CONGRESS DIRECTOR COURSE
By REG BUSCH

LESSON 1B

I set this question in lesson 1A.

You are running a full weekend congress of 24 tables, playing three 8 table sections. For the two qualifying sessions, you decide to play 32 boards for session 1, move the EWs across, then play 24 boards for session 2. Is there any factoring required to reach matchpoint aggregate totals for the two sessions for qualifying purposes?

The answer is 'No'. Why? Because every player in this event has played a total of 56 boards, all with the same top of 14. So the same aggregate score is available to the whole field, and there is no need to factor.

Factoring is an area which many directors do not understand well. I'm going to devote all of this article to it. There are two possible reasons for factoring:
1. Where you are aggregating scores for more than one session and there are different tops available in the two sessions. Before aggregating, you must make the two lots of scores equivalent.

2. Where players whose scores are being compared (either within one section or between sections) where different numbers of boards have been played. So the total available matchpoints were not available to all players.

Can illustrate best by example.

#1. Simple 9 table Mitchell. 27 boards, 9 scores per board, top of 16. Every player NS and EW plays the same number of boards with the same top, so scores are comparable. If you wanted to give a prize for the best matchpoint score over the whole field, you could just select the highest matchpoint total in the whole field.

#2. 7 1/2 table with NS Rover. Playing 28 boards. There are 7 scores per board, top of 12. EWs all play 28 boards. The NSs play only 24 boards, except for pair 7 who does not sit out, and plays 28 boards. To make the NS scores all comparable within this NS section, all NSs except pair 7 must have their scores multiplied by 28 / 24, and you can now compare total matchpoints. For an overall prize, you could compare scores across the whole field, as now all scores are equivalent to 28 boards with a top of 12.

#3. A 9 table Mitchell playing two sessions. With two full movements you could just aggregate the two sessional matchpoints as all have played 54 boards with a top of 16. However, for session 2, one NS pair fails to appear, so we have 8 1/2 tables. Assume that the NS fields and EW fields stay in the same direction for session 2. There are only 8 scores on the TSC in session 2, so the top becomes 14. EW sit out one round in session 2. To tabulate:

	NS	**EW**
Session 1:	27 boards with a top of 16	27 boards with a top of 16
Session 2:	27 boards with a top of 14	24 boards with a top of 14.

All the boards for session 2 have a lower available top. Before you can aggregate the scores for the two sessions, you must make the session 2 scores equivalent to a top of 16 by multiplying session 2 scores by 16/14. So now the NSs would have been scored as a total of 54 boards with a top of 16. The EWs would have been scored as a total of 51 boards with a top of 16. The tops available on every board are now the same i.e. 16. If you need only to place NS and EW within their own sections, that is all the factoring you need to do.

However, what if you wish to give a prize for the best score over the whole field? Or what if you mixed up the field for session 2 so that many players were now sitting in a different direction, and you were awarding outright places on total matchpoints? Now those who sat EW in session 2 are disadvantaged because they played only 24 boards. So, to rectify this, you must, as before, factorise all scores by 16/14 to compensate for the difference in tops. but you must do a further factoring to bring the EW scores for session 2 up to the equivalent of the NS 27 boards. You would multiply then by a further 27/24. Now all raw matchpoint scores are equivalent to 54 boards with a top of 16.

Important note: When factorising for tops, the factor is Top/Top. When you factor for boards, the factor is No. of boards/No of boards.

#4. A little more complicated example. You are running a small 19 table congress with two qualifying sessions. You play as two Mitchells, swapping the sections after session 1. Places 1,2 and 3 in each section and direction will qualify for the final, and also the best 4th NS overall and the best 4th EW overall. So you are comparing scores not just within each section and direction, but across the two fields.

You play A section as 10 tables with a skip (9 scores per board) and B section as 9 tables (9 scores per board) for session one. So, for this session, all have played 27 boards with a top of 16. For session 2, A NS move to B EW and B EW move to A NS so that now we have two 9 1/2 table sections. We must now play 30 boards with a share and bye for both sections. Remember we need to compare across the original fields to find the best 4ths. So

	Original sections			
	A NS	**A EW**	**B NS**	**B EW**
Session 1	27 x 16	27 x 16	27 x 16	27 x 16
Session 2	27 x 16	27 x 16	30 x 16	30 x 16

Fortunately the tops are all the same. But, because you are looking for the best 4th NS, you must make the scores comparable by factoring the A NS by 30/27. Likewise the original A EW.

So whether you factor depends on:

(a) Are there different tops where you are amalgamating scores for the group whose totals you are comparing?

(b) Are there different total numbers of boards played by pairs within the group whose scores you are comparing?

Factoring in Barometer or Swiss pairs movements:

Occasionally, you may be unlucky enough to have to run a Swiss Pairs event with a half table. Or perhaps a Barometer movement with a half table where you have to curtail the movement. How do you cope with this? You need to know how your scoring program treats the sitout round, but most would probably award an average score for this round.

In a Swiss pairs of say 11 rounds, 11 players out of the field would sit out. Giving them an average will disadvantage them if they averaged, say, 58% on their other rounds. It is a simple process to give them the equivalent of their other round scores for their sitout round. Where the program awads an average, subtract this average from their total score to get their results for 10 rounds, then factor that result by 11/10. Use a similar procedure for a curtailed Barometer movement.