

Dear Judges,

On behalf of the Officials Committee, I wish you and your families a Happy Easter! Warm regards to you all!



Susanne E Womersley
Chair – AA Officials Committee

Contents

One For All And All For One
New Age Divisions
New By-law on Arrow Wraps
FITA Rule Book
Recent FITA Interpretations
Dress Standards
Revised Clout Rules
Barebow Recurve and Compound
You be the Judge – Answers
New Case Studies

All For One And One For All

by Karen O'Malley

Whether we like it or not, the red shirt attracts attention. As Judges, we are servants of the Tournament and there to ensure the safe, smooth running of an event, and fairness on the Field of Play.

The competitors do not want to be at odds with each other. They are likely to be shooting together at future tournaments and don't want bad blood between them when it's much easier to be cranky with a Judge! So, as part of our job, we are called on to make the contentious decisions. Early in a Judge's career, it may seem difficult to apply the Rules, especially if that means being 'unpopular' with archers whom we respect or know personally, or even shoot with at times.

But a Judge cannot decide to be 'easy' on one athlete, at the expense of all the other competitors. Even if the person concerned is the only one in their division at this event, or is a young child, or whatever, we are there to ensure that FITA or AA rules are consistently applied at every FITA or AA event in this country, and indeed, for the FITA Rules, around the world. This is the other side of 'fair', and the archers who see you 'bend the Rules', will not forget. Contentious as a decision may be, if you think the circumstances are unusual, and we have all experienced this, still apply the Rule and advise the archer of the right to appeal. This is what the Jury is for.

Are there some 'silly' Rules? It's not up to us to decide which Rules we like/agree with and which we don't. We are there to enforce the Rules that exist, not to ignore Rules we don't like or make up our own, or invent punishments that don't exist. You couldn't decide you don't like the offside rule in football and choose not to apply it as a referee! If Archers enter an event, they agree to the event's being run under the Rules of the competition.

We Judges are about impartiality. If all Judges did their job properly, one archer would never be in a position to appeal against the way another was treated, with regard to

shooting out of time, not shooting on the correct peg or at the right field or indoor face, and so on.

Judges have to have unity. Archers will try to set you up and give a scenario which they have seen or heard about, in order to prove the archers were right and the Judge concerned was wrong. However, if you were not there and do not have all the information, don't be lured into responding negatively about your fellow Judges, nor talking negatively about a competitor, whilst you are on duty.

You will earn respect from the athletes by doing your job with pride. Joking around, especially during line calls, must be avoided. Being the 'archers' friend' passes the hard decisions on to someone else, making them look like the bad guy, simply because that Judge is doing the job properly and implementing the Rules appropriately.

New Age Divisions

As has been previously advised as from the 1 January 2010 FITA and subsequently Archery Australia have changed the age divisions for Junior and Cadet age archers.

The Junior division is now 20 years of age and under and the Cadet division is now 17 years of age and under.

Age Divisions from 1 January 2010 for the year 2010

Cubs	Anyone born in the year 1998 or since
Intermediate	Anyone born in the years 1996 or 1997
Cadets	Anyone born in the years 1993 or 1994 or 1995
Junior	Anyone born in the years 1990 or 1991 or 1992
Open	Anyone born in 1961 to 1989 inclusive
Masters	Anyone born in the years 1951 to 1960
Veterans	Anyone born in 1950 or before

New By-law on Arrow Wraps

As a result of a confusing interpretation in January 2010 on Book 2 (3 and 4), article 7.3.1.7.1 - "Arrow Wraps", an urgent bylaw request was submitted to FITA Council and approved. This bylaw is in effect upon the date of decision which is 6 March 2010.

Book 3, Article 8.3.2.7.1

An arrow consists of a shaft with head (point) nock, fletching and, if desired, cresting. The maximum diameter of arrow shafts will not exceed 9.3mm (arrow wraps will not be considered as part of this limitation as long they do not extend further than 22cm toward the point of the arrow when measured from the throat -nock hole where the string sits- of the nock to the end of the wrap); the points (heads) for these arrows may have a maximum diameter of 9.4mm. All arrows of every athlete must be marked with the athlete's name or initials on the shaft. All arrows used at any end will carry the same pattern and colour(s) of fletching, nocks and cresting, if any.

There was also some discussion about whether the name can be printed on the wrap, rather than the shaft. Names on arrow wraps are certainly allowed - wraps can't come loose like a fletch. You can even purchase arrow wraps complete with your name with the World Archery logo from FITA.

