

## JUDGING NEWSLETTER

WORLD ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE #90

October 2015

### Content

1. Editorial
2. Minute of World Archery Judge Committee Meeting
3. Recent Interpretations
4. New Award
5. Judges Seminar in Rio.
6. Pictures of Judge Commissions at recent events.
7. Judge Commissions at Continental Games.
8. A picture from the past
9. Replies to case studies.
10. New case studies.

### 1. Editorial

**by Morten Wilmann, Chairman**

Dear Judges,

You are now reading the second judging newsletter in 2015. It is a bit delayed compared with our previous schedule, but we had to wait for decisions, reports and the elections of World Archery Congress 2015. I am proud to tell you that all members of the Judge Committee were re-elected.

However, this does not mean that the work of the committee will follow old tracks. On the contrary, there will probably be several changes during our present period – I refer to the report from our meeting at the Aquece Rio International Archery Challenge, which you will find in this newsletter.

Shortly summed up: a lot of effort will be put on updating/changing our seminar structures. Seminars will be longer due to practical exercises and open for fewer candidates each time in order to make more personal assessments of candidates.

For 2016, we gave new guidelines regarding applications for appointments, and that helped us a lot in creating good commissions. We believe we have appointed good chairpersons and given them good deputies, imagining that these deputies will get more specific training and experience that will help them become future chairpersons at various levels of competition.

Good reading,

Morten



## **2. Minute of World Archery Judge Committee Meeting**

---

17-18 September 2015 – Rio de Janeiro

Present                      Morten Wilmann  
                                 Sergio Font  
                                 Dion Buhagiar

Excused                      Séverine Deriaz

Attending parts of the meeting: Tom Dielen

### **Agenda:**

1. Appointments
2. Education system and Accreditation
3. The fitness of Judges
4. Judging Mistakes – proposed procedure for action
5. Honorific titles have come to an end. What now?
6. Future Conferences
7. Future Seminars
8. Publications – Guide book, Newsletter, and Presentations
9. Chairperson of Judges commission – Memoranda
10. "Road Map" for the WAJC 2015-2019
11. Other matters.

The meeting commenced on the morning of 17 September with a brief discussion regarding the agenda to be followed. It was agreed to proceed as indicated above.

### **1. Appointments for duty 2015-2016**

The committee reviewed the list of judges requesting appointment to events during 2015-2016. Each event and allocation was discussed, and judges were assigned accordingly. In addition to the judges forming the individual commissions, it was agreed that each competition would have an appointed chairperson and deputy chairperson. The committee felt that it should adopt this procedure so that the designated deputy chairperson (DCoJ) would have the opportunity to learn from the chairperson (CoJ) of the competition.

Appointments for the Olympic Games are subject to approval by the World Archery Executive Board, and therefore not listed below.

## Appointments 2016

### Indoor World Cup, Marrakesh MAR

Ahmed KOURA (Chair)	EGY	AF
Christophe PEZET (Deputy)	FRA	EU
Patti-Jo MIDDLEBROUGH	CAN	AM
Alt:		
Ahmed ROUSHDY	EGY	AF

### Indoor World Cup, Nimes FRA

Schendorff VANG (Chair)	FRO	EU
Francisco GIMENEZ (Deputy)	ESP	EU
Mariya LARKINA	RUS	EU
Alt:		
Bjarne STRANDBY	DEN	EU

### Indoor World Cup, Bangkok THA

Klaus LYKKEBAEK (Chair)	DEN	EU
Rupesh KAR (Deputy)	IND	AS
Mildred DE LEON	PHI	AS
Alt:		
Ghazaleh RASOULI	IRI	AS

### Indoor World Cup, Las Vegas USA

Robert PIAN (Chair)	USA	AM
Katy LIPSCOMB (Deputy)	GBR	EU
Hossein NASIRINEJAD	IRI	AS
Alt:		
Randall JONES	CAN	AM

