



JUDGES NEWSLETTER

Fédération Internationale de Tir à l'Arc
INTERNATIONAL ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE #60

JANUARY 2003

In this issue

1. Editorial from our Chairman
2. FJC Meeting in Nymburk
3. Your replies to case studies
4. The Judge Guide Book
5. A bit of history
6. Comments on the case studies in Newsletter 59
7. New Case Studies
8. Judge Training Seminar in Brussels
9. Fiber optic sight pins
10. Judging and rules in High Level Coach Seminar
11. Appointments for duty in 2003

1. Editorial from our Chairman

Dear Friends,

With the coming into force of the new Constitution and Rules, a few aspects concerning the accreditation and appointment of the FITA Judges have changed. See the new Appendix 4 of Book 1.

An important innovation is the introduction of a test in order to be reaccredited (see rule 3.1.5). For the next accreditation term (2003-2005) the test will be distributed by our Committee at the beginning of 2003. We are confident that all of you will not have any problems with it.

Other novelties are found in the special requirements necessary to be eligible to serve at the Olympics or as chairperson at the World Championships (rule 4.1). In particular it is required to have received a high-quality evaluation by the chairperson (or the Observers) in charge of the Championship where you served in the last two years. Even if this procedure was generally observed also in the past, now it has to be strictly followed. Therefore, it is important that the chairpersons appointed transmit their evaluations on each member of his/her commission as soon as possible. These evaluations will be kept confidential by our Committee, however each judge will have access to his/her personal file.

Another requirement that we have to take into account is to have served at World Championships, FITA recognised Games, WR Tournaments, or other major international events. Obviously the Judge Committee is in control of the FITA events only; it is therefore vital that the Continental Liaisons to JC inform our Committee of the composition of the Judges Commissions under their control as soon as the events are over. It should be unpleasant not to consider a judge for the Olympics only because we were not aware of an appointment to a Continental event. The cooperation between JC and their liaison to the Continental Association is absolutely important.

Gian Piero Spada
Chairman FITA Judge Committee



2. FJC Meeting in Nymburk

Your Judges Committee met in Nymburk, Czech Republic on the occasion of the World Junior Archery Championships on August 5-6, 2002. The three committee members were present to discuss the following agenda:

- Comments of FAC documents
- Reply to a letter from FJ John Wormesley
- Goals of the Judges Committee
- Judge Observer at major FITA events
- TAC – JC joint meeting
- Judges' Guidebook
- Judges' Seminars: new exam questions
- Continental judges
- Re-accreditation 2003
- Procedure and schedule for selecting judges for the 2004 Olympics
- Judges' Newsletter
- Database
- Judges' List revisions
- Judges' Conference in 2003
- Comments and clarifications on rule enforcement
- Technical items for judges
- Accreditation cards
- Involvement of Judges Committee in FITA Coaches Seminars
- Other permissible items



FJC in Nymburk, Sergio Font, Gian Piero Spada (Chairman), Morten Wilmann

3. Your replies to case studies

Dear FITA Judges,

The present rules of FITA establish general guidelines for the selection of judges for the Olympic Games. One of the crucial factors for this selection is the reply that judges make to the case studies in the Judges' Newsletter. For this reason, it is very important that your replies be as complete as possible. Do not just say YES or NO. Substantiate your answers. Make reference to the articles in the Rules Book that uphold your reasoning.



4. The Judge Guide Book

The new issue (v 4.0) of the Judge Guide Book should be in your possession. The Judges Committee appointed Morten Wilmann to revise and update the latest Guide Book published a couple of years ago, in the light of the most recent changes made to the rules (luckily not many). In our meeting in Nymburk, the committee discussed the proposals made by Morten, and agreed to publish the issue.

FJC is very eager to receive comments and proposals for upcoming issues of the Guidebook. You are on the field and can certainly contribute to fine tune our procedures in the book.

5. A bit of history

Did you know that...?

The archery target was first divided into ten zones in 1932, when this rules was passed in the FITA Congress held in Warsaw.

In that same Congress, FITA agreed that the center of the target should be fixed at 1.30 m above the ground.