FITA Rule Book (edited from the World Archery News Jan and Feb 2010)

You can find on www.worldarchery.org, under the menu Rules/Constitution & Rules Book, the new version of the rule book which includes all the changes since the Leipzig and Ulsan Congresses.

An errata list will be available on 1 March which will show the last corrections. But "Books 1 - 5 Errata Sheet" has a page numbering problem on the even pages. All 2 - 14 are mis-numbered as "2".

The FITA C&R Committee will now together with the FITA office and a workgroup undertake a full restructuring of the rule book so that it will be easier accessible for all readers. However for practical reasons this is the actual version of the rule book and should be used by all involved until the next version will be available.

All rule changes come into effect from 1 April 2010 (with the exception of the age changes to the Junior and Cadet divisions, which have been in force since 1 January 2010).

There are many changes, but the one that will have the most frequent impact at national level is the change in walk-up time (between the two beeps and the one beep to start shooting) from 20 to 10 seconds.

Please ensure you are familiar with the changes. Nothing worse than a judge who quotes old rules.

The following is a list of the bylaws that have been approved and will be effective as of 1 April 2010. They are included in the web version of the FITA Rules, but can also be found on the FITA website under the menu FITA/Rules/Bylaws:

Book 1, Appendix 2, Articles 2.2.1 (new) and 2.2.2

Book 1, Appendix 5, Article 5.5.1.1 (bullets 6 and 8)

Book 1, Appendix 8 - New

Book 1, Appendix 5, Article 4.4.3

Book 1, Appendix 5, Article 5.9 (new)

Book 1, Article 1.5.7.2

Book 1, Articles 1.9.3.1, 1.10 (deletion), and 1.10.1.1 (former 1.11.1.1)

Book 1, Article 1.11.3.1

Book 1, Article 1.17.9.1

Book 1, Article 1.22.3.2

Book 1, Articles 3.17.1.3 and 3.17.1.4

Book 1, Chapter 5, Article 5.3.1.4 (New)

Book 1, Article 1.1 - Addendum

Book 1, Article 1.1 - Addendum

Book 1, Article 1.5.7.2 – bullet 3

Book 1, Article 3.4.2.6

Book 2, Article 7.2.1.1

Book 2 Article 7.2.2.2

Book 2, Article 7.5.2.1

Book 2, Article 7.5.5.1

Book 2, Article 7.5.6.1

Book 2, Articles 7.6.4.1 and 7.6.4.2

Book 2, Articles 7.6.6.1, 7.6.6.2 and 7.6.6.3 (new)

Book 3, Article 8.5.3

Book 3, Article 8.5.4.1

Book 4, Appendix 1 (chart update)

Book 4, Appendix 1, Article 9.2.1.3

Book 4, Article 9.3.5.3.2

Book 4, Article 9.3.7.2.1

Book 4, Article 9.3.8.2

Book 4, Article 9.1.1.10

Book 4, Article 9.5.1.2

Book 4, Article 9.5.1.3

Book 4, Article 9.6.1.1

Book 4, Article 9.7.2.4

Book 5, article 11.10

Book 5, Article 11.10.3.4.1

Book 3, Articles 8.6.4.1 and 8.6.4.2

Recent FITA Interpretations (taken from the FITA Judge Committee Newsletter #74, March 2010, which has also a number of other interesting articles and the World Archery News Jan 2010)

Book 1, Appendix 14.3

Book 2, Chapter 7, Article 7.6.1.4

Book 2, Chapter 7, Article 7.6.1.5

Book 2, Chapter 7, Article 7.9.1

Book 2, Chapter 7, Article 7.9.1.6

Book 2, Chapter 7, Article 7.9.1.12

Book 2, Chapter 7, Article 7.10.1

The Judges' Committee has requested an interpretation of whether or not a Judge may correct a flagrant scoring error of two or more athletes or their agents in outdoor target archery events.

Specifically, the question is the authority of a Judge to require an arrow value to be changed on the score card because the Judge believes that the athletes or their agents have incorrectly determined an arrow value even though there is no dispute among the athletes or their agents and no one has requested the Judge's involvement.

Response from the Constitution and Rules Committee:

The Constitution and Rules Committee ("C&R") is unanimous in concluding that while athletes or their agents normally determine the value of arrows and a judge normally determines an arrow's value only where there is a disagreement between the athletes or their agents (Appendix 14.3, 7.6.1.4 and 7.6.1.5), a Judge has the authority to require the athletes or their agents to change the value of an arrow on a score card where the Judge has observed that a flagrant error has occurred. In C&R's opinion, Judges have this authority based on (i) their duty to ensure fairness to all athletes and that tournaments are conducted in accordance with the FITA Rules and Constitution (the "FITA Rules") (7.9.1) and (ii) their authority to control the conduct of the scoring (7.9.1.6).

