

JUDGING NEWSLETTER

WORLD ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE # 103

December 2020

Content

1. Editorial
2. Judges' committee meeting
3. Joint Committee meetings
4. Appointments for the 2021 season
5. Recent Interpretations
6. New bylaw
7. Judging at the Online Archery Cup of the Americas
8. Visually Impaired Archers
9. Obituary: Jay Ben Ari
10. News from the Continental Associations
11. Customized organization of tournaments in Slovenia because of COVID-19 restrictions
12. First Austrian experience with the Mixed Team in WA Field and 3D
13. Replies to Case Studies N°102
14. New Case Studies

1. Editorial

from Sergio Font, Chairman of WA Judge Committee

Dear judges,

We have come close to the end of an exceedingly difficult year in which we have done little or no international judging. All major events, including the Olympic Games, have been postponed or cancelled in the interest of keeping our athletes, officials, judges, etc. away from the risk of being infected by COVID 19.

Our Committee have done our best to keep our judges involved. We conducted three webinars in August and September, in which we addressed several key topics. Additionally, we worked on revising rules that require clarification and have accordingly requested that they be interpreted to make the job of our judges easier.

The final version of the World Archery Judge Profile has just been published on the website. This was possible thanks to the contribution of several judges who worked hard on putting the document together. We trust you will find this document enlightening.

Newsletter 103 includes a summary of the topics discussed in our annual committee meeting, as well as the areas covered in our meetings with several other World Archery Committees in the last few days.

We have also referred to the most recent interpretations and bylaws released and have included articles written and shared by fellow judges from different parts of the world. Our sincere gratitude to all of them.





You will find the list of appointments to events which will hopefully take place in 2021. Not all our judges made themselves available to officiate next year, and we understand that the uncertainty of what 2021 will bring has caused this lack of availability. We truly hope life goes back to normal sooner than later, and that we will be able to meet face-to-face once again soon.

On behalf of the Committee, I take this opportunity to wish you the best possible end-of-year holiday and a healthy and prosperous 2021.

Regards

Sergio

2. Judges' committee meeting

The Judges' Committee held their annual meeting online on November 28. Our five members and WA liaison officer Severine Deriaz were in attendance. Here is a summary of the items discussed.

1. Follow-up on the joint meetings held with eight other World Archery Committees.
 - a. The Commission chairs for the Olympics and Paralympics to contact their judges and jury members to get confirmation that they will attend the Games in the light of the newly published biosafety provisions. At the time of the Committee meeting, Hannah Brown had already reached out to the Olympic judges, and so had Bob Pian to the Paralympic Games' judges.
 - b. Appointment of additional alternates for the Olympics and Paralympics in case any of the appointed judges cannot attend.
 - c. Severine to contact Singapore a few months from now to get confirmation that the situation allows us to hold the Conference there sometime in the last two months of 2021.
 - d. The Judges Committee to draft instructions to conduct scoring and announce partial and final results of alternate-shooting matches to reduce time. Graham Potts has prepared a document for the Committee to discuss.
 - e. The Committee to further discuss how to conduct equipment inspections at World Cup events to reduce one day in the schedule.
 - f. The Judges Committee to submit to C&R a list of interpretations which we consider no longer relevant and should be deleted from the website/extranet. Sabrina Steffens to coordinate this task. Report to be submitted by December 20.
 - g. The Judges Committee to identify terms that may require a definition in the Rules. This is the result of a discussion with the Constitution and Rules Committee on terms which are not clearly defined in the rules and can therefore be misinterpreted. Robert Erica will coordinate this task. Deadline for submission: December 20.



- b. Completion of the E-learning modules will be considered as a pre-requisite to attend the seminar only if the new version of the modules is available at least four months prior to the seminar.
8. Newsletters. We plan to release the next five newsletters:
 - a. Newsletter 103 December 2020
 - b. Newsletter 104 March 2021
 - c. Newsletter 105 June 2021
 - d. Newsletter 106 September 2021
 - e. Newsletter 107 December 2021
9. Appointments to 2021 events
 - a. The Committee discussed the appointments to events in 2021 and approved a final proposal to be sent to World Archery.
10. CoJ assessment
 - a. The Committee discussed a proposal made by an International Judge Candidate and decided to test it in 2021.
11. Upgrades
 - a. The Committee agreed not to make any upgrades at the end of 2020, as there were no major events this year.

3. Joint Committee Meetings

The Judges' Committee held meetings with the World Archery office and several permanent committees in the second half of November.

