

JUDGING NEWSLETTER

WORLD ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE #94

June 2017

Content

1. Editorial
2. International Candidate Seminar in Salt Lake City
3. High draws ?
4. Understanding the intent of the rule
5. Advertising
6. News from the Continental Associations
7. Reply to Case Studie 93
8. New case studies.

1. Editorial

by Morten Wilmann, Chairman

Dear Judges,

First, we are a little bit out of turn with this Newsletter, as it is the first one this year. Unfortunately, your committee has been delayed in their work, due to illnesses, personal issues and heavy workload.

We promised you an updated Guidebook. We are nearly there, but still not yet finished. We also signaled that we would update the training aids on WA web, but we are also a bit behind in that task.

Back to judging. Even this year we have had a couple of situations where no answers are to be found in the rules. But judges have to think of the intention of rules, if so happens. In this respect, it seems that some judges are not on the proper level. Preparation and understanding the rules, are clues before you are serving at an event. Let me, at the same time, underline that some judges are excellent.

Our next meeting in the committee will be in Bangkok in November, the days prior to the Conference. By that time all applications for 2018 will be considered (WA will soon send you the forms). And let me again mention that if you don't reply to case studies, you will not be appointed – and you even risk to lose your judge status.

Have a good reading!

Morten



2. International Candidate Seminar in Salt Lake City

An International Candidate Seminar was held in Salt Lake City on June 18-20, just prior to the start of the Hyundai World Cup. It was conducted by World Archery Judge Committee members Morten Wilmann and Sergio Font. Ten participants took the International Candidate exam, and seven wrote the Continental Exam. Three sit-ins were also present.

As a result, the following judges have been accredited:

International Judge Candidates:

Nabil HUSEIN (BRA)
Megan TIERNEY (USA)
Maya SHALABY (EGY)
Roy CORTES (COL)
Carsten KUHN (GER)
Douglas LUDWIG (USA)
LI Xi Ping (CHN)

Continental Judges:

Andrew NEVILLE (USA)
John CANNON (CAN)
Maurice LEVESQUE (CAN)
Rae LAURIE (BAR)
Ruben Luis OCHOA (MEX)
Curtis BALUSEK (USA)
Jory ACHTTIEN (USA)



The seminar included an initial test that all participants had to complete. Some of the questions in this test received different answers from the applicants. This is not good, because it shows that not all of our judges apply the rules in the same way. We would like to discuss some of these questions in this newsletter in an attempt to clarify possible doubts and questions.

Question 6) An archer shows a tab with the following design. Is it acceptable or not acceptable?

Ten of the eighteen participants said it was not acceptable. This shows that some of the candidates do not regularly read the interpretations and bylaws published on the World Archery site. This is the FIVICS tab, which is allowed, as any other tab, provided that the metal or plastic extension does not prevent wrist movement.

*"The decision of the Technical Committee was that the extension was legal since it provided no measurable or real additional support when drawing back the bow or during release. This conclusion was based on the assumption that the extension bar does not project past the hand and is being used to brace the draw wrist. The Technical Committee concluded that if the bar extends to the wrist but not beyond (extends at or before the contact point between the hand and the wrist), then the extension is legal. **World Archery C&R Committee, 22 September 2014**"*



Question 11 Archer 33A calls you from his target, and says he believes he has had a pass-through because there are only 5 arrows on the target, mostly 10's and 9's. No arrow is found in the grass behind the target and there are several unmarked holes in the target face.

- (a) You score the five arrows on the target and score the unfound arrow as a miss.
- (b) You score all five arrows on the target and give the archer the benefit of the doubt, as most of the arrows are mostly either 10's or 9's you score the unfound arrow as a nine.
- (c) You score the five arrows on the target and assign the value of the highest unmarked hole on the target face – a ten.
- (d) You score the five arrows on the target and assign the lowest unmarked hole – a seven.
- (e) You regard the incident as an attempt to cheat and disqualify the archer.