### World Indoor Championships, Ankara TUR

Randall JONES (Chair)	CAN	AM
Katerina PLAKOUDA (Deputy)	GRE	EU
Jesus GUEVARA	ESA	AM
Paia WAR NONGBRI	IND	AM
Andjelko PRASKALO	CRO	EU
James LARVEN	AUS	OC
Pedro SANZ	ESP	EU
Sun Hee KIM	KOR	AS

Fulvio CANTINI	ITA	EU
Rubens TERRA NETI	BRA	AM
Jan CERNY	CZE	EU
Karola WOORTMAN	NAM	AF
Xinping LI	CHN	AS
Vladimir DOMINGUEZ (DoS)	CUB	AM
Alt:		
Klaus LYKKEBAEK	DEN	EU

### World Field Championships, Dublin IRL

Karen O'MALLEY (Chair)	AUS	OC
Ringa BALTRUSAITE (Deputy)	LTU	EU
Friedrich KARLE	GER	EU
Indranil DATTE	IND	AS
Martino MIANI	ITA	EU
Lena FAZZOLARI	ARG	AM
Christophe PEZET	FRA	EU
Bjarne STRANDBY	DEN	EU
Laura CHURCHILL	CAN	AM
Drasko MIHINJAC	CRO	EU
David TAN	SIN	AS
Irena ROSA	SLO	EU
David MARTIN	RSA	AF
Alt:		
Pedro SANZ	ESP	EU

### World University Championships, Ulaanbaatar MGL

Pedro SANZ (Chair)	ESP	EU
Alexander V. PASSERINI (Deputy)	BRA	AM
Matsiewdor WAR NONGBRI	IND	AS
Frankie HOON G	SIN	AS
Alt:		
Lian WANG	CHN	AS

### World Cup Stage 1, Shanghai CHN

Schendorff VANG (Chair)	FRO	EU
Karla CABRERA (Deputy)	PHI	AS
Enkhbat SARUUL	MGL	AS
George LOH	SIN	AS
Yu-Hsuan PAN	TPE	AS
Jesus GUEVARA	ESA	AM
Alt:		
David TAN	SIN	AS

### World Cup Stage 2, Medellin COL

Dion BUHAGIAR (Chair)	MLA	EU
Adam MARTINEZ (Deputy)	PUR	AM
Guillermina GARCIA AVILA	MEX	AM
Randall JONES	CAN	AM
Linda COCKRELL	CAN	AM
Louis SIMON PETER	MAS	AS
Alt:		
Lena FAZZOLARI	ARG	AM

### World Cup Stage 3, Antalya TUR

Robert ERICA (Chair)	NED	EU
Mike CULLUMBER (Deputy)	USA	AM
Flemming SKJOLDBORG	DEN	EU
Katy LIPSCOMB	GBR	EU
Mariya LARKINA	RUS	EU
Sharzhad ALLAHYARI	IRI	AS
Alt:		
Ahmed ROUSHDY	EGY	AF

### World Cup Final

Susanne WOMERSLEY (Chair)	AUS	OC
Luca STUCCHI (Deputy)	ITA	EU
Ahmed ROUSHDY	EGY	AF
Alt:		
Sabrina STEFFENS	GER	EU

### Paralympic Games, Rio BRA

Matsiewdor WAR NONGBRI (Chair)	IND	AS
Vladimir DOMINGUEZ (Deputy)	CUB	AM
Nobutomo TAKEUCHI	JPN	AS
Adam MARTINEZ	PUR	AM
Ringa BALTRUSAITE	LTU	EU
Klaus LYKKEBAEK	DEN	EU
Pecilius TAN	SIN	AS
David MARTIN	RSA	AF
Patti-Jo MIDDLEBROUGH	CAN	AM
Ranjan BHOWMIK	IND	AS
Guillermina GARCIA AVILA	MEX	AM
Maren HAASE	GER	EU
Irena ROSA (DoS)	SLO	EU
Alternates:		
Denis PAQUET	FRA	EU

## 2. Education system and accreditation

The judge committee considers the education of judges a very important task, which needs careful consideration. It is a dynamic process and needs continuous updating. After discussion it was agreed that the Judges educational system needs to be reviewed, and the structure of future seminars/conferences will be reviewed, updated and enhanced to provide our judges with the best possible opportunity to become the best they can be. The assessment system needs to be changed so that the committee may obtain a better understanding of the personal aptitude of every international judge and judge candidate. The issue of seminars and conferences will be dealt with in items (5) and (6) of the minutes of the meeting.