- a) Meeting with the World Archery Office: an important topic discussed was the biosafety measures that are being considered for the Olympics and their effect on our judges' accommodation, transport, meals, etc.
- b) Meeting with the Target Committee: interesting proposals were presented by the Target Committee regarding how to reduce the duration of our events and on how to speed up the confirmation of results in finals matches. The idea of removing official practice from event schedules as mandatory was discussed. The Judges Committee are examining the impact of this proposal. The Judges Committee suggested the inclusion of the mixed team in the rules governing indoor events.
- c) Meeting with the Constitution and Rules Committee and the Technical Committee: The C&R Committee has asked the WA Office to set up a timeline for committees to respond to interpretation requests to ensure that replies are made at the earliest possible time. The Judges Committee requested that emails be sent to National Federations and WA Judges notifying that an interpretation has been issued. The Judges Committee mentioned that there is still a discrepancy in two articles of the rules regarding the time to change team members (one indicating 15 minutes, and the other one still referring to 1 hour). The Judges Committee requested the revision of the articles concerning the use of back quivers. It was agreed that clarification is required in the rules about which rules must apply to events at all levels (from national to World Championships), and which ones are meant to be observed only at major international events. The technical committee mentioned that a complete set of rules is being worked out for 3D events regarding the

instinctive bow, which shall be renamed as "traditional" with more flexibility regarding bow specifications.

- d) Meeting with the Coaches' Committee: the issue of high draws and how to decide when a draw is considered unsafe was raised by the Coaches' Committee. It was agreed that a task force including the technical, judges' and coaches' committees should be created to deal with this matter. The Coaches' Committee asked that uniformity in scoring procedures during finals should be sought. The Judges' Committee explained that a more precise procedure was tested at the Tokyo Test Event last year.
- e) Meeting with the Field and 3D Committee: The Judges Committee informed that sessions on Field and 3D judging will be included in future international seminars and conferences. The Field and 3D Committee are looking at the vibration dampening issue with Barebow at a wider level with the Technical Committee.
- f) Meeting with the Para and Classifiers' Committee: The three committees agreed that it is vital that the rules and the classification manual should be linked together. The Para Committee explained that VI Classification will now be made by ophthalmologists in the archer's country of origin. The results of VI classification shall be reported in a form designed by World Archery. The Para and Judges' Committees agreed that archers who are sitting in a wheelchair and remain on the shooting line all the time can be allowed to use devices like tablets or cell phones to read, access social media, etc., during the scoring breaks, but not while shooting is in progress for any archers in the competition. The Judges Committee raised the question on the number of wheels in a wheelchair. It was agreed that 4 is the maximum number of wheels touching the ground. A wheelchair can have more than 4, but only four can be touching the ground. The Judges' Committee indicated that the interpretation made by the Para Committee on protrusions and how to measure them did not answer the question asked. Nancy Littke provided an explanation that the Judges' Committee found acceptable. The Para Committee will redraft the interpretation. Nancy Littke proposed that International Judge and Classifier Megan Tierney be appointed as liaison between the Para, Classification and Judges' Committee.
- g) Meeting with the Medical Committee: Both committees discussed how to ensure that biosafety measures are complied with by archers and team officials. The Judges' Committee indicated that the judges would be willing to assist provided that specific guidelines are provided by the Medical Committee and the World Archery Events department. The Judges' Committee referred to the use of Kinesio tapes which are now available and mentioned that an interpretation request will be submitted. The Medical Committee will discuss the matter and will reply.
- h) Meeting with the Athletes' Committee Chair: Naomi Folkard referred to accuracy in measurements. The Judges' Committee indicated that emphasis on this has been made at practical sessions in seminars and that this will continue to be addressed in the upcoming seminars and conferences. A video has been produced as a reference for new judges. Naomi asked for details about the Target Committee's proposal regarding scoring during finals. The Judges Committee replied that the plan is to test the accuracy of the new electronic system (replacing Falco Eye) at

the first World Cup in 2021, and then the adapted scoring procedure would be tested by the judges at the second World Cup, but paper scorecards would still be used. It is the promptness in the decision on the result of a set/end/match that would be changed.

4. Appointment for the 2021 Season

Indoor Series – Nimes

1. David Catalán ESP IJ Chairman

World Cup – Guatemala

1. Megan Tierney USA IJ Chairman
 2. Carlos Cervantes MEX IJ Deputy
 3. Laura Lynne Churchill CAN IJ
 4. Niels Buitenhuis NED YJ
 5. Christophe Schillinger AUT IJC
 6. Maya Shalaby SLO IJC

Alternates

1. Jesús Guevara ESA IJ
 2. Rolf Volungholen SWE IJC
 3. Alex Vecchio BRA IJ

World Cup - Shanghai

1. Frankie Hoong SGP IJ Chairman
 2. Charmaine Ho RSA IJ Deputy
 3. Angelina Chan SGP IJ
 4. Tanvir Ahmed BAN IJC
 5. Marleen Kroeders NED IJC
 6. Eddie Yip HKG IJC

Alternates

1. Zahra Fahim IRI YJ
 2. Li Jinping CHN IJC
 3. Rupesh Kar IND IJC

World Cup – Paris

1. Graham Potts GBR IJ Chairman
 2. Zhang Xiuzhi NOR IJ Deputy
 3. Kristina Reitmeier CZE IJ
 4. Christina Tiflidou GRE IJC
 5. Piry Ekholm FIN IJC
 6. Cesar Araujo MEX IC

