



NATIONAL JUDGES NEWSLETTER

Issue 56

December 2007

Dear Judges,

It is this time of the year again:
I hope you and your families had a
Merry Christmas and I wish you
all the best for 2008!

Warm regards to you all

Susanne E Womersley



Open and Junior National Championships 2008

The nomination forms for these events are attached.
Please consider and reply by the due date.

International Appointments 2008

The following Australian Judges have been appointed by FITA to officiate at international events during 2008

John Chaplin – Jury of Appeal, Olympic Games, Beijing
Ed Crowther – Judge, Paralympic Games, Beijing
Jim Larven – Director of Shooting, World Youth Championships, India
Susanne Womersley – Judge, Olympic Games, Beijing



John Womersley – FITA Judge Emeritus

At the end of his career as an active FITA Judge, John has been awarded with the **FITA Judge Emeritus** status for his exceptional contribution to Judging. The Judges Emeritus are a select number of people around the world that have gathered experience as a result of their long active commitment to FITA. John's experience will certainly be valuable in guiding new judges here and in the Oceania region.

On behalf of all Australian judges: Congratulations, John, on this well deserved recognition!

Congratulations to Karen O'Malley

Karen and her partner Tony tied the knot on 22 December at a private garden ceremony in the Hunter Valley. We wish them both all the best for the future!

Shooting under UV Protection

In April 2007 the AA Board of Management approved a motion allowing archers to shoot under UV protection. This motion has been distributed and incorporated into the AA Constitution and Shooting Rules.

It has been raised that this motion is in conflict with a direction by the FITA C&R Committee and that anyone shooting under the guidelines in a FITA Star event may have any claims for records or awards rejected by FITA.

The Board has now issued the following clarification:

For AA events, records and awards archers are permitted to shoot from and under a shelter that complies with the agreed motion.

To ensure compliance with the FITA direction, archers shooting in FITA registered events are not permitted to shoot under any building, structure or shelter. But in the opinion of the Board archers may shoot in any shade created by a building, structure or shelter. It should be noted the FITA direction does not specifically disallow this or provide any guidance as to how far from the shooting line any building, structure or shelter may be constructed.

AA intends to submit a By Law change to FITA specifically allowing National Federations to allow archers for their safety and protection to shoot under a structure that provides UV protection.

The Forgotten Etiquetter (by Ken Payne)

Over the years, many Judges, (and Directors of Shooting), become very familiar with our task. This is only natural, and in fact is a very desirable attribute. We keep up to date with the latest rules and interpretations, but sadly at times we tend to forget about a number of little things that relate to etiquette.

What do we mean when we refer to etiquette?

Broadly it refers to any action that demonstrates respect for

- (a) the archer,
- (b) the tournament,
- (c) the Organising Committee and all officials.

It does not make one iota of difference whether the tournament is a National Championships or a 'local' tournament.

Probably the first rule of etiquette is the responsibility to arrive at the tournament on time. Make the effort to be there in plenty of time to carry out all pre-tournament checks without the need to rush or skip over any checks. Not being there on time indicates to the archers that you don't really care and probably don't really want to be there in the first place.

On arrival, immediately seek out the chairperson of the Organising Committee and discuss any relevant issues for the tournament. Don't wander around catching up with all the latest goss.

When carrying out the pre-tournament inspection, be seen to perform all checks. (eg) run a tape over the faces on the butts. The archers see that you are in fact not just taking all for granted.

At all National Championships, equipment inspection is carried out at the appointed time. The same punctuality is desirable at all tournaments.

How many times at 'minor' tournaments do we forget to advise the archers of the time remaining to "Start shooting". My guess is that many times this is lost because the Judge/D.O.S. is still finishing other tasks ready to start at the designated time. If there has to be a delay, advise the archers immediately rather than have them hanging around waiting for a start.

While the archers are shooting their arrows, always remain at your allocated position near the shooting line and keep your eye on the archers within your area of responsibility. This way the competitors know where you are should they need to attract your attention for such things as an equipment failure. The practice of gathering together and chatting is not acceptable.

When the archers have cleared the targets you should always move back to the shooting line following just behind the last group so that there is no delay in recommencing shooting.

