In addition, the arbiter should consider implementing procedures described next in sub-head 5.

### **5. How to deal with the new Article 11.3 of the Laws of Chess:**

- The arbiter may require the player to allow his/her clothes, bags, or other items to be inspected, in private. The arbiter, or a person authorized by the arbiter, shall inspect the player and shall be of the same gender as the player.
- Usually the arbiter will inspect a player as described in Article 11.3.b of the Laws of Chess only in case of suspected breach of AC regulations or after receiving an official In-Tournament Complaint (see Section 3), but only after coming to the conclusion that the complaint is not evidently unfounded. If the arbiter decides to make an inspection on whatever grounds, it is not necessary to give the player a special reason. The arbiter, and any other person conducting the inspection, should be calm, polite and discreet. The inspection of a player should be carried out in a separate room, again by a person of the same gender. Only this person, the player, and one witness (also of the same gender) may have access to this room during the inspection. The player is entitled to select a second witness of his own choice (of either gender).

- If there is no matter of urgency, the inspection of a player and his/her belongings should generally be carried out before or immediately after the end of the game. Still, the arbiter should be aware that it is possible to hide electronic devices somewhere in or near to the playing venue, or to give them to a third party shortly before the end of the game. The arbiter also has the right to check a player who has left the playing venue during a game, or upon request of a player who filed an In-Tournament Complaint, but only once during the round.
- If a player refuses to be inspected, it is advised that the arbiter shall explain the rules calmly. If the player still refuses, he/she shall get a warning. If the player still refuses to submit to an inspection, he/she shall lose the game and be precluded from further play in the tournament.
- If random inspections are considered, they must be announced in the rules of the competition in advance.

#### **6. How to deal with accusations:**

- The procedure for handling accusations is described under Section 3, Part A. If any FIDE-identified person presents an accusation of breach of AC regulations, the arbiter should ask him/her to make an official In-Tournament Complaint. In case of refusal, the arbiter shall make a remark in the tournament report and annotate the person's name as having presented an accusation of breach of AC regulations. In this case the accused player shall not be informed by the arbiter. An arbiter who receives an In-Tournament Complaint may inform the accused player after the end of his/her game, and ask him/her for comment.
- The arbiter should describe in the tournament report any In-Tournament Complaints and inspections, stating the result of each action.

#### **7. How to deal with false accusations:**

- In case of a false accusation by a player, the Arbiter shall penalize him/her according to Article 12.2 of the Laws of Chess. For further procedures, see Section 3, Part A.

## Annex A – In-Tournament Complaint Form

<b>Federation</b>	<b>Name of Tournament</b>	
<b>Venue</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>
<b>Chief Organiser</b>		
<b>Chief Arbiter</b>		
<b>Complainant (include FIDE ID if applicable)</b>		
<b>Player Details (include FIDE ID)</b>		
<b>Complaint details</b>		
<b>Arbiter comments</b>		
<b>Complainant Signature</b>		
<b>Arbiter Signature</b>		
<b>Date</b>		

## Annex B - Post Tournament Complaint Form

<b>Federation</b>	<b>Name of Tournament</b>	
<b>Venue</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>
<b>Chief Organiser</b>		
<b>Chief Arbiter</b>		
<b>Complainant (include FIDE ID if applicable)</b>		
<b>Player Details (include FIDE ID)</b>		
<b>Check with program (Y/N)</b>	<b>Program Name:</b>	
<b>Analysis file provided (Y/N)</b>	<b>Hardware:</b>	
<b>Description of check/results:</b>		
<b>Arbiter comments</b>		
<b>Complainant Signature</b>		
<b>Arbiter Signature</b>		
<b>Date</b>		

## Annex C: Statistical Method

### I. Methods and Levels of Testing

The Committee recognizes two levels of statistical analysis. They are general and not reserved to any one provider or methodology.

#### (1) Screening Tests.

These will generally check all available games from a tournament, in-progress or afterward. They can be routinely provided to the Chief Arbiter, at his/her discretion, by a web server in reasonably quick time (the FIDE Internet-Based Game Screening Tool).

