

Dear Judges,



I want to take this opportunity to wish you all a Merry Christmas and a happy and safe 2005.

Your support and co-operation during the past year was most appreciated, and the Officials Committee is looking forward to working with you next year.

Warm regards to you all

Susanne E Womersley
Chair - AA Officials Committee

Contents

2009 Open Nationals

Ed Crowther- FITA International Judge

International appointments for 2009

Clarification to FITA Interpretation

Clarification from FITA Technical Committee

Interpretations by AA Constitution & Rules Committee

Non-elimination Match-Play

Collective Noun for Judges

You be the Judge - Answers

New Case Studies

2009 Open National Championships

Attached is the nomination form for the **2009 Australian Open National Championships** in Adelaide. Please consider and reply by the due date. **Judges from outside of Australia are also encouraged to nominate.** Please refer to the nomination form for details.

New Australian FITA International Judge

Congratulations to **Ed Crowther** who, at a meeting of the FITA Judge Committee in November, was upgraded from FITA International Judge Candidate to **FITA International Judge!**

International appointments for 2009

OAC President Ms Carole Hicks congratulated judges from the region to their international appointments for 2009:

Oceania congratulates the FITA Judges from this region who have been appointed to important tournaments throughout the world in 2009.

Karen O'Malley (AUS) World Indoor Championships - Rzeszow (Poland)

Susanne Womersley (Aus) World Cup Final - Copenhagen (Denmark)

Carole Hicks (NZL) Summer Universiade – Belgrade (Serbia) and alternate for World Cup Antalya (Turkey)

Didier Gras (FPO) World Games - Kaohsiung (Chinese Taipei)

Les Jones (NZL) World Outdoor Championships – Ulsan (Korea)

Jim Larven (AUS) DoS World Outdoor Championships – Ulsan (Korea) and 2nd alternate Judge Youth World Championships – Ogden (USA)

Ed Crowther (AUS) World Masters Games – Sydney

It is really good to see such a strong representation from Oceania and we wish each of them every success in their respective tournaments.

Clarification to FITA Interpretation

(taken from FITA Info – October 2008)

Constitution & Rules

Further Clarification from the Chairman of the FITA Technical Committee on the Official Interpretation from 12 June 2008 (string dampeners, Book 5, Articles 11.10.3.4.2 11.10.2.4.1)

As noted in the questions, suppressors can have different functions. In our sport, a suppressor could provide dampening/reduction in vibration, torsion, sound and in the case of the string attachments, possibly even amplitude.

1) *Exactly what kind of "suppressors" "dampeners", etc is FITA talking about in the interpretations (string mounted? Riser or limb mounted? Solid or flexible?*

All of the above. Suppressors could be string mounted, limb mounted or riser mounted. Riser or limb mounted suppressors/dampeners have the main function of reducing vibration and torsion. A bowstring mounted suppressor/dampener has similar characteristics and can also reduce sound and possibly string amplitude.

Many of the questions that come to our committee must be viewed on a case by case basis. This is also the reason the Technical Committee is not providing photos, because the market is flooded with numerous types of dampener/suppressor devices with new ones coming on the market all of the time. Providing photos of some devices but not others often causes significant issues where readers function in absolutes, while others understand the use of examples. Each person can have their own interpretation and the reason it is not possible to answer every question or cover every possibility in our written rules.

2) *Will FITA allow any other device on the riser or limb that contacts the string?*

The answer must be basically yes. If an object is attached to the riser and extends enough to contact the string, whether in constant contact or interval contact, it would first be considered a stabiliser due to length and attachment point and would also constitute a string guide, which is illegal under rule 7.3.1.6.1, bullet one and two.

If a dampening device were attached to the limbs and also contacted the bowstring, it would depend on the position, design and overall function. Here it would have to be determined if the device would constitute a stabiliser and if so, fall under rule 7.3.1.6.1.

3) *Will FITA accept any additional device on the riser, limb or string of the recurve or standard bow if it is not specifically included by the rules?*

The rules for bowstrings are very clear under each category and easily interpreted. For example recurve bows (Olympic style) can have nothing on the bowstring other than what is listed under rule 7.3.1.2.1. Regarding the comment about "any additional device on the riser, limb of recurve or standard bow", please remember that there are different rules for each discipline. Therefore, let's examine only the recurve (Olympic style) as the standard bow is more restrictive. On a recurve bow, stabilisers are allowed, as long as they do not touch anything but the bow and do not act as a string guide. No limit on the number of stabilisers currently exists.

Clarification from FITA Technical Committee

Following the article about the AXIS riser in the last issue, the question was asked why this riser had been rejected for the Bare Bow division – size or design?