In 1937, FITA Congress in Paris first authorized a nocking point on the string.

FITA Congress in Helsinki (1955) introduced the FITA Round. From then on, and until 1985, World Championships were to be contested on a Double FITA Round. A single FITA Round consisted of shooting 36 arrows at each distance.

FITA established a Field Archery Committee in 1958.

International Judges were recognized by the FITA Congress in Oslo 1961.

The 1961 Congress studied a proposal to set the time limit on archers to two minutes and thirty seconds for three arrows.

6. Comments on the case studies in Newsletter 59

59.1

We appreciate the number of Judges who would look carefully into the possibilities of safeguarding the points of the archer, by considering both the information about the procedures in use and the time of the shot with regard to the expiry of time.

However, we know that in situations where the procedures differ from the rules laid down, information on the matter will be given during a Team Captain Meeting. So for further discussion of this case, we suppose that the procedure was well known and that the arrow in fact was shot clearly after the expiry of time.

From the answers we would like to underline that archers cannot claim a 30 sec. warning when shooting a 40 sec. end – ref. art. 8.5.3.6.1.

Based on the “fact” that the arrow of archer A was shot after the expiry of time limit, he/she will lose the highest scoring value of that end. If there are judges designated to spot arrows, he/she will lose the arrow in question. (In this case – a 10 – would give no difference). Be aware that it is not enough that a judge incidentally sees and may identify the arrow. Here we have established quite a rigid procedure in order to treat all similar situations in the same manner, regardless of the possibility for a Judge to spot the arrow or not.



Then to the question if the “good sportsmanship” of the other archer shall lead to a different solution? Certainly not!

The reason is quite obvious, and possibly not in the mind of the “sporty” competitor; if archer A loses the match, these points will influence the ranking and may give an unfair advantage. He/she may even gain national or - if he/she wins - international records. And it will not do any good to our sport if there are “whispers” around saying that a champion in fact won by a mistake. The Judges must stick to the rules!

Does this mean that we shall never listen to the competitors in certain cases? Certainly not, their input may often be of great value – but we cannot change or overlook our rules.

59.2

Let us start the discussion of this case by imagining what might have been the result of the fact that two archers don't appear by the start of the matches. For sure, byes are declared (and, as such, the opponents will be declared winners of the matches). According to common procedures, the “winners” are not allowed to shoot on the competition field, but on the adjacent training field and no scores are taken down. Based on the field set up etc. the “winners” may have shot on their respective match-targets, but these targets are then considered practice targets and still no scores are taken down. According to Art. 7.7.2.5., late archers are not allowed to make up arrows in the Elimination or Finals Rounds. Consequently, no extraordinary efforts should be made to re-establish these matches.

Again we have the question if the “sporty attitude” of the opponents accepts to shoot the match? Should we disregard the rules based on that? In our opinion: “no”. Imagine what you would do if one of the opponents accepted to shoot the match, but not the other one? Who are to decide; the opponents or the Judges (after DOS has accepted the circumstances as valid)? Besides, it is fair to the opponents to refer to their sporting attitude, after they have left their mental preparation phase?

What if the Organizers have changed the starting time without giving proper information? Of course there may be circumstances which might lead to a different conclusion, but we should all learn one thing from cases like this: never change time schedule, and certainly not into an earlier start than previously stated.

59.3

Let us start by confirming that all Judges agreed upon the fact that during Elimination and Finals no extra time will be given for equipment failures (or miss-shot arrows within the three meter line).

As for the Qualification Round – in our case – a majority of Judges (approx. 60-40) would not give extra time due to various reasons.

We find it necessary to underline that arrows that drop down (miss-shot) within the 3-meter line may be handled as an equipment failure, just because it might have been just that; an equipment failure (i.e. broken nock). This may not be discovered by the archer from the shooting line during shooting. So, in fact, we give the archer the choice; continue shooting within the time limit or stop shooting and call a Judge (equipment failure procedure). NB! The latter applies even if there actually is no equipment failure.



(Check your Guide Book which states pretty well the idea of a previous official interpretation on the issue).