At all times we must be prepared to educate the archer (in a polite manner), if they are unfamiliar with the rules. If an archer disagrees with you on a rule, it is sometimes helpful to produce the applicable rule and politely show the rule to the archer. This can prevent the attitude by some that "the judge did not know the rules." A statement that some will delight in telling everyone. If however, you were wrong, still show the archer the rule and apologise to them. Do this under the same circumstances that you made the wrong decision. (ie.) If it were at the targets with his competitors there, then that is where you apologise, not off to one side by themselves where the others do not get to hear about it.

When judging Field tournaments, there will regularly be a group of stragglers. If you are waiting for them to finish, remain at a distance from them rather than follow closely on their heels. This can be misconstrued by many as intimidating them because they are late to finish. Some archers are put off by this and their performance deteriorates accordingly.

As a Judge, if you follow the basic rules of etiquette, you will maintain the archers respect. Forget them and they will treat you with contempt.

FITA Info

I really would like to recommend you take the time to read the monthly FITA Information; it contains interesting articles, rule interpretations and FAQs, that apply not only to FITA Judges, but to all of us. If all of you had read the latest one, a lot of answers to one of the case studies would have been different....

It can be found on the FITA website (www.archery.org) under News > Newsletters > FITA Info.

Case Study 54/1 revisited

Here it is – to refresh our memory: *How would you handle the following situation in which an archer claims to have had a pass-through?* The archer in question calls you from his target and lets you know he has had a pass-through. He says he is sure he shot 6 arrows but he can

only find 5 on his target. There is an unmarked hole in the 9 ring. You and the archer look for the arrow but you cannot find it anywhere.

Everyone agreed that the archer was entitled to score the value of the lowest unmarked hole on the target face – a 9. **Rule 7.6.2.6.3** was quoted with wild abandon and ‘benefit of the doubt’ was the term most

frequently used to arrive at this decision; quite correct!

Many would make a note of the missing arrow in case it was found during a future end. Others stressed that when all the arrows had been scored and pulled they would need to verify that the unmarked hole did indeed correspond to the archer’s arrow by checking its dimensions.

In addition, they would check the rear of the butt for further evidence.

Only one person mentioned that they would mark the unmarked hole and only 2 judges saw the need for the butt to be fixed to ensure no further pass-throughs! We must consider that if arrows are passing through after hitting the gold then we need to rectify this since it will surely happen again.

After publishing the last issue of the newsletter, which I routinely also send to the FITA Judge Committee, I received the following response from **Mr Morten Wilmann** (chairman of the FITA Judge Committee):

A small comment to the replies of the your case studies. I notice that all your judges would give the score (a nine) to an archer who claims a pass-through when no arrow is found.

On one side, it is of course nice to see that the judges seem to be protective rather than punitive in their attitude. However, they also have to protect the other archers against any manipulative action to gain scores. Our philosophy is that we give the benefit of the doubt when the situation is objective (cannot be influenced or manipulated), but we never give any score based on hearsay or a possible manipulative situation.

When you have a pass-through, the Judge should be convinced that a pass-through has happened. This is impossible to be without checking the position of the arrow on the ground - and here you do not even have an arrow. An unmarked hole in the target, on the other hand, is not that seldom - on purpose or not....

I am sorry, but this is a Miss (as the situation is).

You be the Judge - Answers from Issue 55

(edited by Ed Crowther)

The table below shows the number of Judges in each RGB and the replies received:

RGB	Judges	Replies	RGB	Judges	Replies
AACT	7	4	ASA	13	8
ASNSW	23	9	AV	11	6
AST	7	2	SQAS	10	4
ASWA	13	2	NQAA	5	1
<i>Oceania</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>2</i>	Total	89	36

40% - What happened? Did six case studies scare you off? Again there are some judges out there who practically always reply, and then there are others who have not yet responded at all! Remember, reaccreditation takes place in June 2008, and you need a minimum of 12 case study replies.