Alternates

1. Helmut Poll AUT IJC
 2. Maren Haase GER IJ



3. Bjarne Strandby DEN IJ

World University Games

1. Pecilius Tan	SGP	IJ	Chairman
2. Roy Cortés	COL	IJC	Deputy
3. Shannon Russell- Cowan	GBR	YJ	
4. Wu Tsung Yi	TPE	IJC	

Alternates

1. Irati Zurbano	ESP	YJ	
2. Louis Simon Peter	MAS	IJ	

World Cup Finals

1. Friedrich Karle	GER	IJ	Chairman
2. Guillermina García	MEX	IJ	
3. Jean Martens	BEL	IJ	

Alternates

1. Andras Hegedus	HUN	IJ	
2. Rupesh Kar	IND	IJC	

World Championships – Yankton

1. Karla Cabrera	PHI	IJ	Chairman
2. David Catalán	ESP	IJ	Deputy
3. Bettina Kratzmuller	AUT	IJC	
4. Christophe Pezzet	FRA	IJ	
5. Katerina Koncalova	CZE	IJC	
6. Carsten Kuhn	GER	IJC	
7. Lais Nunes	BRA	IJ	
8. Vladimir Domínguez	CUB	IJ	
9. Liz Pérez	MEX	IJC	
10. Barry Brophy	IRL	IJC	
11. Hossein Nasirinejad	IRI	IJ	
12. Sunethra Senevirathne	SRI	IJ	
13. Mariya Larkina	RUS	IJ	
14. Junji Ozawa	JPN	IJC	DoS

Alternates:

1. Ringa Baltrusaite	LTU	IJ	
2. Nabil Husein	BRA	IJC	
3. Rolf Volungholen	SWE	IJC	

World Youth Championships

1. Paco Giménez	ESP	IJ	Chairman
2. Alison Hagaman	AUS	IJ	Deputy
3. Nico Ylipelkonen	FIN	IJC	

4. Qu Yanan	CHN	IJC	
5. Ahmed Koura	EGY	IJ	
6. Zahra Fahim	IRI	YJ	
7. Didier Gras	FPO	IJ	
8. Saruul Enkhbat	MGL	IJ	
9. Marusa Gajic	SLO	YJ	
10. Ana Luiza de Mesquita	BRA	YJ	
11. Logan Andrew	NZL	YJ	
12. Susanne Womersley	AUS	IJ	
13. David Tan	SGP	IJ	
14. Robert Potts	GBR	IJC	DoS

Alternates

1. Denis Paquet	FRA	IJ	
2. Nasrin Ghashghaei	IRI	IJC	

2020Tokyo Olympics

1. Brown Hannah	GBR	IJ	Chairman
2. Erica Robert	NED	IJ	Deputy
3. Baltrusaite Ringa	LTU	IJ	
4. Cabrera Karla	PHI	IJ	
5. Cantini Fulvio	ITA	IJ	
6. Datta Indranil	IND	IJ	
7. Garcia Avila Guillermina	MEX	IJ	
8. Martin David	RSA	IJ	
9. Pan Karen	TPE	IJ	
10. Steffens Sabrina	GER	IJ	
11. Tan Pecilius	SGP	IJ	
12. Vang Schandorff	FRO	IJ	
13. Vecchio Passerini Alex	BRA	IJ	
14. Dominguez Vladimir	CUB	IJ	DoS

Alternates

1. Catalan David	ESP	IJ	
2. Churchill Laura Lynne	CAN	IJ	
3. Karle Friedrich	GER	IJ	
4. Hoong Frankie	SGP	IJ	

2020Tokyo Paralympics

1. Pian Bon	USA	IJ	Chairman
2. Lipscomb Katy	AUS	IJ	Deputy
3. Aguilar Andrea	GUA	IJ	
4. Allahyari Shahrzad	IRI	IJ	
5. Bhowmik Ranjan	IND	IJ	
6. Ho Charmaine	RSA	IJ	



7. Hoong Frankie	SGP	IJ	
8. Miani Martino	ITA	IJ	
9. Skjoldborg Flemming	DEN	IJ	
10. Terra Neto Rubens	BRA	IJ	
11. Wang Lian	CHN	IJ	
12. Hagaman Alison	AUS	IJ	
13. Unsal Aslihan	TUR	IJ	
14. Bortot Andrea	ITA	IJ	DoS
Alternates			
15. Enkhbat Saruul	MGL	IJ	
16. Koura Ahmed	EGY	IJ	
17. Araujo Cesar	MEX	IJ	
18. Haase Maren	GER	IJ	

5. Recent Interpretations

- 1) World Archery Norway indicated that a bow is being produced with two adjustable tiller bolts. Around both bolts there is a rubber-piece that seem to function as a dampener for limb-vibrations. This can be replaced by a brass bolt and nylon-washer to avoid the dampening-function. If one of the two rubber-spacers is replaced with a brass-bolt as described, can the other tiller bolt be left with the rubber-spacer under the Instinctive Bow Division? Or do you have to change both rubber-spacers with fixed material to avoid any dampening on the limbs?

