



NATIONAL JUDGES NEWSLETTER

Issue 55

October 2007

Dear Judges,

It has been a long time since the last newsletter, I know.... But since the writing of the newsletter is timed to coincide with school holidays, and I spent the July holidays in Europe I simply did not manage to get the last issue out. But do not despair, there will be six case studies this time to make up for it. Don't say I don't look after you!

Warm regards to you all

Susanne E Womersley

Olympic Games Nomination Trials

These will take place in December 2007 and January and February 2008, and judges are required for all three events. Please look at the attached nomination form to find more details.

New National Judge Candidates

Earlier this year a judges course was held in Victoria which resulted in the accreditation of three new National Judge Candidates: Archie Kaan, Peter Reid and Ron Rowe. I hope you all will enjoy your "judging career"!

New National Judges

The following National Judge Candidates from ASNSW recently gained full accreditation as National Judges: Vince Nimmo and Steve Salmon – congratulations to you both!

Field Course Inspections (by Ken Payne)

Any judge should be fully aware of what the requirements are for a safe and fully shootable field course.

The requirements are not only covered in the rule books but also in the judges handbook. However, experience and common sense play an even greater part in ensuring that a field course is safe and able to be shot by everyone.

Unfortunately though, it is rare to go to a field shoot as a competitor where the course does not present unreasonable problems for at least some archers. This unfortunately includes courses that I have shot at all levels of tournaments.

We have to be aware that a field course is normally set up by one or two main archers. Through lack of experience with all bow types etc., they quite often only look at the course from the perspective of their own bow type.

First and foremost, **SAFETY** has to be considered for every target on the course.

When inspecting the course it is advantageous to have people wading the course ahead of you by a couple of targets. This way you are better able to see if there is a problem with paths etc crossing the overshoot area.

Most judges are aware of the basics but some of the faults that are regularly encountered are covered as follows.

- Is the path around the field marked out well enough so that no-one inadvertently wanders into another lane/ overshoot area?
- Where are the porta-loos, and or canteens going to be placed? Overshoots from the targets may be OK, but can archers get to the toilets without crossing an overshoot area.
- Is the shooting position safe and accessible. (Challenging – YES. Downright awkward or dangerous – NO)?
- If the shooting position is close to trees or obstacles is there clearance for all bows for all ages/sizes of archers both left and right handed?
- Can **ALL archers** see the entire target face they are shooting at?
- Can **All arrows** clear all terrain and trees, twigs, etc. from the lowest flattest trajectory to the tallest and highest trajectory? An arrow glancing off a tree can travel outside the normal safety area and injure someone, apart from the damage to the arrow.
- Can the archers shoot two up at a time without transgressing into the other's shooting space?
- Can spectators wander onto the course unobserved / uncontrolled?
- If you inspected the course when the weather was fine, will branches or foliage drop into the arrow path if it rains?
- If there is a shift in wind direction or velocity, will foliage then present an obstacle?
- Can the archers shoot from within about a metre each side of the peg? If the intent is to shoot one each side of a tree, you may not see the target if you stand on the peg, but one metre each side, you can. The archer to the left must be able to shoot on the left of the peg and the archer on the right must be able to shoot on the right side.

You must look for potential problems and have them rectified before they become a problem for the competitors during the course of the event.

FITA Judge Committee Newsletter

I really would like to recommend you take the time to read the latest issue of the FITA Judge Committee Newsletter; it contains a number of interesting articles that apply not only to FITA Judges, but to all of us.

It can be found on the FITA website (www.archery.org) under News > Newsletters > Judges Newsletter 67.

You be the Judge - Answers from Issue 54

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

RGB	Judges	Replies	RGB	Judges	Replies
AACT	7	4	ASA	13	10
ASNSW	22	9	AV	13	5
AST	7	4	SQAS	10	4
ASWA	13	7	NQAA	5	2
<i>Oceania</i>	7	3	Total	90	48

53% - Still more than half; but 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.

I've often said that if you put half a dozen judges together to discuss a particular case, you'd never get 100% agreement – **WRONG!**

Is this the first time in living memory that **all judges agreed on all responses?**

54/1: 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.

54/2: At a tournament the bulb of the yellow light in one of the light devices went out immediately when switched on, so that no indication was given during the remaining 30 second at one end of the field. There was no countdown clock at this event.

When the time was out (2 min.) and the DOS gave the stop shooting signal, one archer in this area was taken by surprise and shot her last arrow on the signal, a poor shot.

Claiming that she got no indication of short time left (no yellow light) she therefore wanted to re-shoot her poor arrow.

Your comments, please.....

Full agreement with the judge's action here citing **Rule 7.4.5**.

Some also referred to 7.5.7 of the Judges Manual, stating that this would apply only if the arrow had **not** been shot. If, for example, the archer had indicated an equipment failure or otherwise drawn the attention of a judge to the problem, and not shot her arrow, the situation would have been different.

Many argued that that the green light going off was, in itself, a warning that 30 seconds remained.

Others quoted **7.4.2.1** which alludes to the acoustic time control taking precedence over the visual one in the event of a discrepancy.

Only 2 judges stated that they would have the problem rectified before shooting continued.

54/3: Archer A is calling you to the target as he has an arrow that obviously has hit his own arrow in the 10 zone (this arrow – the 10 – has been severely damaged) and then deflected into the 8 zone. The angle of the arrow in the 8 zone clearly indicates that it has hit the other arrow before and then drifted to the 8 zone. His third arrow in the target is a 9.

What is the score for this end?

All saw this as a straightforward application of **Rule 7.6.2.6.5** – the score would be 10 9 8 = 27; end of story, no correspondence entered into, goodbye, etc.

Well done, everyone and, once again, it was really pleasing to note that just about all of you quoted a FITA Rule, too.

Let's take it for granted in the future that you would advise the archer of the right of appeal (except in arrow value situations) – this way it will save you saying so in each response!

Also consider what action you might take to ensure that the situation does not re-occur (e.g., 54/1 and 54/2) as well as just interpreting the rule.

Will history repeat itself in the next series of Case Studies? Stay tuned.

Ed Crowther

You be the Judge (Case studies)

Here are the new case studies (as said before: six of them to make up for the missing newsletter issue) – let's keep the answers coming!

Please have your replies with RGB administrators by the end of November, who in turn are asked to collate and forward replies by mid December. 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.

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?*

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?*

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.*

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?

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?

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?