



NATIONAL JUDGES NEWSLETTER

Issue 50

December 2005

Dear Judges,



It is hard to believe, but this is the 50th issue of the Archery Australia National Judges Newsletter. It is also the festive season again; I hope you enjoyed Christmas, and I take this opportunity to wish you and your families a happy, healthy and safe 2006.

Warm regards to you all

Susanne E Womersley

Congratulations to Coral Dandridge (ASWA)

Coral Dandridge officiated at the World Crossbow Shooting Association 2nd World Crossbow Championships held in Perth from 24th to 31st October, 2005.

Due to her dedication, commitment and efficiency at the championships the Chairman of Judges recommended that she be accredited as a World Crossbow Shooting Association International Judge Candidate. This recommendation was accepted and Coral is now an accredited **World Crossbow Shooting Association International Judge Candidate**.

FITA Honorary Judge – Clive Barnett

Following his resignation as a FITA Judge and AA National Judge the FITA Judge Committee awarded the status of **FITA Honorary Judge** to Clive in recognition of his commitment to the FITA family.

On behalf of the Officials Committee I take this opportunity to wish Clive well in the future and to thank him publicly for his high level of commitment to officiating for so many years.

Open National Championships 2006

Did you know that Melbourne ranks very highly on the list of the world's most livable cities? Attached is a nomination form for officiating at the Open National Championships in April 2006. Please consider and reply by the closing date.

New FITA Rules

The new FITA Rules come into effect on 1 April 2006 – please do not try and let anyone apply them before that date, even though they are available on the FITA website and should be available in hard copy very soon.

Please make sure that you receive a copy of the new rule book. I am aware that some RGBs pay for rule books for their judges, whereas others recover the cost from the judges. Either way it is imperative that each judge has a copy of the new rule book.

FITA Interpretations (taken from FITA Info 10/05 and 11/05)

1. A question was raised on the use of the Spigarelli Revolution riser in the Bare Bow division of FITA.

Response from the Technical Committee:

It is the official opinion of the FITA Technical Committee that the current design of the Spigarelli Revolution riser is not allowed in the Bare Bow division of FITA. Under 9.3.1.2, the riser contravenes this rule due to the half round cut out section within the sight window.

2. A question was raised on the possibility of using a Personal Digital Assistant (PDA), pocket PC or similar equipment.

Response from the Technical Committee:

It is the majority opinion of the FITA Technical Committee that the use of any personal hand held computer device is legal – with the following stipulations – for Indoor and Outdoor FITA Target competition, but not legal for FITA Field archery.

The following restrictions would apply: The device may not be used for receiving “real time” communication information with or without headsets. Under article 7.3.4.1 any electronic communication device and headset in front of the waiting line is not legal. As long as the device is used for calculating scores, plotting arrow impacts, countdown timer and other such operations, it is legal. But it is not legal as a direct communication device.

Bylaws decisions approved by FITA Council in October 2005

There are several bylaws decisions that have been approved by FITA Council on 8 October 2005.

These bylaws will all come into effect as of 1 April 2006. However they will not have been included in the main part of the new rule book, but placed as addendums at the rear of the book – which may or may not have been included in the hard copies available now. Please check!

They can be found on the FITA website (www.archery.org) in Rule Book/Bylaws or under Publications/FITA Info October 2005.

Judges Course in Western Australia

Towards the end of January, a judges course will be held in Western Australia which will hopefully result in the accreditation of 12 new National Judge Candidates from that RGB.

Congratulations to Keith Schurman and his team for being so pro-active on the officiating side of the sport!

You be the Judge 48/2 revisited

After publishing the last newsletter I received the comments below from Morten Wilmann, FITA International Judge and member of the FITA Judge Committee:

Dear friends,

I would like to add some comments to your case study 48/2, as this is a classic example of a case where the Judges feel that the action of an archer “deserves” a strong action. In such situations it is absolutely vital that the Judges do not “create” new rules, but stick firmly to those we have.

The losing of the highest scoring arrow is strictly regulated to certain occasions. Shooting after a warning signal is not one of them! Is the action of the archer wrong? Yes – he is supposed to stop shooting. Did he act dangerously? Maybe - this can only be considered on the spot. Do we have rules that covers the situation? Yes – in fact – ref. art. 7.8.1.8.

Following from that article, the question will be if the offence is serious enough to eliminate the archer, or if a (strong) warning is enough as a teaching lesson.

Morten B. Wilmann

You be the Judge - Answers from Issue 49

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	5	ASA	13	8
ASNSW	15	7	AV	10	6
AST	8	7	SQAS	7	3
ASWA	7	nil	NQAA	5	3
<i>Oceania</i>	7	2	Total	73	41

56% - We are above the 50% mark again, but keep them coming!