In our case, the archer made his/her choice – and he/she himself is responsible for shooting the necessary arrows within the prescribed time. Therefore he will not get another 40 sec.

From some of the answers, we got the impression that an archer must call a Judge before the stop shooting signal in order to claim an equipment failure. This is, however, not correct. An equipment failure may occur so late in the time sequence that it is not possible for the archer to signal to the Judges that an equipment failure has occurred before time

59.4

Some Judges base their answer to this case on a presumption that it must be indeed difficult to score arrows that have broken into pieces and are severely displaced. It is not possible to discuss these difficulties without actually being on the scene and looking at the target.

In this case, we were (a little bit) more interested in the principles, and we may say that our Judges again separated in two groups of equal size; those who said that the Judge did his/her absolute best out of a difficult situation, and those who insisted that all archers should “re-shoot” this end.

First of all, Art. 7.4.5.1., second bullet gives the authority to the Judges to “take whatever measures they deem necessary, etc.” There is no doubt that the Judge acted according to the rules, the question may be if he/she made the best choice? Possibly he/she should have consulted other Judges in such a difficult and peculiar situation. Those Judges who voted for all archers on the butt to “re-shoot” the end, referred to fairness”.

But, if we look closer at the term “fairness”; would it be “fair” to archer A, who had a very, very good end under difficult wind conditions, to tell him/her to “re-shoot” if his/her scores in fact could be identified?

We are of the opinion that the “fairest” judgement that could be made, is to try to identify the scores actually shot, and only “deem arrows not shot” if there is absolutely no possibility to identify the scores.

Can archer A ask for a second call related to position of arrows in the target face? Even if this is not an ordinary situation, we cannot deny Art. 7.10.1 (7.10.1.1). He/she has the right to ask for a second call!

Can archer A protest against the ruling of archer B’s “arrow in the air”? Yes! Never be mistaken about the fact that an archer can protest (handled by the Jury of Appeal) against any Judge’s decision except for the value of an arrow in the target face. Art. 7.11.1.

7. New Case Studies

Please send your reply (by e-mail, fax or mail) regarding the following case studies by **March 31st, 2003** to the FITA Office, attention: Caroline Murat, e-mail’s address: cmurat@archery.org

60.1 At a tournament, a judge was called to a target to correct the scorecard. Upon checking the values of the arrows with the scorecard, he/she realizes that one of the arrows noted as a 7 could hardly be more than a 6. He/she pulled up his/her magnifying glass, checked that arrow properly, and declared it to be a 6.



One of the archers, however, blamed the judge for intervening without having been called for that purpose, as the archers on the target have agreed on the value. How would you consider the Judge's action?

60.2 Regarding the team event, you may find these scenarios:

- a) The second archer of the team is crossing the one-meter-line too soon when his/her team-mate is returning from the shooting line. Due to the stress of the competition, the team and their coach did not take notice of the yellow card given by the judge, and the archer shot his/her three arrows.

The judges decided to take away the highest score of that end when scoring. However, the other team in the match filed a protest claiming the team to lose the three highest scores, as the archer shot three arrows after the yellow card was given before returning behind the one-meter-line. What is your opinion regarding this protest?

- b) The third archer of the team removes his/her arrow too soon when moving forward to the shooting line. The judge gives the yellow card and calls the name of the team. Due to the stress of the competition and noise from the spectators, the coach and the team were not aware of the card until after the archer had shot one arrow. Discovering the card, the coach then asked his/her archer to return behind the one-meter-line to then move forward again to shoot his/her remaining two arrows.

The judges decided to take away the highest score of that end, as the archer had not reacted immediately to the yellow card.

The team, however, filed a protest against the judges, claiming that the team did not get any time advantage because the archer returned behind the one-meter-line and then came into the line again to shoot his/her remaining two arrows.

What is your opinion on how to handle this case?

- c) A team is getting short of time and decides to let their third archer move forward to shoot even when their second archer is still on the shooting line. The judge, of course, immediately shows the yellow card, but this was ignored by the team.

Consequently, the team had two archers shooting two arrows each at the same time. The second archer returned behind the one-meter-line when he/she finished shooting, and the third archer remained on the shooting line to shoot his/her remaining arrow.