Since the FITA Rules assign scoring to athletes/agents generally, C&R believes that a Judge should intervene without being requested and require athletes or their agents to change an arrow value only when the Judge has observed a flagrant error, meaning that the Judge has observed a clear error using only his or her naked eye (as opposed to an arrow whose value may not be determined without close review). Under FITA Rules, the decision of the assigned Judge as to the arrow value is final (7.6.1.5) and may not be appealed (7.10.1).

FITA C&R Committee, 18 July 2009

Approved by the FITA C&R Committee, 18 July 2009

Book 1, article 3.22.1.2

The Norwegian Archery Federation has requested an interpretation on the definition of a sport shoe.

The Constitution and Rules Committee finds the question presented to be within terms of reference of the Technical Committee but that the input of the Athletes Committee should be obtained.

The Constitution and Rules Committee has determined that the following interpretation of the Technical Committee is not contrary to the existing rules or Congress decisions and is supported by the comments of the Athletes Committee.

Response from the Technical Committee:

Sport Shoes/Athletic Shoes - Dictionary definition:

An athletic shoe is a generic name for a shoe designed for sporting activities. They were originally sporting apparel, but are today worn much more widely as casual footwear. It can also go by the names *sport shoe*, *running shoe*, *gym shoe*, tennis shoes, *sneakers* (American English) or *trainers* (British English).

The Technical Committee feels this definition provides an adequate guideline allowing for any suitable footwear for the purpose, but not necessarily limited to this definition. The definition would exclude open toed or open healed footwear such as sandals, "flip flops",

etc. If the shoe fully covers the toes and heel to or past the height of the feet arch, we feel they should be considered legal.

Additional comments - Any footwear used by an athlete who determines the selected footwear is best suited to facilitate their comfort and provide maximum performance is acceptable with the few restrictions noted. This interpretation takes into account the comfort and personal preference of the athlete regardless of the sporting activity. These can be running shoes, walking shoes, hiking boots, work boots or **any** suitable footwear as determined by the athlete under the guidelines noted.

FITA Technical Committee, 8 February 2010

Approved by FITA C&R Committee, 2 March 2010

Book 2, article 7.3.3.9

The Norwegian Archery Federation has requested an interpretation on whether the use of an electronic telescope would be legal at the shooting line.

The Constitution and Rules Committee finds the question presented to be within terms of reference of the Technical Committee and has determined that the following interpretation of the Technical Committee is not contrary to the existing rules or Congress decisions.

Response from the Technical Committee:

It is the majority opinion of the Technical Committee that electronic spotting scopes are legal in the same way typical optical only spotting scopes would be used in competition. The electronics used in the spotting scope do not constitute a communication device with the intention of communicating information to anyone other than the archer utilizing the device. As long as there is no device within the spotting scopes electronics that is used for communication beyond the waiting line while the archer is competing, we see no reason to determine the device unacceptable for competition.

Additionally, as long as the viewing screen is used strictly to allow the archer to determine arrow impact in the same manner as a common optical scope and used solely for that purpose, the device is legal.

The following rules refer to communication beyond the waiting line and therefore do not apply to this device. We view an electronic spotting scope in the same way an electronic stop watch would be exempt under these rules.

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.

7.3.5 For Olympic Games no electronic communication device is allowed on the competition

FITA Technical Committee, 8 February 2010

Approved by the FITA C&R Committee, 2 March 2010

Book 4, article 9.3.1.4 and Book 5, article 11.10.3.4.1

The Norwegian Archery Federation has requested an interpretation on whether a longbow can be a take down bow.

The Constitution and Rules Committee finds the question presented to be within terms of reference of the Technical Committee.

The Constitution and Rules Committee has determined that the following interpretation of the Technical Committee is not contrary to the existing rules or Congress decisions.

Response from the Technical Committee:

A Longbow is described under athletes' equipment in Book 4 , article 9.3.1.4 and Book 5, article 11.10.3.4.1 as follows: "The bow will correspond to the traditional form of a long bow..." A majority of the Technical Committee has concluded that a takedown bow which meets this requirement when assembled is a longbow for purposes of these articles. As long as the bow has the traditional form of a longbow as is currently allowed in various FITA competitions, and does not deviate from this principle, the Technical Committee believes that a takedown longbow is acceptable.