The Constitution and Rules Committee (“C&R”) finds the question presented to be within the terms of reference of the Technical Committee.

C&R has determined that the following interpretation is not contrary to the existing rules or Congress decisions.

Response from the Technical Committee:

It is the unanimous decision of the Technical Committee that the riser as shown in the photo below may not incorporate a rubber dampener in the limb pocket that must be locked down. The intent of the Instinctive Bow division was to have a simple bow, where one limb could be adjusted to set bow tiller, but without the ability to adjust limb poundage during a competition. Limb dampeners are allowed, but not in the location of the limb pocket that must be immovable for each competition the athlete participates in. The Technical Committee does not consider the rubber components to be simply “spacers” as they would provide some dampening capabilities for the limb that requires non-adjustment. To be legal, the rubber spacer/dampener will require replacement with a solid component on the limb that must be locked down. The other limb pocket does not require modification and may incorporate a rubber dampener in that limb pocket.



- 2) Three interpretations were released on August 11 on **barebow tabs**, regarding a tab presented by the German Shooting Sport and Archery Federation. The tab (see picture below) is legal in the Barebow division, as marks do not have to include uniform spacing.



The Judges' Committee asked whether a tab with more than two different line lengths would be permitted in the Barebow division. The response of the Technical Committee was that the interpretation released on July 5, 2017 for USA Archery stated that up to two lengths of the tab manufacturer's lines/marks are allowed.

"As of this year (2020), the interpretation now applies to the athlete's personal marks, allowing up to two lengths of lines.

No more than two lengths of line are permitted.

The current rule 22.3.8.1 and 11.4.8.1 regarding finger protection does not require uniform spacing between lines/marks.

The same ruling applies to tab stitching. There may be up to two lengths of stitch with no regulation on spacing.

Stitching must be a single uniform color (normal stains form dirt, etc. are acceptable)."

An interpretation request on whether **shock absorbers and limb dampeners** can be considered synonymous to interpret WA rules on equipment was submitted by the Judges' Committee.

The response from the Technical Committee was that "It is the unanimous decision of the World Archery Technical Committee that all of the references to limb dampeners, vibration dampeners and shock absorbers noted in the rules, most of which are provided below, are to be considered to have the same basic function, that of reducing felt shock or vibration. The function of these devices is the same, to reduce or displace residual vibration energy felt by the athlete. Therefore, the terms related to shock absorption, vibration damping and limb dampening devices are to be considered the same basic components that serve the same basic function.

Definitions:

- Shock Absorber – A device for absorbing jolts and vibration.
- Vibration Dampener – vibration dampeners are used to absorb vibration emanating from machinery (in this case a bow, which is a machine). Vibration dampening is the process of absorbing or changing vibration energy to reduce the amount of energy transmitted to equipment, (or in our case to reduce vibration or shock that would be experienced by the user of the device).

Application of Rules:

- **Vibration dampeners** fitted as part of the bow are permitted provided that they do not have stabilisers (see Articles 22.3.6.1/11.4.6.1).
- Weight(s) may be added to the lower part of the riser. All weights, regardless of shape, shall mount directly to the riser without rods, extensions, angular mounting connections or **shock-absorbing devices** (see Articles 22.3.6.2 /11.4.6.2).
- Accessories are permitted - also permitted are **limb dampeners**. (see Articles 22.3.10.1 /11.4.10.1)."

6. New Bylaw

This new bylaw rules on the length of the center serving on a barebow string in target archery, as opposed to the same item in Field and 3D.

11.4.2.1.

Which may be of multi-coloured strands and serving and of the material chosen for the purpose. It may have a centre serving to accommodate the drawing fingers, one or two nocking points to which may be added serving(s) to fit the arrow nock as necessary, and to locate the nocking points. No lip or nose mark is permitted. The bowstring shall not in any way assist aiming through the use of a peephole, marking, or any other means. The

end of the center serving where it transitions to bowstring material shall not end within the athlete's plane of vision at full draw.

7. Judging at the Online Archery Cup of the Americas

After a qualification round that involved 710 archers from 23 countries in August, 45 online matches were held in able-bodied and para categories in September and October. Three judges (international or continental) were appointed to each match. The three judges in each match were connected through WhatsApp for their internal communication in a group separate from the archers and transmission production team. The judges were also included in the WhatsApp groups with archers and commentators, but their decisions on arrow values were made through their own internal channel.



All three judges watched the Facebook live broadcast and became involved only when the value of an arrow was questionable. The archers or their agents (when it was necessary in the para categories) moved to the targets and scored only when the commentators (who were in touch with the judges) allowed them to do so. Questionable values were decided based on the photos taken by the archers. These photos were displayed on the general WhatsApp group. The judges often needed to ask for pictures taken from other angles. The final decision was taken by a majority vote.