I forwarded the query to the chairman of the FITA Technical Committee, Don Rabska. Here is an excerpt of his reply:

If the bow fits through the 12.2 cm ring, it is legal for Bare Bow. The reason the Axis was not allowed for Bare Bow was due to the riser being too wide to fit through the 12.2 cm ring.

This should now clarify the issue for bows similar to the Axis, eg. Hoyt Gamemaster Recurve – if they fit through the ring, they are legal....

Recent interpretations by the AA Constitutions & Rules Committee

Head phones

The C & R Committee received a request to clarify the rules relating to the use of electronic equipment (head phones used for listening to music, etc) on the shooting line. Here is the official response:

The rules are quite clear on this matter - as follows:

1. Archery Australia has adopted in almost total FITA rules governing equipment, shooting, timing, etc. Please refer to the AA Constitution & Rules Chapter 8: Athletes Equipment Article 8.11 General page 101 - *"For all specifications relating to athletes equipment, refer to FITA Articles 7.3, 8.3, 9.3 and any amendments that may be introduced from time to time."*

2. FITA Constitution & Rules BOOK 2 Chapter 7 Article 7.3 ATHLETES EQUIPMENT Clause 7.3.4 *"For athletes of all divisions the following equipment is not permitted:*

7.3.4.1 Any electronic communication device and headsets in front of the waiting line."

These rules shall apply to all forms of competition/tournaments - club, state and national - including practice sessions and the actual competition. It is a dangerous practice should there is a need to halt shooting for any reason, ie danger. Those archers who may be using headsets for whatever reason (for the younger competitors very loud music) may not be able to hear the signal to stop shooting, which may cause a serious problem.

Longbows

A request was received by the C & R Committee to clarify the rules regarding the laminations on the upper part of the handle riser in a particular brand of Longbow.

A particular supplier is making longbows that have layers of banded wood on them. This gives the effect of different coloured layers of wood on the inside of the limb. Each layer is approx.2cm wide. They are above and below the arrow rest. They are openly being used as a means to aim in all forms of archery (Outdoor Target, Indoor Target and Field).

Here is the official response:

In this case the FITA rules are quite clear:

Article 9.3 ATHLETES EQUIPMENT

Clause 9.3.5.2 Barebow and Longbow Divisions

"No sight nor sightmark(s) on the bow that may help aiming are allowed."

9.3.11 For athletes of all Divisions none of the following equipment is permitted

Clause 9.3.11.3 *"Any part of an athletes equipment that has been added or modified to serve the purpose of estimating distances or angles, nor may any regular piece of equipment be used explicitly for that purpose."*

It is the majority opinion of the Constitution & Rules Committee the laminations on the top part of the riser and extending into the limbs contravene both of these rules, and this model of Longbow is therefore illegal. However, for future competition the laminations shall be suitably taped and checked by the judges to ensure they cannot be used as sight marks.

There is also the possibility some AA Records have been or are about to be claimed using this type of equipment. If this is the case it is the recommendation of the C & R Committee:

1. The RGB Recorder shall not to allow the record claims for the reason the equipment used is illegal;
2. If AA Records have been claimed and allowed, the Records Committee should be immediately contacted advising the situation.

If a similar bow was passed by the Judges previously, it does not follow automatically that bow is accepted at any future competitions. This has always been the fact in AA and FITA. If a previous Tournament Judges Commission has made a mistake in approving any item of equipment, that is good for the competitor concerned however; the mistake can certainly be picked up at later competitions.

Please refer to the latest Archery E News (December Issue) for more interpretations.

Non-elimination Match-Play

During the Australian Open in Melbourne in October a "new-style" match-play round was shot by approximately 100 competitors from all around Australia and from overseas, which received positive comments all around.

This round differs from traditional match-play rounds in as much as nobody "travels 100s or 1000s of kilometres only to shoot 12 arrows and then go home again". Everybody stays in the competition until the end to get a placing.

Attached is an outline of this round, and clear instructions on how to organise it. It might be something you want to get your RGB or club to try out, so that match-play is shot more often than what it is now. Contrary to some people's beliefs, it is fun!

Collective noun for judges

Two votes only (Thanks, Donna and Emerson!) - what about the rest of you?

So, here is another chance. Vote by reply-email (**Do it now!**) to vote for your favourite.