FITA Technical Committee, 5 February 2010

Approved by the FITA C&R Committee, 11 February 2010

Dress Standards

Every now and then judges are drawn into a discussion about dress standards at tournaments. Both FITA (3.22 – these are for major international events) and AA (7.10 for Archery Australia events) have dress regulations, that need to be adhered to. However, 7.10.4 (AA Rules) stipulates very clearly that it is the responsibility of the Organising Committee to enforce dress regulations and take appropriate action if needed. It is **not** the responsibility of the judges for national or RGB events.

Revised Clout Rules

At the last meeting the Board approved a revised version of the AA Clout rules, coming into effect from 1 January 2011 – however, for the upcoming Nationals and Youth National Championships authorisation has been sought to use these new rules and the Board has granted permission. The Organising Committees will advise all entrants of the rules that will be used.

These rules are available from the AA website www.archery.org.au.

Barebow Recurve and Compound

A reminder that Hoyt Tec bar risers (e.g. Axis) that do not fit through the 12.2cm ring are not allowed in the Barebow Recurve division. Judges need to look out for such bows during equipment inspection.

At Indoor tournaments the following AA Rule applies:

For the Barebow Compound Division the inner ten (10) (X) ring shall score 10, the rest of the ten (10) ring shall score ten (10), the rest of the yellow scoring zone shall score nine (9).

You be the Judge - Answers from Issue 64

Edited by Ed Crowther – for the last time

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	15	10
ASNSW	20	9	AV	10	6
AST	11	4	SQAS	11	3
ASWA	10	4	NQAA	4	1
<i>Oceania</i>	7	3	Total	88	44

We managed to get 50% exactly this time!

64/1: *During the 1/64 Eliminations an archer has a bye, but decides to shoot. Of course the archer does not score during the bye. During the first end of the match (bye for the archer in question) the archer shoots his last arrow after the signal that shooting is completed. You cannot take away the highest scoring arrow, as the archer is shooting a bye and is not scoring. So, as a judge what action would you take?*

I must admit that I was more than surprised when some judges said that they would take away the highest scoring arrow of the archer's next end – **particularly since it is stated in the question that you cannot do this!** Some treated this as if it was part of the

official practice, quoting 7.4.2.3, but this is not the case here. The only recourse really open is to issue the archer with a warning since **this is a safety issue** and any archer practising whilst others are actually shooting must comply with the shooting timings laid down by the DOS or would be banned from practicing whilst others are shooting scoring ends if this re-occurred. Refer to Articles 7.4.2.8 and 7.8.1.8.

64/2: *This one is a follow-on from the easy 63/2 last time. This arrow has not struck the face nor has it rebounded nor is it lodged in the nock. It is actually stuck in the fletch. How would we score it?*

Very interesting! Most argued that none of the provisions under 7.6.2.6.4 or 7.6.2.6.6 applied and yet despite this 90% of judges would still give a 10! In reality we do not know what has happened so it is dangerous to try and make assumptions which are not based on evidence. My first reaction was to give the archer the benefit of the doubt but since the question says that the arrow has not hit the face (assumingly verified by there being no unmarked arrow hole after the procedure for dealing with a "hanger" has been followed) then I changed my mind and called it a M. Some argued that this was "physically" impossible. However, after consultation with a leading expert on the Laws of Physics I reverted to my original thought and I quote my mole:

"I think it could happen. For example, you could take the kinetic energy of the second arrow and have it flex the first arrow and dissipate energy laterally. It would hence need to be a pretty compelling argument that the physics would not allow it."

So 7.6.2.6.6 **could** apply and it looks like my first instinct was OK. After all, it has struck another arrow.

64/3: *At an indoor youth event, the practice is finalised and target faces changed. At one of your buttresses there is one compound archer and two recurve archers shooting, and after having shot three ends, an archer from the neighbouring target calls you saying that he thinks mistakes have been made in scoring on target 12. You check the scorecards and for the compound archer you find the following ends: 10-9-9, 9-9-9 and 10-9-9. On the face you clearly notice that there are 7 holes in the nine ring, 2 holes in the ten ring and no holes in the inner ring (X-ring). You ask the archer why he has scored two tens. The archer says he was in doubt being quite new to indoor archery, but the recurve archers told him that the scoring was correct. What would you do?*

Article 8.10.1.2 allows us to correct mistakes but only whilst all the arrows remain in the face. This rule also states that "any disputes concerning entries on a scorecard must be referred to a judge." This rider puts the onus on the judge to do something! It is clear that there are no holes in the inner 10 so the compound archer could not have scored any 10s. Is it fair that the scores should stand? Part of our charter is to ensure that tournaments are conducted "in fairness to all athletes." I would explain the scoring to all the archers, indicate in my subtle, succinct, inimitable fashion and with all the decorum I could muster, that mistakes had been made, carefully extract my red pen, adjust and initial the new arrow values to be 9's and advise the right of appeal. It may also be advisable to have the DOS make an announcement re-enforcing the scoring for compound archers – which I'm sure was done before the tournament started, wasn't it?