The judges discussed the situation, but found nothing in the rules regarding this specific situation and decided to deduct the highest scoring arrow of that end. In spite of that, the team won the match two points ahead of their opponent.

The opposing team filed a protest claiming that such behavior was against the intention of the rules, and that the team had deliberately done it in order to save time.

What is your solution?

- d) During the last end of a team match, one of the archers in Team A was clearly observed to cross the one-meter-line too early. However, the judge unfortunately overlooked the incident and the match went on to conclude that team A won the match by 5 points.

Team B protested to Jury, and named several independent witnesses to the situation, including a video tape of the match.

What is your solution to this case?

- e) In a team match, an archer crossed the one-meter-line too soon and removed his/her arrow from the quiver before standing on the shooting line. The judge raised his/her yellow card and the archer returned behind the one-meter-line accordingly – but only once.

Do you see any problems here?



- 60.3 a) At an equipment inspection you find a fiber optic sight pin of approx. 5cm long. However, this sight pin extended towards the archer and not towards the target as usual. The judge claimed that the pin was illegal, and the archer protested due to design mentioned.
- b) At the judges meeting in the evening after the equipment inspection, upon the information of the case above (a). One of the other judges informed that he/she had checked a fiber optic sight pin that extended towards the target almost 5 cm before it curved and ended outside the sight vision. The judge accepted this sight pin because it ended outside the sight vision.
- Would you accept these fiber optic sight pins? Explain. Do not just say Yes or No.
- 60.4 During the inspection of the field the judges overlooked that the individual shooting positions were not marked on the shooting line. During practice before the competition started, one of the judges realized so, and came up to the chairman of judges. The chairman, however, was not willing to possibly delay the start of shooting in order to correct the field, and said that they would just wait and see if somebody protested. Give your thoughts in this respect.

8. Judge Training seminar in Brussels

A judge training seminar was held in Brussels with the participation of 11 new applicants from 8 countries. FJC members Gian Piero Spada and Morten Wilmann conducted this seminar successfully. Congratulations to our new candidates, among which an Olympic medalist is found: Boris Issachenko, silver medalist in Moscow, 1980.

BUHAGIAR	Dion	MLT
ISACHENKO	Boris	BLR
LANDSKAUG	Vigdis	NOR
LI	Chung-bong	HKG
SANZ	Pedro	ESP
TAMER	Roula	LIB
VERSTRAETEN	Michel	BEL



The new applicants with their instructors and a group of experienced international judges who attended as sit-ins. (R. Poulain, J. Reijers, J.P. Galeyrand, H. Wagemakers, J. Kramer, J.M. Charquero, P. Ney, J. Schoos, T. Mc Loughlin, P. Wiggeler, J. Daunan, J.P. Gabarret, C. Olsen, N. Dimmock, C. Garcia Molina, J. Martens).



The Judge Commission in Nymburk. Happy, weren't they? Busy? Yes, they were. They had to judge in more than one field at the same time. They did a great job, and so did their chairman Pol Ney.



The DoS in Nymburk, FITA Judge Horst Helfrich. As you can see, it takes more than blowing the whistle.



9. Fiber optic sight pins

Based on a discussion that arose among International Judges who were sit-ins at the recent seminar in Belgium, we would like to make the following statement:

Regarding: Measuring the length of the fiber optic sight pins.

After having consulted the FITA Technical Committee who made the basic interpretation (later on the rules) about the fiber optic sight pins, we will measure the length of the sight pin itself (max 2 cm in line of vision towards the target).

This means that the total length of the sight (house and fiber optic pin) may exceed 2 cm since they are not in the same level of aiming.

10. Judging and rules in High Level Coach Seminar

During the High Level Coach Seminar organized by EMAU in Antalya, Turkey, in late October, "Judging and rules" was for the first time on the programme.

This fact was instituted on the initiative of the Judges Committee, based on an experience telling us that many "cases" occurred just simply because the archers and coaches did not know what to do (often did not know the rules).