Here we go again (in alphabetical order):

an **APPEAL** of Judges

a **HOVER** of Judges (That is what we do sometimes.)

a **MILLING** of Judges (This is in fact a saying that dates back to the 1982 FITA World Field Archery Championships in England. The IJ from USA Allan Marten coined the saying when he noticed the Judges standing in a group chatting and laughing. *"Well, here we are milling again!"* followed by *"Judges are very good at milling!"*)

a **PLAIT** of Judges (Several strands of different perspectives come together and form a new dynamic whole for each competition. No two plaits will be the same; however, they will all always present as a neat tailored whole in the spirit of the FITA Rulebook.)

a **RULE** of Judges

You be the Judge - Answers from Issue 59

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	7 again!	ASA	11	6
ASNSW	20	7	AV	10	8
AST	5	3	SQAS	9	2
ASWA	14	7	NQAA	3	2
<i>Oceania</i>	7	nil	Total	79	42

**53% - Congratulations to AACT. 100% for the second time in a row!
Great work – something for the other RGBs to aim for!**

59/1:

a) Everyone (except for one judge who cited safety as a reason) agreed that the judge was wrong. Our colleagues in Western Australia were outraged and wanted to know if he was still alive! Several judges suggested some stringent counselling. Many found it difficult to understand how an arrow in the frame might confuse another group of archers since we often see this scenario in all forms of archery and the arrow cannot always be moved before the next end is shot.

b) Once again, most believed that by calling the field crew it would be possible to have the arrow removed. No one has yet come across a situation where this has not been the case. Many judges also carry multi-tools. Some suggested that if the arrow were stuck in the face then the face itself would need to be removed to determine the cause. The Chairman of Judges would also need to be contacted before a final decision could be made. Ultimately there may be no alternative but to declare the butt unshootable and eliminate it from the round. However, 9.10.1.4 actually enables the butt to be replaced if time and conditions allow.

59/2

All quoted 7.4.5.1 which states that the "arrow may be considered to have not been shot if it drops or is mis-shot..." 5 judges (I was 1 of them) would regard the arrow as *shot*; everyone else considered it not shot. Interestingly, this case begins with, "as an archer releases her shot..." Is there any evidence of the arrow's being "mis-shot?" Suppose this had occurred at 30m and part of the arrow had lodged in the 2 scoring zone rather than in the grass. Would you then say that the arrow had been 'not shot?' And just what is the definition of "mis-shot?" Perhaps we need to go to the FITA Judge Committee for such a definition?

59/3

Just about everyone quoted 7.10.1.2, and 7.6.2.6.4 was also cited with gay abandon. A third of the judges would score the arrow as a miss; the remainder would allocate a score equivalent to the lowest score of the opponent's arrow in which it had become embedded. Personally, I would favour the latter. Even though the arrows had been withdrawn the next end had not yet started. Surely it would be quite possible (and fair to the archer) to look at the other archer's scorecard, determine the lowest value (analogous to what we would do with a bounce-out where there is more than one unmarked hole), and apportion

that value. We do not know what the value of the other archer's arrow was but at least the archer does get some credit and we cannot deny that there must have been a score – unless the other archer had a miss, of course! Two judges would actually award the *highest* arrow value as they saw this as giving the archer the benefit of the doubt. (Comment from Susanne: Remember, "benefit of the doubt" only applies to the value of an arrow on the line between two scoring zones.)

Protect or punish? Do we apply the rules unbendingly or use common sense based on the *intent* of the rule "and in fairness to all athletes?" (7.9.1)

All fun and games – Merry Christmas! Ed Crowther

You be the Judge (Case studies)

Here are three new case studies to keep you busy over the Christmas break!

Please have your replies with RGB administrators by 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.

60/1: At a major national field tournament the following occurred: On Day 2 of the competition two archers of a group arrived at the venue, signed in and checked their target allocation. This was only laid out in divisions and not by target allocation.

They then proceeded to the practice butts and practiced until the whistle ended practice and called all archers to the pre shoot briefing.

During the latter part of the briefing, score sheets were handed out and one of those two archers collected the scoresheets for that target group.

Arriving at their designated target, the two archers concerned became aware that the other archers assigned to their group were not present. As the tournament started, these two then began to shoot without the other archers assigned to the group. During the initial stages of the shoot these two shot several targets in the presence of two judges without any intervention. As they proceeded to shoot in view of a third judge they were informed by that judge, that they were in contravention of the rules and that they would be disqualified, which they subsequently were.

Was the judge right/correct in having these two archers disqualified? Why? Why not?

60/2: An archer is shooting Outdoor Target and has a sighting scope on the shooting line. After completing only 3 arrows of a 6 arrow end, the front leg of the sighting scope collapses and the scope falls into the 3m zone in front of the archer. The archer stops shooting and signals for an equipment failure.

What does the judge do? Is this a legitimate equipment failure? Can the archer make up the unshot arrows?

60/3: During a Clout end a bird strays into the clout area and unfortunately is hit by an archer's arrow and killed. When the archers reach the clout to score they find that the bird is laying across the 9/10 scoring zone and is pinned to the ground by the arrow. The arrow shaft has exited the bird in the 9 zone, but the exit point of the arrow from the ground, which would be close to the 10 zone, is hidden under the bird and therefore it is not possible to determine whether the arrow has scored a 9 or 10 without moving the bird.

The judge is called. What do you do?