All this is part of our educational role.

Mark Brothers quite correctly draws our attention to the following in his response which I quote below:

"A FITA rule interpretation (dated 18 July, 2009) for judges correcting scorecards in relation to a flagrant error, prescribes that judges have the authority to make a correction based on

- (i) their duty to ensure fairness to all athletes and that tournaments are conducted in accordance with the FITA Rules and Constitution (7.9.1) and
- (ii) their authority to control the conduct of the scoring (7.9.1.5).

These rules in Outdoor target archery are identical in wording to rules 8.9.1 and 8.9.1.5 in relation to Indoor target archery, so the legislative basis of the judge's power is identical." Well picked up, Mark!

It does sometimes pay to check the FITA website under "Rules – Interpretations" in these cases – there are many listed here which are not included in the Rulebook or in the Judges' Guide Book.

Remember: If this person is shooting an **unsighted (Barebow) compound** at an AA Indoor event (even though it may be according to FITA rules), then our *AA rules (Article 10.1.1 as of 1 September, 2009)*, allow him to score the same as for a recurve archer so his original scores would be OK, since AA recognizes this bow type for Indoor where FITA does not.

After a few years of endeavouring to compile a synopsis of all your responses, I am signing off this section of the Newsletter which will now be edited by the very capable Karen O'Malley, member of the AA Officials Committee and FITA IJC extraordinaire.

Best Wishes to you all.

Ed Crowther

Ed, thank you very much for your contribution over the past years, your "pearls of wisdom" have been much appreciated by all.

You be the Judge (Case studies)

Here are three new case studies. Now that it is getting cooler and not so many tournaments are being held, I hope for a big number next time to give our new case study editor something to do!

Please have your replies with RGB administrators by the end of May, who in turn are asked to collate and forward replies by mid June. Alternatively, judges can e-mail their answers directly to Karen on dragonladyofthelake@gmail.com (but inform your RGB administrator, you have done so).

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

65/1: *The first day of a FITA round a compound junior man archer shoots his first two ends of practice at 90 meters, and then moves to a target in which compound cadet men are shooting their practice at 70 meters and shoots two ends of practice at this distance. A team captain complains to the judges that this archer is violating the rule that states that practice is only allowed at the first distance of the day.*

This team captain argues that this archer must be disqualified because he is taking undue advantage over the rest of the archers on the field. What would you do if you were the judge?

65/2: *At a FITA tournament with three archers per target (ABC) the lanes for each target are 3 m wide. Based on the FITA rules the judges marked the center of the archers' position on the shooting line. The center for archer B was marked in the center of the 3 m wide lane.*

Then they measured 80 cm to the left and marked the position for archer A. They marked the center for archer C 80 cm to the right of the center of the lane. Archer B complains that archers A and C have a lot more space than him. What would you do? Where would you mark the center positions for archers A and C?

65/3: *At an international event there were only two archers shooting at target 31 since the beginning of the FITA Round: archers 31A and 31B, who had been standing on the left hand side and the middle position on the shooting line all throughout the FITA Round.*

Right before the start of the 30 meters (triple faces mounted on the target) archer 31B asked if she could shoot at face C (right hand side face) since there were only two archers at the buttress. The judges decided not to allow this since she had shot the whole day as B-archer, and it could confuse other archers, judges and spectators. An announcement was made that archer A must shoot bottom left, archer B at the top and archer C at the bottom left target. The judges explained that the archers had the right to change positions but not just when coming to the 30 meters. What do you think about the judges' decision here?

And Finally.....

A duke was hunting in the forest with his men-at-arms and servants; he came across a tree. Upon it, archery targets were painted and smack in the middle of each was an arrow. 'Who is this incredibly fine archer?' cried the duke. 'I must find him!'

After continuing through the forest for a few miles he came across a small boy carrying a bow and arrow. Eventually the boy admitted that it was he who shot the arrows plumb in the center of all the targets.

'You didn't just walk up to the targets and hammer the arrows into the middle, did you?' asked the duke worriedly. 'No my lord. I shot them from a hundred paces. I swear it by all that I hold holy.' 'That is truly astonishing,' said the duke. 'I hereby admit you into my service.' The boy thanked him profusely.

'But I must ask one favor in return,' the duke continued. 'You must tell me how you came to be such an outstanding shot.' 'Well,' said the boy, 'first I fire the arrow at the tree, and then I paint the target around it.'

