

## JUDGING NEWSLETTER

WORLD ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE #91

February 2016

### Content

1. Editorial
2. Committee Ad-Hoc Members
3. Judges Conference in Medellin
4. Recent Bylaws
5. Candidates upgraded to International Judges.
6. World Archery Judges Outstanding Service Award.
7. Reply to Case Studies.
8. New case studies.

### 1. Editorial

by Morten Wilmann, Chairman

Dear Judges,

First of all I would like to wish you a very Happy New Year.

It seems that we, again, are entering a busy year, with highlights like the Olympics and Paralympics, the start of a new circuit of conferences (the first one in Colombia following the World Cup in May) and an international seminar in Osaka, Japan in September. In 2016 we will continue to fine-tune the structure of our seminars and of course to update the Judging Guidebook and our presentations on the internet.



In fact, due to other everyday life factors like our day jobs, your committee members have been feeling a certain time pressure in general, and we have asked World Archery to allow the appointment of a couple of ad hoc members to assist us. Under certain conditions, this request was granted, and I am happy to welcome Sabrina Steffens and Indranil Datta as our ad hoc members. They have already been involved in the completion of some tasks.

As a positive message to bring in the New Year, I would like to forward a message from the World Archery Athletes Committee, which said that the archers in general are satisfied and supportive of the work of the international judges.

Keep up with the good work, be attentive and alert – and good luck in 2016.

Morten

## **2. Committee Ad-Hoc Members**

---

As mentioned by Morten in his editorial, World Archery accepted our committee's request for two ad hoc members who will assist us in carrying out some of our tasks. Our committee decided that it would be great if our ad hoc members were young judges who have shown knowledge and skills in their international appointments in the last few years. For this reason, the following judges were appointed and are welcome to work with us.



Sabrina STEFFENS (GER), Indranil DATTA (IND)

## **3. Judges Conference in Medellin**

---

For the 2016-2018 three-year period, our international conferences have been allocated to the Americas in 2016, Asia in 2017 and Europe in 2018. The first one, which can be attended by judges from all over the world, will be held in Medellin, Colombia, on the occasion of the second stage of the Archery World Cup.

The sessions of the Conference will take place at the Acqua Express Hotel on May 16-17. If you intend to attend, please book your flights to arrive at the Jose Maria Cordoba International Airport in Medellin on May 15, and to depart on the 18<sup>th</sup>.



You will receive a complete package of information about the Conference, including costs and schedule, from Severine Deriaz. Send registration forms to her at [sderiaz@archery.org](mailto:sderiaz@archery.org), and copy Sergio Font [sergiofont@yahoo.com](mailto:sergiofont@yahoo.com).

We remind our judges; youth judges, International judge candidates and International judges, that in order to keep your accreditation as a judge, it is mandatory for you to attend at least one conference during the accreditation period; 2016-2019.

#### 4. Recent bylaws

---

**BYLAW:**

Approved by World Archery Executive Board on 12 December 2015 Effective as of 1 April 2016  
Book 2, Chapter 7, Article 7.2.1.2 Book 3, Appendix 1 (Target Faces and Equipment).

7.2.1.2. Each butt shall have a target number. These numbers shall be minimum 30cm tall (for Outdoor Rounds) and minimum 15cm (for Indoor Rounds) ~~with black figures on a yellow background, alternating with yellow figures on a black background (e.g. no. 1 black on yellow, no. 2 yellow on black, etc.)~~. Target numbers shall be fixed above or below the centre of each target butt, so they are clear of the target face.

Corresponding amendments to Book 3, Appendix 1 (images 2 and 10)

Comment from the Judges Committee regarding this bylaw: *Though it is not included in the text of the bylaw, we should not forget that the original intention of having the yellow/black combination was to make sure that there was contrast between the background and number so that the archer would be able to identify their targets just by looking at the number. After the bylaw change, black and yellow are no longer mandatory, but the intent of the old bylaw regarding color contrast should still be observed. Let's look at the numbers used at the test event in Rio last September. They comply with the contrast provision and look great.*



BYLAW

Approved by World Archery Executive Board on 12 December 2015 Effective as of 1 April 2016  
Book 2, Chapter 8, Article 8.1.1.8

8.1.1.8. The butts shall provide a margin to allow all scoring arrows to be in the butt. At no point may any target face be less than 15cm from the ground. In all instances, regardless of the terrain, the buttress should be placed reasonably perpendicular to the athlete's line of sight from the shooting peg in order to present the target face's full picture (for example (see image 9: 80 and 60cm Target Face for Field).