The committee also discussed the various methods that could be adopted to better educate World Archery judges. Methods such as individual practical testing, and video review could be used to highlight possible mistakes and good performances that have been made in the past. It is being recommended that the number of participants to each seminar should be limited to not more than 10 to 12 judges. In this way the committee feels that better individual assessment could be made during the seminars.

WAJC raised the issue of the lack of understanding by many coaches of the existing competition rules. In view of this, it was agreed that there should be better interaction between the WAJC and the World Archery Coaches Committee. (WACC).

WAJC will seek to prepare educational videos for Judges, which will be used during seminars and during judge evaluation exercises.

The possibility of having an online pre-seminar test and a re-accreditation exam in the next quadrennial will be explored.

### **3. The Fitness of Judges**

WAJC was informed by the World Archery office that in due time there will be some requirements to the physical standard of our judges. To be able to physically endure long competition days, and to cope with irregular and slippery terrain at field and 3D events, certain stamina is necessary. The WAJC will evaluate WA recommendations.

### **4. Judging Mistakes – Way forward**

There have been a number of recent judging mistakes that have been brought to the attention of WAJC. Two recent cases have been investigated, and the judges concerned were asked to give their account of the incident.

WAJC discussed the present effectiveness of the current procedure and has decided that in the future the following actions will be taken when incidents occur.

- (a) The judge concerned will be asked to submit an incident report to WAJC for consideration.
- (b) After consideration the WAJC will decide on the incident and inform the judge of its deliberations.
- (c) If the judge is found to have made a serious mistake, then the judge concerned will be informed that he will not be given any further appointments until he has fulfilled one judging appointment at continental level within two years of the notification. WAJC will cooperate with the continental associations on the subject and ensure that an evaluation report is made by the Chairman of that event (or an appointed mentor).

According to these guidelines, WAJC considered the two recent cases to be serious and has informed the two judges involved accordingly.

### **5. Honorific titles have come to an end. What now?**

Honorific titles for judges will no longer be issued by World Archery. WAJC discussed the present state of affairs and in light of the discussions would like to make the following recommendation:

WAJC would like to introduce an award to be given to judges that have given outstanding service to World Archery at the highest possible level of judging. This will be known as the **"World Archery Judge Outstanding Service Award"**. The judge receiving this award must have been a full International Judge.

The new award will be awarded to the following retiring judges:

- (a) Christiane Murphy – Canada
- (b) Macide Erdener – Turkey
- (c) Jean Pierre Galeyrand – France
- (d) Tom Green – USA

In addition to this, WAJC will consider recommending retiring judges who have made substantial contribution to World Archery judging for a long period of time for World Archery plaquettes.

## **6. Future Conferences**

WAJC is to restructure the content of the international conferences, so that they are used as the annual event to raise awareness and discuss topical issues with its Judges. For this reason WAJC will be issuing a call of interest to all International Judges asking them to highlight topics of discussion that need to be brought to the conference.

The tentative schedule for the three conferences is as follows:

2016 – Medellin, Colombia (May 16-17)

2017 – Place and dates to be decided.

2018 – Lausanne, Switzerland, to be held at the World Archery Excellence Performance Centre.

## **7. Future Seminars**

WAJC has reviewed the current structure of the educational seminars, and decided to restructure the content of the seminar, giving greater emphasis on personal evaluation and practical training. WAJC feels that the number of judges attending the seminars should be limited to no more than 10 to 12; by doing so this would ensure proper individual assessment of each and every judge. WAJC discussed the possibility of using the World Archery Excellence Centre in Lausanne as the venue for all future seminars when it is finished.

