



NATIONAL JUDGES NEWSLETTER

Issue 48

July 2005

Dear Judges,

Good news to start off with – I have just received word from the FITA Secretary General, that the IOC has kept archery in the Olympic programme for London 2012. More than likely the competition will take place at Lords, the well known cricket ground.

Warm regards to you all

Susanne E Womersley

Reminder - Code of Ethics

In compliance with Australian Sports Commission requirements each Australian judge and DoS is required to sign a Code of Ethics form.

If you have not returned your form, please print off the one I have attached again and return in **hard copy – snail mail** (do not fax or e-mail!) **as soon as possible.**

New National Judge Candidates

AST and ASNSW have recently run judges courses, which resulted in the accreditation of 3 and 4 new National Judge Candidates respectively. Welcome to Raymond Denton, Peter Fisher and Natalie Luttrell from AST and Neil Ciclovan, Rosemary Edwards, John Hyde and Karen O'Malley from ASNSW!

Australian Masters Games

I have been informed there is no funding available for travel and/or accommodation for judges officiating at the Australian Masters Games in October. If you are interested to go anyway, please get directly in touch with Bruce Lang.

Orders for Judges Shirts

If you want to order a (second, third...) judges shirt – an order form is attached. Please return together with an appropriate cheque (payable to Archery Australia Inc.) by **31 July 2005.**

Archery Australia Interpretation

I attach an interpretation by the AA Rules and Constitutions Committee regarding a modified shooting glove.

FITA Interpretations

There have been no interpretations by any of the FITA committees since the last issue of the AA Judges Newsletter. However, to bring you up to date I attach the latest issue of the FITA Information, which gives an overview about changes to FITA rules (most effective from 1 April 2006) amongst other relevant information from the recent FITA Congress.

You be the Judge - Answers from Issue 47

The table below gives an indication of the number of Judges in each RGB and the number of replies received:

| RGB | Judges | Replies | RGB | Judges | Replies |
|----------------|--------|---------|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| AACT | 8 | 8 | ASA | 13 | 3 |
| ASNSW | 15 | 5 | AV | 10 | 5 |
| AST | 9 | 7 | SQAS | 7 | 4 |
| ASWA | 7 | 2 | NQAA | 5 | 1 |
| <i>Oceania</i> | 7 | 4 | Total | 74 | 39 |

53 % - that is a bit down from the 64% from last time. As I said, if it is easier, get together with other judges in your RGB and discuss the case studies, then send one written answer – there is nothing wrong with that! At least there is some discussion and combined thinking going on.

47/1: Two archers take the first peg in a walk-up during a National field event, both proceed to shoot 3 arrows at the single face target before realising that they should have moved forward to the closer pegs. They call a judge, asking whether they should score their arrows before shooting their last arrow.

How would you advise them to proceed?

This one threw a few people. First let's clarify: It was a National Field Round (although that might not have been 100% clear on re-reading the case study); so AA Rules count, there are four arrows shot per target, and it is a marked round.

Scoring should only happen after all four arrows have been shot. There is no reason to score before that.

Most people (21) would take the two highest scoring arrows, the others (11) would let them score all four as they lie and give a warning. The remaining seven answers were either unclear or referred to a FITA field round with only three arrows to be shot.

Even if you look at 11.6.10 and 11.7.1 (AA Rules), the rules say the archers will shoot, etc., etc, but there is no loss of score penalty stipulated for a situation as described.

Again, we cannot make up penalties! Consequently, scoring all arrows and giving the archers a warning would be the most appropriate course of action.

47/2: At a national FITA tournament, the three archers assigned to a particular target proceed to the target to score the final end of the 90m distance. On approaching the target the archers find two arrows, each from a different archer, on the ground in front and to the right of the target butt.

The archers agree that the two arrows were the result of bounce outs, which were not apparent during the shooting of the end. The archers call upon a judge to resolve the situation. Upon examination of the target face, two unmarked arrow holes are found on the right hand side of the target face, one in the 9 scoring zone, the other in the 5 scoring zone. There are no other unmarked holes in either the target face or on the butt.

All archers on the target are using similar type and size arrows.

As the assigned target judge, how would you resolve the problem to the satisfaction of all the archers on that target?

Most responses (25) would probably dissatisfy at least one archer on the target, scoring both arrows as a 5 – most quoting 7.6.2.7 (FITA Rules). Twelve replies would give both archers a 9, and two would split the difference and give them a 7 each.

7.6.2.7 talks about one arrow and two holes; here we have got two arrows that have bounced and two holes; I would agree with the judges who would give both archers the benefit of the doubt and protect both scores. It seems to be better to give an advantage to the competitor who shot the 5 than disadvantaging the one competitor who has shot a 9. Obviously the incident needs to be recorded in case of a protest by one of the other archers.

47/3: At a world ranking tournament, archer X completed only the 90 and 70 meter distances. At the start of the 50 meter distance he had a serious equipment failure which he could not repair before the 30 meters concluded. There are 62 archers in the competition, and byes will be allowed for the 1/32 elimination round.

Would you allow this archer to compete in the individual Olympic Round?

All but six replies indicated that the archer should be allowed to compete, as there are only 62 competitors and 64 spots.

Most of those who would not allow the archer to compete used the 15 minute equipment failure rule as a reason. However, this rule does not apply here, because we are not talking about making up arrows. The archer will simply be ranked using the score he shot before the equipment failure – more than likely last. But if he is ready to shoot at the start of the Elimination Round, there is no reason why he should not be allowed to do so.

You be the Judge (Case studies)

Please have your answers with RGB administrators by the end of August, who in turn are asked to collate and forward replies by mid September. Alternatively, judges can e-mail me their answers directly (but inform your RGB administrator, you have done so).

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

48/1: By mistake an archer had brought with him his mobile phone to the shooting line. Unfortunately it started ringing when 10 seconds remained. The archer next to him, who repeatedly had problems with getting his arrows through the clicker, although without any late shots, claimed he was disturbed by the ringing as he took down and asked for another 40 sec to shoot his last arrow.

Would you give him these 40 seconds?

48/2: A series of sound signals are suddenly given in the middle of an end because a dog is entering into one side of the large field. One archer immediately realises that the dog is far away from his target so he shoots his last arrow of that end some seconds later. A judge promptly takes action and when this end later on is scored, he deducts the highest scoring arrow of this archer.

What is your opinion?

48/3: At an international event ranking round shot at 70m the following occurred: An archer raised his bow to shoot his sixth arrow but ran out of time. Surprised by the sound signal, practically without aiming, he shot his arrow and missed the target. This archer was completely out of his shooting style, and the Judge was standing just behind him and clearly saw the arrow missing the target. The Judge listened for the arrow hit, but heard no sound.

The Judge participated in the scoring on that target and scored the last arrow as a Miss. He didn't take away the highest scoring arrow, considering that he was able to clearly identify the sixth arrow as a miss.

What do you think of his decision?