Since the calls were made on photos and not on the arrows as such, it was decided that the opinion of only one judge would not be reliable enough, and therefore three judges became involved.



Prior to the start of each match, the judges verified through videos showing the tape measure that the targets were 18 meters away from the shooting line and made sure the arrow sizes were in accordance with the special regulations agreed on for this event.

As regards para-archers in wheelchairs, the judges also checked that the rules regarding strapping were observed.



This judging procedure was highly appreciated by participants and organizers.

Here is what Continental Judge Kristy Wapniarski (USA) commented on the experience:
"This morning, Bob Pian, Jory Schroeder Achttien and I comprised a virtual team of three judges working the match between Sara Lopez (COL) and Dafne Quintero (MEX)

in the Online Archery Cup of the Americas. The match was live streamed on Facebook and it was a pretty cool experience. World Archery Americas has done a very good job fine tuning the process to make it as seamless as possible for the archers, judges, commentators and the spectators.

Takeaways:

- Live streaming has varying delays. I had 2 different devices streaming the match simultaneously (computer and tablet) and neither of them were synced. There was at least a 5-15 second delay between the two devices.*
- While watching the match, it was important for me to keep track of which spot was shot when I wrote the score down on my paper scorecard. With the live stream happening, the cameras would bounce back and forth between athlete and target face. It was easy to confuse the spot shot on arrows 2 and 3.*
- The archers provided us with pictures of their target faces through a separate app after each end for score verification and included multiple images of arrows that needed to be called. It took a minute to sort through the images and make sure you were looking at the correct athlete's pictures/arrows before a final call was made.*
- It felt fast paced and your attention had to be 100% on the match (screen), the scorecard being used for tracking, and you had to be ready with a secondary device for the arrow calls.*

Overall, it was a lot of fun and it's good to know that there are ways we can keep judging safely from a distance for virtual events like this. WAA did a wonderful job!"

8. Visually Impaired Archers

By International Judge and International Classifier Megan Tierney

Visually impaired archers have been classified by International Blind Sport Association (IBSA) sanctioned Classifiers. They are put into their Sport Class of B1, B2, or B3 based on their visual acuity. These athletes are then placed in one of two divisions. The VI1 is their own division and must use a blindfold at all time once they enter the field of play. VI2 and VI3 are in a separate division and do not use a blindfold when competing. Men and women compete against each other in their respective divisions and it does not matter what type of bow is used. If there are not enough athletes in either division, then all athletes whether women or men, compound, or recurve bow, shoot against each other and everyone must wear a blindfold. (Fig. 1)



Fig. 1 VI Archer

A blindfold can be a sleep mask, wrap around glasses, or goggles (Fig. 2). This shall be checked during equipment inspection and may be re-checked by a Judge at any time during the competition. The VI1 athlete shall always wear the blindfold while on the field of play. This includes setting up their equipment, practice, and competition. The blindfold stays on at all times on the field of play.



Fig. 2 Mask

Athletes can shoot either a recurve or compound bow. The compound bow is restricted to a 45-pound peak draw weight and can be shot with either fingers or a release. All other World Archery rules apply to either bow and the arrows.

All athletes must use a tactile sight and no other sight is allowed.

The sighting device/stand must not present an obstacle to other competitors. The size of the tactile sight may not exceed 2 cm in any direction and shall only be in contact with the back of the athlete's hand or forearm (Fig. 3).



Fig. 3 Tactile Sight

The tactile sight is mounted on a stand which normally includes foot locators (Fig. 4). The maximum depth of the functional part of the foot locators that is in contact with the athlete shall be not more than 6 cm (2.5 inches). The total width of the stand/foot locators shall be not more than 80 cm (31.5 inches). There needs to be at least 90 cm (35.5 inches) of space between each tactile stand. The tactile sight & stand, including the foot marker, may be left on the field of play until the end of the athlete's competition as long as it does not present an obstacle to other competitors.



Fig. 4 Foot locators with stand

A VI athlete is permitted to have a person acting as an assistant (Fig. 5) who may sit or stand behind the athlete 1m behind the shooting line. The role of the assistant is to tell the athlete the position of the arrow in the target face and also to inform them of any safety issues. The athlete may adjust his tactile sight at any time during the shooting. *The assistant may only adjust the sight between practice and/or scoring ends.* Equipment set up set up may happen only between practice and/or scoring ends. The assistant shall not disturb the other athletes while giving verbal assistance.



Fig. 5 Assistant

When the athlete has finished his scoring arrows, the assistant will go behind the waiting line. The athlete may remain on the shooting line throughout the shoot or return behind the waiting line. The assistant may guide the athlete to the target and back to the shooting line, but the assistant shall do the scoring for the athlete. Each athlete will sign their own score card.

During individual matches a VI athlete may have an assistant or a coach but not both. The athlete and assistant shall be recognizable as partners wearing the same uniform.