We would like to think that all of our international judges agree that the correct answer is (a). However, seven seminar participants answered this question incorrectly. When we discussed the exam questions with them, the reason they gave for choosing choice (c) was that they would give the archers the benefit of the doubt. The benefit-of-the-doubt "rule" applies only when there is at least some evidence. When an arrow is not found, there is no doubt, because there is no evidence that the arrow was actually shot.

Q23 In which category(ies) is the following target face used?

- (a) Indoor recurve
- (b) Indoor compound
- (c) both recurve and compound



Four participants (not international or continental judges yet) did not know that there is a new target face for the compound indoor categories. In this new (not so new anymore) face, the 10 ring measures 2 cm in diameter, and the face does not show 10 ring for the recurve. The purpose of this face is not to create confusion to spectators who are watching and they see a circle that means nothing for the compound bow.

3. High draws?

The following is an extract from the Judges' Commission report on the Salt Lake City Hyundai Archery World Cup regarding high draws. Please note that the judges' reports from World Cups this year include a section with the names of archers who have been warned for several reasons, including high draws.

"High draws: During official practice, judges were appointed to walk along the line watching the archers' form. One archer was warned due to his high draw: (name of archer included in the report). The CoJ informed the coach that this archer's technique needs to be changed for the next international event. He was not asked to change it for the SLC World Cup because there is a very tall wall behind the targets that would be able to stop any arrows shot over the top of the targets.



A second archer (name of archer included in the report) was closely watched as her form apparently looked like a high draw. The judges, however, decided that it was not a high draw situation because though her arms were high, the angle of the draw was not higher than acceptable."



Once again, here is procedure to follow when the technique of an archer looks dangerous, either a high or a side draw.

- Observe the archer several times.
- Ask the opinion of other judges on the field.
- Discuss the issue with your chairman.
- Talk to the archer's team captain.
- Keep on checking.
- Chairman of judges may ask the archer (through his team captain) to stop shooting.
-

4. Understanding the intent of the rule

At a recent major World Archery event, in the middle of a Recurve Team Finals Match (alternate shooting) the following situation occurred.

The second archer of a team walks to the shooting line, and as she tries to nock her arrow she realizes that one of the vanes is loose. She immediately drops this arrow on the ground and takes another arrow out of the quiver. She shoots this arrow, and walks out to allow the third member of her team to come in. When the third archer crosses the line the judge raises the yellow card. Believing that it was an issue of crossing the line too early, the archer walks back behind the 1 meter line and crosses again. The judge raises the yellow card again and points to the arrow that is on the ground, indicating that it had to be removed before the third archer would be allowed to shoot.

When questioned by the coach after the set finished, the judge claims that it was a "live arrow", and that it could not be on the shooting line.

First of all, we need to look at the intention of the yellow card rule. It is meant to disallow archers to gain a time advantage by crossing the line too early, or by having the arrow out of the quiver before standing on the shooting line. A third situation is now considered for a yellow card: a compound archer in a team match with his release aid attached to the string before he/she is on the shooting line. In these three situations if the archer disobeys the rules, he must be given a yellow card and will need to return behind the line.

But in the situation described regarding the "live arrow", is there any time advantage? Was the team supposed to receive a yellow card then? It is obvious that the action taken by the judge is incorrect. The team was finally able to shoot all of their arrows within time. What would have happened if the team had not had time to finish shooting and the last arrow was not shot? We all know that a yellow card given by a judge cannot be appealed, but would this rule of not allowing an appeal against a yellow card apply in circumstances in which the yellow card was given for an invalid reason, not related with a time-advantage situation? Would Jury apply the rule blindly, or would they consider the intent of the rule?

5. Advertising on clothing

The following is a section of the report submitted by International Judge Jim Larven, who chaired the commission in Shanghai. It is a very interesting analysis of the term "per item" we find in the rules regarding advertising:

"There was some discussion between International Judges and WA Staff over the wording in the WA Rules regarding advertising in particular clause 2.2.7.1. 2.2.6. Athletes may wear advertising in addition to the normal manufacturer trademarks of the articles worn. The manufacturer's trademark is the registered mark of the company which produced the item. If a company has an item made for it under contract, the label of the item, if appropriate to the item, shall correspond to its trademark. 2.2.7.