49/1: At a FITA Star Tournament the numbering of the ladies' targets are from no. 1 until 7. These targets are on the 70m line.

Because the field is small compared with the number of archers, there is no space between the ladies and the men on the shooting line, although the men of course are shooting at 90m. The top male archer is shooting on target 8.

During the break after the first distance, the targets are moved towards the shooting line; the ladies' targets now on 60m and the men's targets on 70m distances. However, as no female archers were shooting on target 7 (they didn't turn up), this target was not moved and remained on 70m, next to the men's target no. 8.

Starting at 70m the top male archer, leading the event, shot at the wrong target (no. 7 instead of no. 8) as the target furthest to the left no longer was his target but the remaining target no. 7. The numbering of the targets is, however, correct.

The archer is protesting against the field set-up, and wants to re-shoot his three arrows, alternatively he wants the score as they are (in no. 7).

What do you think?

All but four judges would correctly score the arrows as Misses. There is no way he can re-shoot the arrows (we all know that rule!), and he did shoot in the wrong face. The rule here is totally clear as well. Most judges acknowledged that the butt or at least the face should have been removed, and that there was not enough space between the ladies and mens section, but the target numbers were correct. A number of judges also stated quite correctly that they would make sure the original scores would be recorded, in case the competitor wished to lodge an appeal with regards to the field set-up. Some would remind him of that option.

49/2: At a National Field Championships an archer calls a judge to the target saying he has had a pass-through on his third arrow. This is the final (24th) target for the round and so far this archer has scored all 5s, as he is a top shooter. His first two arrows on this target are also both 5 spots. There is only one unmarked arrow hole and that is in the 3 zone. The archer insists that there is no way he would have shot a 3 and that the pass-through almost certainly went through the hole of a previously shot 5 spot. He insists – and he is very insistent – on shooting another arrow, which he does – and it's a 5, giving him a perfect score.

As the judge, what would you do?

I am quoting part of a reply from one judge as it sums up part of the situation nicely:

“This situation could have been used as an educating process. As the judge I could ask them were they aware that as a group if they all agreed on the fact that a pass-through happened and on the value of the arrow, the agreed value could be recorded without having to call a judge (9.6.2.6). But if they wanted me to adjudicate I would have to give the arrow value as the lowest unmarked hole in the scoring zone. Then ask the group whether I was needed and act accordingly.”

The fact though is, that our competitor shot a fourth arrow against the directive of the judge! Most answers dealt not really clearly with that aspect and did not give a clear indication of the final score for that end. This will be a new case study – 50/1.

49/3: When you check a target range just before the competition starts, you find three target faces that have been slightly used. There are only a few holes in them which have all been clearly and correctly marked. When you check with the organisers you are told that because of bad weather during the practice days more faces than expected have been used. That is why some used faces have been mounted on the butts. An archer on one of the targets in question complains that he will be handicapped by this situation.

What action will you take if any?

Most judges would not change the face. As one judge put it, “Only a little used? All holes marked? What’s the problem? They are all soon going to have many more holes in them.....”

A number of judges stated they could not find a rule that specified new faces at the start of competition however, some pointed out the rule about faces having to be uniform (in my opinion that rule does not stretch to cover a couple of holes...)

You be the Judge (Case studies)

Please have your answers with RGB administrators by the end of February, who in turn are asked to collate and forward replies by mid March. 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. And there are still people who don’t put their name on the attachment. I print them out and with no name I can’t give you credit for the reply!

50/1: Refer to 49/2 – but this time make sure you comment on the final score for that end, keeping in mind that four arrows were shot. Clearly state your reasons for coming with the arrow values that will be written on the score card.

50/2: You are judging at a FITA Field event and you discover that a group of archers have not marked the arrow holes on any target they have shot.

a) What is your course of action?

b) What penalty do you apply?

c) Does the penalty apply to one person in the group or to any others in the group?

State your reasons.

50/3: At a field archery tournament: With his first arrow of an end, the archer shoots a 2. He is very dissatisfied. He puts his second arrow on the bowstring and, still angry with himself, strikes his bow with the hand - the arrow drops from the bowstring and falls about 3m behind the shooting line. The archer leaves the shooting line, picks up his arrow, returns to the shooting line and shoots this arrow. Then, he shoots his third arrow. These 3 arrows are shot in the allotted time. When scoring at the target, the Judge who happens to be around, decides to remove the value of the highest scoring arrow of that end advising that the archer, while shooting, is not allowed to leave the shooting line.

Was the Judge's action correct?