55/1: On a marked field course on target 6 archers continuously shoot arrows low either just hitting or just missing the target. During a gap between groups of archers you pace the distance. The red peg is marked 40m but you step out 43m. The blue peg is marked 35m and this paces out almost correctly. You radio the DOS who brings down a full measuring tape which shows the red distance is 43.5m. *What action will you now take?*

Clearly everyone understood the judges' obligations (9.9.1.2) to check the correct distances. However, this does not solve the problem. Frequently quoted also was 9.10.1.3 which alludes to the target's being "eliminated ...for all athletes of the division involved, ***should an appeal be upheld.***" We all agreed that the Chairman of Judges and OC be contacted too. There was a fairly even spread between those who said they would have the peg moved to the correct distance and those who would leave it where it was. A few made no reference as to whether they would move the peg or not.

The case for moving it. A number of judges claimed that it would be irresponsible to leave the peg where it was as this could continue to cause damage to arrows. Some stated that there was an ***implication*** under 9.10.1.3, dot point 2, that if it could be rectified before any other divisions had shot it, then it could still count for those divisions. The provision for an appeal in this rule also leaves the door open for remedial action. Comment was also made to the effect that it would be a sound idea to take note of the names of the archers in the group which was ***first*** to shoot the corrected distance to enable the situation to be tracked back at the end of the day. Similarly, there is a need to ensure that all archers have recorded their scores against the correct target number. Archers shooting from the blue and yellow pegs would, of course, not be affected. **Some judges would move the peg and then allow those who had shot it to return at the end of the day and re-shoot this target – this is a worry!** *However, having said that, at a field tournament I officiated at over 10 years ago there was an appeal to the Jury and this is exactly what happened!*

The case for leaving it. It was argued that since some archers had already shot this target then the peg could not be moved to the correct distance. In adopting this stance we would need to ensure that every red peg archer who had not shot this target was informed that it was at the incorrect distance and that it would be eliminated from the scores. How do we do this? Provided that we possess radios each judge on the course could relay the information to groups passing them and report to the Chairman when this was completed. The field crew could provide a sign at the waiting area, etc., etc. We probably have the means to do this and we certainly could not afford the luxury of leaving a judge there all day. One judge argued that the peg should be left where it is and the following groups told of the distance. Again we have a tolerance problem so I don't believe we'd be justified in asking them to shoot an invalid distance.

So, what's the answer? It lies in the 2000 Field Organisers' Manual and the 2002 Judges Training Handbook – Field Archery, which state that **the peg cannot be moved**. Actually there is nothing in the Rule Book or in the FITA Judge Guide Book to help the judge so I have suggested to Susanne that this be followed up with FITA.

This is an excerpt of Morten Wilmann's response:

If a target distance does not conform to the rules, the target is considered cancelled for the actual division. (Possible scores on this target do not count). For the division(s) involved there will for example then be only 23 targets instead of 24 targets. If practical and possible, if the mistake is found early, the Organizer may create another target of the same kind (at correct distance) to be shot instead for the division in question.

What to do on the spot when the mistake is found out, I would for sure stop archers of the division in question from shooting (and possibly destroying arrows) advising them that the target would be cancelled due to a mistake. For other divisions, for which there would be no mistake, they may just go on.....

55/2: An archer has an equipment failure during a target event. He repairs his equipment and then asks to have a few shots on the adjoining practice field to check that everything is alright, before shooting his make-up arrows. As the judge, would you allow this?

There was almost complete agreement, apart from one judge, that the archer would not be allowed to go off and shoot practice arrows. Most cited the FITA C & R Committee memo to MA's as forwarded by the AA CEO to all RGB's on 3 October. This is also documented in the **FITA Judge Newsletter 67** but it concerns me that a number of judges appeared to be unaware of either communication. *It is imperative that we all keep up to speed with changes to rules and by-laws.* This can be readily achieved by taking time to periodically check both the FITA and AA websites.

55/3: The Phillip Island Archery Club (not its real name) is hosting a 70m FITA and match-play. There are 30 archers taking part. You have just started the semi finals and the first archer has just shot their first arrow when the timing lights go out and the electronic timing device stops working. The line judge asks the archers to retire from the line and waits instructions. You and a tournament organiser find the power is off. Further investigation and 10 minutes later finds that there is a power cut to repair local lines. There is a portable generator available 30 minutes drive away so the return trip will be an hour. But the owner is not sure if the generator is at their place as a relation may have borrowed it. It is now 11am Sunday. The archers are waiting for your decision.

