

In 2022-23, the State and Affiliates Committee (SAC) worked on the following items:

- (1) Complaint pending from 2018, an Affiliate challenging the actions and policies of State Affiliate X, including lack of chess promotion and negative representations about the Affiliate's activities. In response, State Affiliate X challenged the same Affiliate's conduct, including organizing competing events with State Championship tournaments and naming events "State Championships".
- (2) A new complaint, filed in December 2022, by State Affiliate Y against an Affiliate for titling an event in a manner sounding of Scholastic State Championship.
- (3) The DC Applications for State Affiliate status.

SAC was unable to work on planned policy and procedural matters due to the still uncertain and not-in-effect status of the Amendment to Article VIII, which was approved by the Delegates at the 2022 Annual Meeting. The status of the Amendment is unknown to SAC and remains "pending legal review".

On the X matter, SAC determined that the Affiliate must make best efforts to cooperate with the State Chapter and not use event names reserved for State Affiliate authorization, and that the State Affilaite refrain from disparaging chess activity in their state. The State Chapter was also advised to consider the creation and maintenance of a state or multi-state clearinghouse to facilitate cooperation of Affiliates in its state and avoid some of the issues presented in the case. On or about September 21, 2022, the committee voted 10-0-0 in favor of the final terms of the decision.

On the Y matter, the Affiliate, named via moniker for its state, organized a "State Championship" event, rather than a company championship. The Affiliate agreed to change the event name, if so ordered. SAC ordered the change. Again, SAC reaffirmed that "state championships" are an event name reserved for State Affiliates. On or about January 20, 2022, the committee voted 10-0-1 in favor. (As part of this matter, SAC discovered that State Affiliate Y has no membership. However, on or about January 16, 2022, per EB request, SAC voted 9-0-1 in favor of accepting jurisdiction over the case. SAC was directed not to proceed on the membership issue.)

On the DC matter, in spring 2022, SAC ruled that DC Chess League, the current and now resigning DC State Affiliate, was failing and needed to take action to correct its form and activities, or lack thereof. DCCL declined, and instead selected to withdraw as DC State Chapter. US Chess announced the vacancy and three applications were received pursuant to Bylaws Article VIII Section 1 as follows: (a) DC Chess Association (DCCA), (b) DMV Chess (DMV), and (c) DC State Chess Federation (DCSCF).

Prior to any work, the SAC EB liaison, Kevin Pryor, communicated that the EB was limiting SAC analysis to the applications as submitted and that nothing further may be requested by SAC or produced by the applicants. Mr. Pryor also worked with SAC Chairs, Lakshmana Viswanath and Alexander Lumelsky to prepare a State Affiliate

criteria test in advance of releasing the applicants' applications to the SAC Chairs and the committee. The developed test was as follows:

State Affiliate Criteria Test

1) Looking at each application separately, does the application meet the minimum requirements of Bylaws Article VIII Section 1 (submission of credentials within the allotted deadline) and DACI 1991-27(4) (governance document requirement—the only required section of DACI 1991-27 which can be demonstrated by organizations that are not current State Affiliates)

2) Looking at all applications in their entirety, which applicant can better “guide the chess activity within the state in a manner that provides representation to all groups of chess players within its state” Article VIII Section 2

The Committee voted 9-0-0 in favor of this two-part test. The EB approved the test and released the applications to SAC for analysis and decision.

Consequently, applying the test, on part one SAC found that DCCA and DMV have no membership in their organizational structures, as required by DACI 1991-27(4), and are therefore ineligible for consideration as State Affiliate. Meanwhile, SAC found that DCSCF is eligible, due to its inclusion of traditional membership in its organizational structure. Pursuant to part one conclusions, SAC applied part two analysis only to DCSCF's application, the only eligible applicant.

In applying part two to DCSCF, SAC found that the organization fell short of meeting the test, exhibiting through several clauses in its bylaws that the organization is unable to perform Article VIII Section 2: “representation to all groups of chess players” in DC. Accordingly, on or about April 23, 2023, SAC rejected all three applications, voting 7-1-1 in favor of the final decision.

With the final decision communicated to the EB, nothing further was directed to SAC by the EB on the DC State Affiliate matter.