- If an allegation is made either formally or publicly, a screening test shall first be performed. Even if the complaint is about only one game, all available games played by the accused in the current tournament should be screened to give context.
- A screening test performed in response to an allegation either results in calling for a full test of games involving the accused and one or more players, or results in dismissal of the allegation.
- Screening test results do not represent primary statistical evidence in support of any allegation - only a full test can.
- Calling for a full test based on screening results is the Chief Arbiter's decision.

Guidelines to arbiters on considerations in deciding whether screening results call for the performance of a full test can be found in Section 6.B.3 under arbiter recommendations.

#### (2) Full Tests. These must meet the following criteria:

- They must provide one or more recognized statistical tests of a null hypothesis, backed by peer review and appropriate empirical testing of the test statistics.
- They must incorporate more extensive game analysis than screening tests.
- They must be human-supervised, in co-ordination with ACC, including a second party conducting a test with different analysis engine(s) from the first.
- The tests should measure specific criteria, such as move-matching to the engine(s) (MM) or average difference from optimality (AD), so that a positive result has more specific meaning than "this person played unbelievably well."

The ACC shall designate a statistical procedure that meets these criteria. The approved procedure shall be subject to periodic review.

### II. Procedures for Using Statistical Results

A full test must provide a so-called *p-value*, which represents the probability of a deviation at or exceeding what is observed given that the null hypothesis is true—that is, given the event of "normal play." For tests under normal distribution the *p-value* is commonly derived from a *z-score*, which is expressed in units of standard deviations called *sigmas*. The ACC does not simply use either the standardly-recognized "5% threshold" or "1% threshold" for significance of *p-values*, but rather demands more stringent thresholds depending on the absence or presence of other evidence, the size and nature of the tournament, and the circumstances of the complaint. The following guidelines are recommended:

- A  $z$ -score under 2.00, commonly regarded as failure to pass the 5% threshold, may be considered a finding that statistical evidence does not support a complaint.
- A  $z$ -score of 2.75 or greater, representing a 0.3% threshold, may constitute strong supporting evidence in the presence of physical or observational evidence.
- Higher thresholds may be deemed needed for further stages of a FIDE-level investigative or judicial process, in consultation with the Ethics Commission.

When a full test is conducted in response to a formal complaint, the results shall be included in the report on the complaint. A full test performed at the Chief Arbitrator's discretion when there has been no formal allegation shall remain confidential. Test results may also warrant overt measures taken by arbiters onsite, such as increased watch, searches, and changes in game locale or environment, subject to considerations in other parts of this document.

FIDE is currently reviewing a candidate system for conducting the full test developed by Dr. Kenneth W. Regan as principal author of several academic papers and public expositions of the system. The ACC believes that in its current state the system is adequate for all stages of in-tournament advising and judgment in conjunction with other evidence, and that it has proven effective for these purposes in numerous instances over the past several years. The ACC currently believes that it has not yet been implemented at a high enough level to be considered for sole judgment, pending the integration of multiple engines into the system and the passing of further field tests. FIDE has received legal guidelines and advice from Reymond & Associés for the use of such systems at all levels.

## **Annex D - Equipment**

The following technical equipment is recommended for cheating prevention, according to the level of the tournament and to local laws:

- Mobile phone jammers;
- Hand-held security metal detectors
- Walk-through metal detectors
- Automatic electro-magnetic screening devices for metallic/non-metallic items
- Closed circuit cameras

In most cases, a hand-held metal detector will prove enough to secure that electronic devices are not being carried into the playing venue, and should thus always be considered as the first-choice device for maximum protection. The actual equipment to be adopted shall be agreed between the ACC and the Tournament Direction on a case-to-case basis.

FIDE is entitled to buy extremely sophisticated anti-cheating equipment for use in sample checks, whose features it will not disclose. This equipment may be used by ACC-empowered commissioners during on-site inspections.