BYLAW

Approved by World Archery Executive Board on 12 December 2015 Effective as of 1 April 2016

Book 3, Chapter 21, Art. 21.4

21.4.4 Equipment rules are the same as World Archery Rules, with the following exceptions for the W1 Class: The peak draw weight of the bow is 45lbs; No peep sights or scope sights are allowed; Level device is not allowed; Release aids are permitted;

Add the following: For the 50m compound round and 50 compound match play, the full 80cm target face will be used.



*A W1 archer*



*Target line for W1 archers starting on April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016*

#### BYLAW

Approved by World Archery Executive Board on 12 December 2015 Effective as of 1 April 2016

Book 3, Chapter 21, Art. 21.6.5, second bullet point.

Other athletes, when their international classification card allows strapping, may have only a single strap of not more than 2 inches (5cm) wide at any point and wound only horizontally and only once around the torso.



Comment of the Judges Committee: Straps like the one in the picture will not be allowed after April 1, 2016.

### **A VERY IMPORTANT RECENT INTERPRETATION:**

#### **Book 3, Article 20**

World Archery Norway has requested an interpretation as to the applicability of the dress rules set forth in Book 3, Article 20.

The Constitution and Rules Committee ("C&R") has concluded that the question asked is within its own terms of reference. C&R consulted with the Executive Board in reaching its conclusion.

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

Response from C&R:

It is the opinion of C&R the dress rules set forth in Book 3, Article 20, apply at the following events:

- Competition for World and Continental titles;  Competition for Olympic and Paralympic titles (which may be more restrictive than World Archery clothing rules);  Competition at Outdoor World Cups;  Competition for Outdoor World Ranking; and
- Archery events of Major Event Organisations (any international multi-sport organisation that acts as the ruling body for any continental, regional or other International Event).

Provided, that such dress rules do not apply at (i) events which are organized at the Member Association or lower level, in which case the applicable Member Association's dress rules shall apply or (ii) Indoor World Cup events except to the extent that World Archery Executive Board otherwise determines appropriate.

World Archery Constitution and Rules Committee, 10 September 2015

## **5. Candidates upgraded to International Judges**

---

The following Candidates have just been upgraded to International Judges by your Committee. These judges have done a remarkable job along their time as candidates.

Christophe Pezet (FRA)  
Marya Larkina (RUS)  
Ringa Baltrusaite (LTU)  
Chen Ting-Ni (TPE)

Martino Miani (ITA)  
Denis Paquet (FRA)  
Drasko Mihinjac (CRO)  
Rubens Terra Neto (BRA)



Martino MIANI, Ringa BALTRUSAITE and CHEN Ting-Ni at the Youth Olympics in Nanjing

## **6. World Archery Judge Outstanding Service Award**

---

As mentioned in our previous Newsletter, four retiring judges have earned the World Archery Judge Outstanding Service Award. Here is some information on the judging career of two of them:

### **Tom GREEN (USA)**

*Tom's career as an International Judge started in the early 1990s. He officiated at three Olympic Games and has been one of the world's best judges for more than two decades. Tom GREEN's participation as Chairman or member of Judges' Commissions at a large number of major international events has contributed to the success of these tournaments.*

*He has always been willing to attend tournaments in many countries in his continent as a Judge, Chairman of Judges and Technical Delegate. In the last few years Tom has been the Chairman of Judges at the Arizona Cup, one of the world's largest archery events.*

*Tom's contributions to judging have also been made in the area of judge continual education. He has conducted seminars in the United States and several other countries. Tom's professionalism and ethics for all the time he has served is widely recognized by archers, officials and fellow judges.*



### **Christiane MURPHY (CAN)**

*Christiane's continental career started in 2007. She became an international judge in 2009, and officiated at a number of events all around the world, including the World Archery Championships and World Archery Para Championships in 2011, and the Paralympic Games in London in 2012.*

*She is a reliable and confident judge on the field. She recently officiated at the Pan American Games in Toronto, and at the World Para Championships in Germany.*



Our Judges' Committee thanks Tom and Christiane for their dedication and for setting such a high standard for the new generations of judges to follow.