Again all agreed that they would continue the shoot using alternative forms of timing, e.g., flags, whistles and stopwatches, quoting 7.2.4.2 – “manual equipment must be available in case electronic equipment fails.”

55/4: A FITA round was shot at a small venue where the archers are required to not only move their own target butts, but change the target faces as well. At the end of the second distance an archer was delayed briefly (less than a minute) from getting to the target in order to collect a new target face for the shorter distance. On arriving at the target she found that the other two archers pulled her arrows out of the target without scoring them. The other two archers claimed they could not remember where the arrows were (they had marked the holes before pulling them).

(a) As this was no fault of the archer concerned would you let her (out of fairness) re-shoot the end or would you give her 6 misses?

(b) What action if any would/or could you take, against the other two archers?

The majority of judges correctly would have the scores recorded as **6 misses**. Since the scenario states that the arrowholes had already been marked it would be impossible to backtrack through the scorecards. 7.4.5 does not allow the arrows to be re-shot **although 7 judges would allow the arrows to be re-shot ‘in fairness to the archer.’** One has to sympathise here but this actually did happen at the Nationals a few years back. 7.6.2.1 refers to the scoring situation but does not invoke a particular penalty. Most would give a warning to the scorers and a stern reminder of their responsibilities whilst one judge would apply 7.8.1.8 and suggest to the OC that the scorers should be disqualified. The problem with this is, have they “knowingly” broken the rules and how do we prove it? *Interestingly, one judge would not give her 6 misses but would also not permit her to re-shoot her arrows! One judge also*

suggested that they put down the scores they think she got and forget they called a judge! Many would advise of the right of appeal.

55/5: At a recent Indoor championship a female archer had a bouncer. Confused by the incident she stopped shooting and turned to the Judge informing him of the incident. The Judge asked how many arrows she had left, but the archer misunderstood the question and answered by showing two fingers (meaning she had shot two arrows/or that maybe that this was her second arrow. The Judge then told her to continue shooting two arrows, which the archer did within the time limit.

Upon scoring the archer now had the following situation on the target:

Upper centre 9 Middle centre 10 Lower centre 8 And a bouncer on the floor in front of the target.

None of the archers on the target had marked the arrow holes and there were several unmarked holes in the various centers, the lowest unmarked hole in the upper centre was 7, in the middle centre 8, and in the lower centre another 7.

There was also one unmarked hole in the paper outside, but close, to the lower centre – in the corner of the paper.

As a Judge you are called to this target, how would you score the arrows?

This was undoubtedly the doozie of the whole lot!!! We all recognised that mistakes were made by both the judge and the archer but we still need to make a decision! I have never seen as many differing responses! Here is the selection of the *9 different scores* to be awarded:

10 9 M (1 answer) 9 8 8 (1), 9 8 7 (10), 9 8 M (7), 9 7 M (4), 9 M M (2), 8 7 M (7), 7 7 M (1) and finally “all the lowest unmarked holes.”

Some quoted 7.6.2.6.1 which details procedures for handling a bouncer BUT this relates to Outdoor archery which requires the archer(s) to stop shooting. *There exists a subtle difference in procedure for Indoors.* We need to go to 8.6.2.7.1, dot point 1, which states “when a rebound occurs the athlete concerned will, **after shooting his or her end of 3 arrows**, remain on the line...” But if we look at dot point 2 there seems to be a contradiction in procedure. It may well be that the procedure under dot point 2 applies only where the bouncer occurs during the first detail’s shooting. I cannot see it’s being necessary if it is time for all the archers to go up and score.