WAJC has been approached to hold an International Judges seminar in Japan during 2016. The new format will be launched at this seminar.

## 8. Publications – Guide book, Judges newsletter, and Presentations

There are a number of publications that WAJC manages and they need to be prepared and updated on a regular basis.

- (a) Judging Newsletter to be issued three times a year. (Sergio Font)
- (b) The Judging Guidebook needs a review and updating 2016 and 2018 (Dion Buhagiar)
- (c) Online presentations (Dion Buhagiar)

## 9. Chairperson of Judges commission – Memoranda

WAJC discussed preparing a specific publication for Chairpersons, which will highlight various competition procedures and important points that need to be brought to the attention of all judges in the commissions.

Dion Buhagiar is already working on a “pocket book” for judges, a shorter version of the Guidebook, and the committee believes this one also may fulfil the purpose of such a memoranda.

## 10. “Road Map” for WAJC 2015-2019

- (a) **Oct. 2015** - Judging Newsletter with information on disciplinary procedures, new rules re awards, some future plans.
- (b) **March 2016 - Changes to the present seminar structure** to reflect the changes in judging and the new demands being made of International Judges. Limiting the number of participants during seminars, increasing the number of seminars and holding of all judging seminars at the World Archery Excellence Centre.
- (c) **May 2016 -Changes to present conference structure and content.** The format of the conference will be reviewed and updated to reflect the needs of International Judging.
- (d) **May 2016 – updated Judging Guide book.** We hope to make the Judging Guidebook even more concise.
- (e) **May 2016 – updated online presentations.** The presentations will be updated to reflect current rules, by laws, interpretations and procedures.
- (f) **May 2016 – Judges Conference Americas, Medellin**
- (g) **2016 – International Judges Seminar, Japan**
- (h) **2017 – Judges conference Asia (TBA)**
- (i) **2017 – training videos for seminars**
- (j) **2017 – Introduction of On-line stress test**
- (k) **2018 – Judges Conference Europe, Lausanne.**
- (l) **May 2018 – Updating of Judges Guide Book**
- (m) **May 2018 – Updating of online presentations**
- (n) **2018 – Introduction of On-line re accreditation exam**
- (o) **2018 – International Youth Judges seminar (TBA)**

## **11. Other matters**

- (i) Given the amount of work envisaged for the next four years and in the future, WAJC would like to recommend to World Archery that two additional ad hoc members be accepted into the present committee and that in future WAJC consist of five members and not three as it presently is.
- (ii) The issue of professional chairmen was discussed, and WAJC feels that given that judges are expected to be of the highest possible standard that a pool of 12 chairpersons be created to service the annual calendar of World Archery events. These judges would be always available to serve as chairpersons. The post should be by application and interview.
- (iii) In addition to this, a further pool of 12 deputy chairpersons will be created, and it is expected that the chairpersons will mentor their deputy chairpersons. WAJC would like to support and propose young promising International Judges (of an age yet to be decided) to the post of deputy chairpersons.
- (iv) WAJC after discussion would like to recommend to World Archery that the Chairperson appointed to Archery World Cup stages arrive at the event two to three days before the event so that he/she may be able to hold a seminar for the national judges prior to the event. WAJC feels that this will be greatly beneficial for the event.
- (v) WAJC will be introducing a procedure whereby the members of the judge commission will be assessing the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the commission.

Meeting concluded on 18 September 2015

## **3. Recent Interpretations**

---

### **Book 3, Chapter 11, Article 11.1. 3, Book 4, Chapter 22, Articles 22.1 and 22.3**

*USA Archery has requested an interpretation on whether the arrow rest shown below is allowed in the Recurve and the Barebow Divisions.*

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 decision of the Technical Committee that the arrow rest shown in the photo below is legal in the Recurve and Barebow divisions. Arrow rests with multiple contact points have been used successfully in World Archery events for decades. As long as the contact points for the arrow rest stay within the required distance back from the pivot point of the bow grip (4 cm recurve, 2 cm barebow), the Technical Committee considers it legal.