Judge Committee Member, Morten B. Wilmann, had approx 3 hours at his disposal for a very wide subject, and some extra time during the evening was offered to the participants.

Based on the feedback from several Coaches, the subject was far more interesting and enlightening than they anticipated, and hopefully also the understanding of judging and the role of Judges will be clearer in the future, creating an even better cooperation in order to bring the circumstances for good performances to the peak.

Hopefully such an input would also be included in future Coaches seminars organized of our various bodies; FITA, Continental Associations and National Federations.

Items covered were:

- 1) Introduction
 - Archery, a mental game
 - Rules - an advantage or disadvantage
 - Cooperation with Judges
 - Team Captains Meeting
- 2) The duties and rights of the coach
 - Ethics
 - Giving information
 - Where/When to be on the field
 - Coaching
- 3) The duties and rights of the archer
 - Ethics
 - Space
 - Arrow calls
 - "Everything" being according to rules
 - Protests
- 4) Knowledge of the rules
 - Intention
 - Knowledge in general



- How to shoot on 30m triangular set-up of faces?
- How do you handle bouncers?
- 5) Practice before start of competition
 - How many arrows?
 - When does the practice end?
 - Leaving arrows on the field
- 6) Timing
 - When time has expired
 - 30 sec. warning signal
 - Discrepancies
- 7) Miss-shot
 - 3m line
 - Archer's action
- 8) Equipment failure/Medical problems
 - 40 sec. per arrow
 - Verified by a judge
 - Max. 15 minutes make-up
- 9) Scoring
 - Touching the arrows or target
 - Judge touches the arrow or target
 - Shot through the face
 - How to mark arrow holes
- 10) Scorecards
 - Corrections
 - Signing
- 11) Archers' equipment
 - Archers' responsibility
 - Shaft size/point size
 - Fibre optic sight pins
 - Taping of glasses
 - Initials on arrows
- 12) Other subjects
 - Uniforms
 - Footwear
 - Mobile phones
- 13) Olympic Round
 - Start time
 - Qualification, shoot-off
 - Byes
 - Pairing
 - Shooting position, left/right
 - No extra time for equipment failure or medical problems
 - Alternate shooting, sequences
 - Team event procedures
 - shooting
 - coaching
 - Ranking
- 14) Archers' Agent
 - Responsibilities
 - Rights



11. Appointments for duty in 2003

The Judges Committee has made the following appointments for duty in 2003.

World Indoor Championships, Nîmes, France

Chair			
Gian Piero	Spada	IJ	ITA

Members			
Per	Bolstad	IJ	NOR
Tsang	Chiu Kee, Mr	IJc	HKG
Burak	Demiralp	IJc	TUR
Osvaldo	Garcia Calvo	IJ	ESP
Horst	Helfrich	IJ	GER
Jeannot	Schoos	IJ	LUX
Masatoshi	Seki	IJc	JPN
Marty	Swanson	IJ	USA
Konrad	van Warmelo	IJ	RSA
Schendorff	Vang	IJ	FER
Henrik Pieter	Wagemakers	IJc	NED
Partick	Wiggeleer	IJ	BEL
Susanne	Womersley	IJ	AUS

Alternates			
Peter	Morris	IJ	GBR
Abdul	Rahman Nur	IJc	MAS

DOS			
Jean Pierre	Gabarret	IJ	FRA



World Outdoor Target Championships, New York

Chair			
Carole Ann	Hicks	IJ	NZL

Members			
Macide	Erdener	IJ	TUR
Jean	Martens	IJ	BEL
Vincente	Blumenschein	IJ	BRA
Sergio	Font Milian	IJ	CUB
Morten	Wilmann	IJ	NOR
Rae	Thibert Jones	IJc	BAR
David	Wallace	IJ	RSA
Ping-Kun	Chiu	IJc	TPE
Stefan	Lehmann	IJc	GER
Irena	Rosa	IJ	SLO
Borje	Jonsson	IJ	SWE
Lionel R.	Caldwell Jr	IJc	USA

Alternates			
Rathin	Datta	IJ	IND
Pavel	Prokop	IJ	CZE

DOS			
Clive	Barnett	IJ	AUS