## **7. Reply to Case Studies**

Before discussing the cases as such, the texts give us the opportunity again to underline that normally the judges have to make their own decisions, without involving the chairperson for every situation that occurs. In extremely difficult or strange cases, however, it might be wise. The chairpersons will be involved automatically when there is a formal protest.

To the cases:

**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?

**Reply:**

Here we have a case telling us (again) that we should not jump to conclusions. However, let us first conclude the same way as almost all the judges: this case has nothing to do with "signing scorecards, etc." At the time of signing scorecards, an archer may have no possibility of knowing if his opponent has been using illegal equipment.

What the case tells us is that an archer, by a random test, has a compound bow with a 64 pound draw weight. We presume that our scales are accurate.

Then we have three possibilities:

- 1) There was no poundage checking of all compound bows during the equipment control
- 2) During equipment control his bow weight showed less than 60 pounds
- 3) During equipment control his bow weight was 64 pounds and he was asked to adjust it

Most of the judges, but far from all of you, would disqualify the archer for cheating referring to the rules. But the rules are using the word "knowingly" about using illegal equipment, and also say "may be disqualified" – in other words it indicates that disqualifying someone is a very severe action, which should make us a bit careful.

Let's look at the first situation above (1). It is absolutely possible that the archer may have thought that his bow was legal, may be his personal scale or other methods of checking have not been accurate.

However, you may say that his bow is not legal, knowing it or not, giving him an advantage over his opponent. Yes, but that means that you actually have to determine if he had any advantage or not. If the weather is good, no wind, no rain – shooting at 50m - he would not likely have any advantage at all. Under such circumstances the judge acted correctly.

Let's look at the second situation above (2). Here, the crucial point is exactly when you did the spot check. If there was some time after the end of the match, the archer may have adjusted the set up of his equipment and incidentally increased the poundage – in other words; after the end of the match. If this was the case, the judges acted correctly by asking the archer to reduce his poundage. If he immediately on the return from the target after pulling arrows is asked to check the bow, then the situation is different – and more like the situation below.

Let's look at the third situation above (3). You may say that here the archer got a kind of warning during the equipment control - to reduce his poundage. Now it turned out that he has not done so, then the fact is not discussable, he has knowingly shot with illegal equipment, which is his sole responsibility, and he will be disqualified. His opponent will be declared the winner, and will go on for the next match.

**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?

**Reply:**

With few exceptions we are happy that our judges would take a closer look at the possibility of penetrating the target face/buttress.

The judge in this case did so, and thereby was able to identify the actual hole belonging to the pass-through arrow. Our mission is always to try to be fair, and our guidebook gives an explanation re pass-throughs and how to deal with them.

Of course there should have been new faces for the shoot-off, and thereby the situation mentioned would not happen. However, it would in this case be the judge's call to decide if there was a tie or not.





## **8. New Case Studies**

---

### **91.1**

At a National Championships the judges have all compound archers use a bowscale provided by the Organizing Committee to measure their bows' poundage. None of the bows was found to be over the 60 pounds allowed by the rules.

A judge, who was not appointed to check compound equipment on the equipment inspection day, happened to have his own bowscale, and on the day of the qualification round he started doing some random check for poundage along the compound line of archers after four ends had been shot. Archer 11B's bow showed 63 pounds on this judge's bowscale when he was asked to draw his bow to this random test.

The judge immediately calls his chairman and reports the issue, suggesting that archer 11B should have the scores shot so far disqualified. If you were the chairman here, would you support your judge's suggestion?

### **91.2**

An archer turns up late for the Elimination Round (ER) and thereby did not shoot the first two sets of his match. However, he wants to enter the match now as he might still win the next three sets and thereby the match.

Would you say this is a problem? What would you possibly say to the archer?

**Replies to the case studies should be sent to  
[sderiaz@archery.org](mailto:sderiaz@archery.org) before 15 March 2016**