**World Archery Technical Committee, 15 April 2015**  
**Approved by the World Archery C&R Committee, 16 April 2015**

**Book 3, Article 11.1.7.1, Book 4, Articles 22.1.7.1, 22.3.7.1, 22.4.6.1, 22.5.6.1**

*Austria Archery has requested an interpretation as to whether the requirement that all arrows be identical requires that arrows have the same weight. Austria Archery notes that when using arrows with break-off points, it is possible that the points have different weights although appearing to be identical.*

The Constitution and Rules Committee ("C&R") finds the question presented to be within the terms of reference of the Technical Committee after consultation with the Judges Committee. C&R has determined that the following interpretation is not contrary to the existing rules or Congress decisions.

**Response from the Technical Committee:**

Where the rules require that all arrows be identical, this means in all respects visually, including length, but does not include weight.

**World Archery Technical Committee, 30 June 2015**  
**Approved by the World Archery C&R Committee, 30 June 2015**

**Book 3, Chapter 11, Article 11.2 and Book 4, Chapter 22, Article 22.2**

*The French Archery Federation has requested an interpretation as to whether the antigrip device shown below is allowed in the compound division.*



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 majority decision of the Technical Committee that the device shown below is legal in the Compound Division. Article 11.2 indicates the following equipment is allowed in the Compound Division:

**All types of additional devices are permitted, unless they are electric, electronic, compromise safety or create unfair disturbance to other athletes.**

It is our decision that the anti-grip device does not contravene any existing rules for the Compound Division and is therefore legal for competition for able bodied athletes and the Compound Open class for Para-Archery. However, it will not be permitted for the Para-Archery W1 division. Further, the anti-grip device will not be permitted in the Recurve Division.

**World Archery Technical Committee, 25 June 2015**  
**Approved by the World Archery C&R Committee, 27 June 2015**

**Book 3, Chapter 11, 11.3.10.1 and Book 4, Chapter 22, Articles 22.3.10.1 and 22.4.9.1**

*The Swiss Archery Federation and the German Shooting Sport and Archery Federation (DSB) have requested an interpretation on whether the devices shown below are allowed in the recurve, instinctive, and barebow bow divisions.*



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 decision of the Technical Committee that the limb dampening, bowstring dampening and bowstring silencing devices attached to the bow limb devices shown in the photos below are legal in the recurve, barebow and instinctive bow divisions. Due to long standing precedence set by athletes using similar devices in major competitions, there is a long history of similar devices being legal. Bowstring silencers are allowed in the instinctive bow division, while the rule does not indicate if they need to be attached to the bowstring or not.

**World Archery Technical Committee, 9 April 2015**  
**Approved by the World Archery C&R Committee, 11 April 2015**

#### 4. New Award

---

As you have seen from the WAJC meeting minutes, World Archery has now removed all rules re honorific titles (and Judge Committee Award). Your committee would still like to appreciate retired international judges who have served outstandingly over a period of time.

An Award will be given also in the future – although with a different requirement than before. We wish to call it “**World Archery Judge Outstanding Service Award**”.

Judges who previously have been given an honorific title (or award) are still appreciated as such, but they will no longer be listed on the WA web.

Judges who previously have received a title have the possibility of still applying for DoS work. That would be possible also in the future. Additionally, all retired international judges will now have this possibility. Your committee will consider possible tests in this respect.

#### 5. Judges Seminar in Rio

---

A seminar to train new International Candidates and Continental Judges was held in Maricá, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, on Sept. 23-24 with participants from Spain, Guatemala, Argentina, Chile and the host country.

World Archery Judge Committee Members Sergio FONT and Dion BUHAGIAR conducted the seminar, with a new format for seminars that focuses more on dealing with judge performance under stress, practical situations and the role of judges in a number of contexts.