Outdoor VI rounds Round consist of four times 36 arrows shot at 30m with the following target faces in this order:

- The first 36 arrows on a 60cm face,
- The next 36 arrows on an 80cm face,
- The next 36 arrows on an 80cm face,
- The final 36 arrows on a 122cm face.

If there is to be only one face size, then the VI 30 m round consists of 72 arrows shot at 30m on the 80cm face. The VI Olympic Round is shot at 30m on the 80cm target face and target allocations shall be arranged so that athletes do not have to move targets even if this means that their opponent is not on an adjacent target.

The VI Indoor Round consists of 60 arrows on a 60cm face shot at 18m. The full "recurve" 10 zone will be used for scoring purposes even if a compound bow is used. The VI Indoor Match Round is shot on 60cm faces and follows the other rules of the Indoor Match Round. The full "recurve" 10 zone will be used for scoring purposes even if a compound bow is used.

So what are the Judge's considerations during a competition that has Visually Impaired athletes? We must know who is in the VI1 division because they are to wear their blindfold at all times from set up until the termination of the tournament. Any time they are on the field of play, they must be wearing their blindfold. Equipment inspection is the same as able bodied with the exceptions of no sights on the bow and compound peak draw weight

is 45 pounds. We may need to go to the athlete's set up to assess if the tactile sight and frame are within specification. During eliminations, we may have to help the athlete and their assistant with the brackets since the athletes do not change targets.

9. Obituary: Jay Ben Ari

Our Judges' Committee was quite recently informed of the passing of former International Judge Jay Ben-Ari from Israel. His passing occurred on November 19, 2019, but it was only now that we learned of the sad news.

Jay was a FITA and World Archery judge for many years. He officiated at the 2008 Paralympic Games in Beijing and at several Target and Field World Championships.



10. News from the Continental Associations

World Archery Americas: Online National Judges' Seminars

Two online national judges' seminars (one in English and one in Spanish) were conducted from September to November by international and continental judges in the Americas. Two hundred and twenty participants took the exam representing Bahamas (3), Bolivia (17), Brazil (4), Chile (21), Colombia (25), Costa Rica (1), Dominican Republic (11), Ecuador (21), El Salvador (3), Guatemala (8), Guyana (10), Honduras (4), Virgin Islands UK (1), Virgin Islands US (1), Mexico (57), Panama (4), Peru (9), Puerto Rico (1), Trinidad & Tobago (16), the United States (1), and St. Vincent and the Grenadines (2).

The seminars included eight modules delivered in twelve two-hour sessions.

- Introduction. Philosophy, levels, and roles of a judge
- Events
- Venue inspection
- Equipment inspection and archers' technique supervision
- Shooting rules
- Scoring rules
- Team matches
- Penalties

World Archery Asia: Judges' Webinar

The World Archery Asia's Judges Committee conducted a webinar on September 18-19, which was attended by over 150 judges from the whole continent.



11. Customized organization of tournaments in Slovenia because of COVID-19 restrictions

Contribution made by former IJ Irena Rosa (SLO)

As most of the countries, also Slovenia was three months in lockdown; no gathering and therefore no competitions could be organized. The first competition after the corona pandemics was a national 3D tournament, organized on June 13th, but immediately after that, the number of people that could gather dropped again from 100 to 50.

The next tournament was a 70m Round, organized on June 20th in Kamnik, the place where the 5th edition of Veronica's Cup should have been held in April, but it was cancelled due to Corona.



Because the competition was held in the open area, wearing the masks was not obligatory, but the restriction to keep the distance at least 1,5m from each other was still required. The organizers placed a limited number of targets with the distance of 2m apart and only two archers could shoot on one butt in two sequences – A and D (AB/CD). Two sessions of the qualifications were organized, with no matches. Many Barebow archers were shooting too and some high scores were shot, but as the tournament was not recognized by WA, there were no records achieved.

On July 4th the 3D National Cup was organized. Restrictions of max. 50 people in the same area were still valid. As usual in Slovenia, we expected that more than 100 archers would like to participate. We had exactly 100 entries. There were 24 targets, archers were split into 26 groups. We decided to organize the staggered start or as used and called by IAA-HDH the flying start – every group started to shoot on target No.1. After the start list was published two days before the competition, the detailed schedule was prepared: every group was allowed to enter the central area exactly 40 minutes before their start, LB, IB and BB in intervals of 8 minutes, CB in 10 minutes. Archers had first to confirm their participation and then they went to the practice field. After 30 minutes of warming up, they were called to the equipment inspection and after that, they were accompanied by the marshal to target No.1. The entry fee had to be paid in advance by the banking system. The course was built with special care, it was always possible to keep the necessary distance between athletes during the walking and during the shooting as well. At the end of shooting, the archers had to leave as soon as possible, medals were delivered to the club – no medal ceremony was organized. As the groups were combined strictly by categories and the LB started first, followed by IB, BB and CB as last, also the final ranking was fast known. Below you can see the starting schedule:

Group	Entrance to the area, confirmation of the presence and start of warm up	Equipment inspection and going to the course
1	8:50	9:30
2	8:58	9:38
3	9:06	9:46
4	9:14	9:54
5	9:22	10:02
6	9:30	10:10
6b	9:38	10:18
7	9:46	10:26
7b	9:54	10:34
8	10:02	10:42
9	10:10	10:50
10	10:18	10:58
11	10:26	11:06
12	10:34	11:14
13	10:42	11:22
14	10:50	11:30
15	10:58	11:38
16	11:06	11:46
17	11:16	11:56
18	11:26	12:06
19	11:36	12:16
20	11:46	12:26
21	11:56	12:36
22	12:06	12:46
23	12:16	12:56
24	12:26	13:06



In all three tournaments, it was also a challenge for judges, especially during the equipment inspection. In the last 3D tournament, one extra judge was appointed only for the equipment inspection, while disinfectant, masks and gloves became part of the required national judge's uniform. The control of the equipment was customized.



12. First Austrian experience with the Mixed Team in WA Field and 3D

Contribution by IJC Bettina Kratzmuller (AUT)

In principle, shooting as Mixed Team – that is a female and a male archer from one division – is nothing new for archers competing in WA Outdoor tournaments. However, it's new in the WA Rules for 3D and

Field Archery since 2020. Unfortunately, there was no chance (at least for European archers) to compete in a 3D or Field Mixed Team Round at European or World Championships because of the COVID-19-pandemy. Quite contrary to Austria.

Many Austrian 3D and Field archers compete also in Target Archery where the Mixed Team is part of the National Championships, too. Therefore, when the Austrian archers performed the Mixed Team at the National WA 3D (WBTC Krumphof/Burgenland) and WA Field Championships (WBZ Zwettl/Lower Austria) for the first time in the summer of 2020, shooting in a Mixed Team was nothing really new for most of them. Especially in 3D where each archer shoots just one arrow it wasn't a great challenge. In Field, however, there were several details that had to be thought about before and during the competition. The rules state that the Semi-finals and Finals consist of four targets in each match with marked distances. The targets are placed taking into consideration the terrain, lay of the ground and venue. All target faces (20cm/40cm/60cm/80cm) must be used and there should be a mix of short, medium and long distances. When shooting at a 20cm face, each Mixed Team will shoot at a 2x2 set up, one arrow in each. Moreover, it is clear that each Mixed Team has the own 60cm and 80cm face.

For the 40cm face, however, the set up is not specified in the rules. After having contacted Hannah Brown (Chair of the WA Field and 3D Committee) it was decided by Helmut Pöll (IJC and Chairman of the Austrian Judges Committee) that both teams will shoot at two faces set up horizontally on one target, one face for each Mixed Team. That meant that at the end each face had four arrows. It turned out that for Compound (especially at the shortest distance of 20m) this set up is not ideal because good archers damage their arrows when shooting four arrows into the center. To avoid such a damage, Indoor you have one scoring area for each arrow at 18m. Therefore, we would suggest a set up of four 40cm faces at one target – two vertical stripes with two faces each – so that each Mixed Team shoots just two arrows in the same scoring area instead of four arrows – like in the Outdoor Compound Mixed Team event.

During the warm up at the practice field, the archers were given a short introduction into the rules (set up of the target faces, two arrows shot by each archer, time limit of 160 seconds, rotation of the athletes after each arrow). Moreover, they got the chance to practice in "competition mode" and were watched by the judges helping them when something was performed wrongly.

During practice it turned out that two details felt strange for the archers. First, the time limit of 160 seconds seemed comparably long for them being used to shoot their four arrows in 80 seconds like the Mixed Team in Target Archery. Here it must be said that the lay of the ground was flat. Would the terrain have been more selective, the archers would have been glad having enough time for the rotation. Second, the fact that the athletes MUST rotate after each arrow, that means that they MUST change after each arrow, caused problems for some archers who were used to shoot their two arrows in a row – as it is one of the possibilities when you shoot the Mixed Team in Target Archery where the athletes shoot two arrows each in an order of their own choosing.

In the Austrian Field event both Mixed Teams shot at the same time. Concerning the shooting position at the peg, another decision had to be taken. It is not clearly defined in the Rules which Mixed Team will shoot from the left position on the left face(es) and which will shoot from the right position on the right face(s). Taking Target Archery (Book 3, 13.2.2) as a reference, when both Teams shoot at the same time, the left/right position for matches followed the match play chart and the printed scorecards (result program i@nseo).

The time limit was never a problem due to the terrain which was not difficult for finding a good stand and for a quick and easy rotation. The one or other archer was "rescued" by the judge in charge or the other team member from shooting two arrows in a row. As there is no clear definition of how far away from the peg the non-shooting athlete has to wait and in order to apply to the rule, the archers waited about one large step or about one meter behind so that only one athlete from each team was on the peg at any time.