Rules were cited with gay abandon to justify the myriad of answers! Among the favourites were 8.6.2.2 and 8.8.2.6 – “if more than the required number...only the three lowest in value will be scored.” This was closely followed by 8.6.2.3 – “if more than one arrow is shot into the same scoring area (**note that it says “shot into” – doesn’t have to stick in!**)...only the lowest value arrow will score. *The other arrow...will score as a miss.* **The problem is that we haven’t a clue as to where the 4th arrow hit! There is no guarantee that the bouncer hit any of the faces.** Let’s give her the benefit of the doubt and say it did actually hit a face. If this is the case then we call it a **7** – the lowest unmarked hole.

It’s clear to me that the archer has no excuse for shooting more than 3 arrows, no matter what the judge’s direction might be. I don’t think anyone could go to an indoor tournament and claim they did not know they only shoot 3 arrows! Hence there needs to be a penalty. Her 4 arrows were 10 9 8 7. Remove the 10 as the highest scoring arrow and we arrive at 9 8 7 and since the bouncer is presumed to have hit one of the faces (benefit of the doubt!) then the other arrow in that face must be scored as a M. If it hit the lower face we would score 9 7 M and if it hit the upper face we would give 8 7 M.

Being fairly confused I suggested to Susanne that she contact the FITA Judge Committee Chairman to obtain a response. My call was the lowest three – 8 7 M. The answer from Morten was 9 7 M - allocating the higher score of the two *based on the benefit of doubt.* To those 4 who got it right, Robert de Bondt, Mark Logan, Steve Salmon and Susanne Womersley, – WELL DONE! A more detailed answer will be in the next FITA Judges Newsletter.

I often wonder why we are tortured with these Indoor questions since in almost 15 years of judging Indoor archery I've never seen anyone shoot 4 arrows!

I suppose we have to know what to do if it actually happens one day!

N.B. Only 3 judges mentioned that they would have all the arrow holes marked after this incident.

55/6: At a FITA outdoor tournament there were four archers at each target; they shot in two details: AB–CD, then CD-AB, etc. The order of shooting was indicated on a visual electronic board close to the countdown clock. At one stage the archers on one target got confused, with the consequence that archers CD shot when the sign showed AB, and archers AB shot when the sign showed CD. The incident was noticed by a team captain of archers not involved on this target. He protested and claimed that all the archers on the target in question should lose all the values for that end, as they shot out of sequence. The judge called to the target agreed with the team captain and decided to score all the arrows as M's. However, all the team captains of the archers on that target protested, claiming that this was highly unfair. The incident was presented to the Jury of Appeal.

As member of the Jury of appeal do you agree with the Judge's decision in this case? Why/Why not?

7.4.2.2 and 7.5.1.2 were quoted here and nearly all disagreed with the judge's decision and would allow the scores to stand, believing that this was done in all innocence and that the archers were not seeking to gain any unfair advantage. Some would only remove the highest scoring arrow and allow the other 5 to be counted whilst 3 respondents actually agreed with the judge.

You be the Judge (Case studies)

Here are the new case studies, back to our usual three this time – come on, let's go for a record!

Please have your replies with RGB administrators by the end mid March, who in turn are asked to collate and forward replies by the end of March. Alternatively, judges can e-mail their answers directly to Ed on jilled@bigpond.net.au (but inform your RGB administrator, you have done so).

Please remember to give reasons and quote appropriate rules for all your answers.

56/1: Since Ed likes the Indoor scenarios – here is another one, but with only three arrows shot this time: During a major Indoor tournament vertical triple faces are used. An archer shot his first arrow touching the line between the 10 and the 9 in the upper face, his second arrow in the 8 on the bottom face, and the third arrow in the 9 of the middle face. During scoring another archer on the target calls you and claims that the arrows have not been shot in the correct order. *How would you score this end?*

56/2: At a Field tournament (FITA Arrowhead) archers are required to shoot their arrows from the top of a 3 meter high platform (accessible by a flight of steps). When the judges inspect the course they feel a bit uncomfortable about everyone having to climb onto the platform and request the organisers put another peg at the bottom (at exactly the same distance from the target), so that those competitors who don't want to shoot from the top can shoot from the bottom. *Do you agree with that course of action?*

56/3: An archer is calling you due to an arrow that almost passed through the face, though you can see its nock in the 9 zone and one of the feathers cutting the line to the 10 zone. *How do you score the arrow?*