As a result of this seminar, the following new International Judge Candidates have been accredited:

David Catalan (ESP)  
Lais Machado Nunes (BRA)  
Andrea Aguilar (GUA)  
Jose Luis Del Torno (ARG)

The following judges passed the Continental Exam:

Rafael Dos Santos Costa (BRA)  
Tiago Correa Louzada (BRA)





The participants at the Seminar in Rio de Janeiro

## **6. Judge Commissions at recent major events**

---











Olympic Games Test Event, Rio de Janeiro – September 2015

## **7. Judges Commissions at Continental Games**

---



Pan American Championships, Toronto – July 2015



The judges and officials at the Parapan American Games, Toronto – August 2015

## 8. A picture from the past

---

This is a picture with some of the judges who officiated at the 1992 Olympic Games in Barcelona. From left to right Um Sung-Ho (KOR), Paul Paulsen (NOR), Juan María Charquero (ESP-DoS), Klaus Schulz (GER-CoJ), Sergio Font (CUB), Paul Ney (LUX) and Candido Garcia (ESP).





## 9. Reply to Case Studies

**89.1.** In a team match an archer uses a quiver in which the point of the arrows is visible, as in the following photo.

When the archer with this quiver crosses the 1 meter line, his arrow is still in the quiver, but his point is visible. The judge did not take any action, but the coach of the opposing team filed a protest indicating that the point of the arrow was visible and that contravened what is stated in the judges guidebook.

Would you have done the same as the judge did? Nothing? Or would you have raised your yellow card? Explain.

### ANSWER:

Almost all the judges agreed in the fact that even if the points were visible as such, they were not out of the quiver, which is the intention of the rules to prevent. Using the leather band that keeps the arrows in the quiver would be adequate to use as "the top of the quiver" in this respect.



**89.2.** Do you find anything wrong or suspicious with this archer's form and equipment? Once you have identified the issue, can you explain how you would handle it from a judging perspective?

### ANSWER:

Even if a photo is not exactly the same as viewing situations in reality, most judges indicated that the stabilizer on the bow pointing towards the archer also touched the archer's forearm, which makes a stabilisation bow/arm that is not acceptable and the archer would have to adjust his equipment or remove this stabilizer.



## 8. New Case Studies

---

**90.1** During a break between the 1/48 and the 1/24 Round in the Compound Men Elimination, a judge has one of the archers winning a 1/48 match use a bowscale to measure his bow's poundage. The bow scale shows 64 pounds. The judge asks the archer to lower the poundage and lets him shoot the 1/24 Round. The archer who lost the 1/48 match versus the archer in question hears the judge say that the archer's bow exceeded the 60 pounds and complains to the chairman of judges, claiming that he should be declared winner of the 1/48 match. The judge says that it is not possible because he signed his scorecard agreeing that he had lost.

If you were the chairman of judges, what would you do?

**90.2** In an individual compound match a shoot-off is necessary. Each archer shoots his arrow. When they walk to the target they find out that Archer B's arrow is not in the target; it is found about 5 meters behind the target in a position that indicates that it may have passed through. The judge comes to the target and when he inspects it, he finds two unmarked holes: one in the ten zone close to the dividing line between the 10 and the 9, and the other one in the X ring. The hole in the 10 ring is a tiny round hole through which no arrow could have passed. The one in the X ring suggests that an arrow could have easily gone through. Archer A's arrow is also in the X ring, at a distance from the center very similar to the distance between the hole of Archer B's arrow and the center in his own target.

The judge decides to give Archer B's arrow the value of the hole in the X ring, indicating that there is evidence that it could not have gone through the hole in the 10 ring.

As the arrow is not in the target and the distances to the center of Archer A's arrow and Archer B's hole in the target are similar, the judge decides to declare a new tie and tells the archers to go to the shooting line again.

Archer A protests claiming that the rules say that when there is more than one unmarked hole the arrow should be given the lower value.

You are the chairman of judges, and you are called to take action. What would you do?

**Replies to the case studies should be sent to  
[sderiaz@archery.org](mailto:sderiaz@archery.org) before 15 November 2015**