Altogether the Mixed Team in Field and in 3D was an interesting new experience in the two Austrian National Championships of the year 2020. Meanwhile, the program (Qualification Rounds, Pool Shoot-up, Individual Semi-finals and Finals, Team and Mixed Team Rounds) is growing too large to get all done in less than three to four days. Especially when you try to have the Medal Matches – or at least the Gold Finals – performed as an event at a special Finals Field with public audience, Livestream, commentator etc. However, we know that we in Austria were the lucky ones this time actually having the chance to hold our National Championships for our archers during the COVID-19-crisis.

13. Replies to Case studies 102

102.1

In a Recurve team match with alternate shooting, Team A shoots 4 arrows in their first rotation with archer 1 shooting two consecutive arrows. In the same rotation, Team B shoots 2 arrows, archer 3 has problem drawing the bow and clearly says to the line judge to stop the clock. In the second rotation, Team A goes to the line and shoots their 2 remaining arrows (archer 2 and archer 3). During the same rotation, Team B shoots 4 arrows – the additional arrow being shot by archer 3 to "recover" the unshot arrow of first rotation.

How will you react to the situation? What will be the scoring procedure for both the teams?

R: As regards Team A, the situation is covered by an interpretation issued a few years ago. Team A loses the highest scoring arrow of the set for having shot one arrow out of sequence. There is no further penalty because the team shot 6 arrows. Had the team shot three arrows in the second rotation, a seven-arrow situation would have occurred, resulting in having the six lower values in the scorecard, and then having the highest one of these values turned into an M for shooting an arrow out of sequence.

As for team B, a mistake was made by the judge and the DoS who accepted to stop the clock before the third archer shot his arrow. This means that all arrows shot in the second rotation would not count as valid (considering that there was a judge with a scorer behind the blind and they were able to identify the values of the first two arrows shot). Given that the team shot their arrows in the second rotation due to a mistake made by the judge and the DoS who stopped the clock when only two archers had shot, it would be unfair to deduct the highest four values (number of arrows shot out of time/sequence).

102.2

In the team match with alternate shooting, in the first sequence only two of the three members of the team shoot an arrow while the third for some reasons (problem with the equipment) doesn't shoot and goes back behind the one meter line. The team didn't communicate this with the line judge and the DoS didn't stop the clock and the time went to zero. How do we manage the time and the shooting order for the second team, since the first one hasn't got any time left?

R: The rules, as they stand now, do not allow the DoS to stop the clock until the three archers have shot an arrow. The Judge' Committee has submitted a bylaw change request to consider allowing the team (archer/coach) to signal to the judge that one of the archers will not shoot in the first half. The unshot arrow would be considered as a miss, and the DoS would be entitled to stop the clock for this team. In the second half, the team would be allowed to shoot three arrows only (one per archer). This proposal has not been brought to the attention of the Executive Board yet, waiting to hear from other committees involved (target, coaches' and athletes'). In the meantime, if a situation like the one described in case study 102.2 occurs, the best practical solution if the judge is asked what the team can/should do, is for the judge to suggest that the archer concerned should hand-throw an arrow beyond the 3-meter line.

102.3

An archer comes to equipment inspection and while checking the arrows for the archer's name or initials, the judge noticed that the name on the arrows do not match the name on the quiver. The archer is using arrow wraps and has had his "nickname" put on the wraps instead of his real name or initials. The rules specifically state the Archer's Name or Initials should be on the arrow but nothing more than that. What would you do?

R: The intent of the rule is to mark the arrows so that it is possible to identify who they belong to if they are found somewhere on the field. This can be possible if the judges are able to relate the archer's nickname with his name in the event registration, which may be even better than writing initials that may be the same as for other archers in the same event. A sidenote on the list archers used for the inspection will allow all the judges to know who these arrows belong to.

14. New Case studies

103.1.

The following is a picture of a barebow tab. The archer can put the metal hooks wherever he wants, and they serve as the markings for the finger position. Once put in position, the metal hooks can only be changed by removing the cover of the tab as you see it on the picture. Is this tab allowed or not?



103.2.

In an indoor event, archer 30A shoots two arrows and reports an equipment failure to the judge. Fixing the failure may take around three minutes, therefore the judge informs the DoS that he can proceed with the signal to move to the targets to score. Archer 30A's coach walks to the target to be present at the time scoring takes place. His archer has an arrow in the middle face (ten points), and one in the lower face (9 points). When everyone returns to the shooting line after scoring, archer 30A tells the judge that he is ready to make up the pending arrow. The judge informs the DoS. The DoS announces that archer 30A will be allowed 40 seconds to shoot his arrow and that scoring for this arrow will take



place before all archers are called to line to shoot their next end. Archer 30A stands on the shooting line and shoots a 10 in the middle face. Archer 30B complains that 30A shot two arrows in the same spot in the same end. What should the judge do?

Replies to case studies should be sent to sderiaz@archery.sport by 31 January 2021.