Athletes may have advertising on their personal and technical equipment (e.g. bows, bags, etc.) in addition to the item's normal trademark. All advertising referred to 2.2.6 and 2.2.7 above shall not exceed 400cm² per item. Athletes' numbers are not covered by this article. The WA Rule 2.2.7.1 uses the term "per item" and there was disagreement over the meaning of the term "per item". My belief was "per item" is referring to the item of clothing but other International Judges believe the wording item refers to each item of advertising. I made the decision (after referring to Chris Marsh) that 'per item' refers to each item of clothing. For clarity in particular for people who do not have English as their first language maybe this clause requires some rewording to "per item of clothing".

Jim Larven's definition of "per item" as "per item of clothing" is the concept that our Committee shares, and we expect all of our judges to see it the same way.



Advertising on shirt and cap

6. News from the Continental Associations

Continental Seminar in Argentina

A continental judges' seminar will be held in Rosario, Argentina on Sept. 29 - Oct. 1, just prior to the Youth World Championships. It will be conducted in Spanish only. A session of the seminar will be devoted to 3D and Field archery. For further information on this seminar, please contact Sergio Font at sergiofont@yahoo.com

7. Reply to Case Studies 93

93.1

Question: At a World Ranking Event the 1/48 Round for recurve men is shot in two details (AB – CD). A match between archers A and B, and a match between archers C and D. When the first set begins, archer A starts walking to the shooting line 10 seconds after the beep to start shooting was given because he was fixing something in his bow. To his surprise, his position on the shooting line is occupied by archer C, who has already shot one arrow. Archer A lets the judge know, and archer C realizes he was not supposed to be shooting now, but two minutes later. Archer C walks out the line, and archer A steps in. He manages to shoot his three arrows within time. Archer C asks the judge what he should do in his own two-minute sequence. Will the arrow already shot count as part of the end? Will it be considered as an arrow shot out of time? What would you reply to archer C in this situation?

Reply:

The whole situation by shooting matches in two details is not common. However, sometimes due to the size of the field and schedule, it has been accepted. One match to be shot at the top targets and one match at the lower targets (compound).

In this case it is quite clear (since it is a match) that archer C shot an arrow out of sequence and will lose his highest score of the end.

Having said that you may also think of two other scenarios and what you would have done

- a) Archer C also shot in the wrong face, hitting archer A's face.
- b) The same setup is made for Qualification Round, what would you do then?

93.2

Same situation as in 93.1, but in this case archer A is not able to complete his three-arrow end because archer C has taken his position for a few seconds. Archer A asks for 40 additional seconds to shoot his pending arrow. What would you reply to him?

Reply :

There have been some comments referring to Archer A not being present at the start of the match, but presence is not depending on the being on the line, but the fact that he is around there. If he has been delayed in his shooting because another archer has taken his place, he will certainly get his 40 sec. for the remaining arrow – and almost all judges replied accordingly.

8. New Case Studies

94.1

On the day of the recurve finals (with alternate shooting), an issue occurred mainly due to the wrong management of the timing equipment by the DoS assistant. In the recurve women's team match between Team A and Team B, , the DoS assistant (wrongly assuming that it was a shoot-off situation) stopped the clock after the first archer of Team A shot her arrow in a regulation set, and incorrectly started the clock for Team B. The second archer in Team A, not noticing that her clock had stopped, shot an arrow without the timer running. The clock was then reset to allow 80 seconds for team A (4 arrows were pending). Team B lodged an appeal claiming that the second archer in Team A had shot without time being shown on the clock, and demanded that the highest scoring arrow should be deducted because that arrow was shot out of time (the clock was stopped). What would you decide in this situation?

94.2

On the same day, in another recurve team match, the DoS wrongly stopped the clock in the middle of a match (alternate shooting), after the first archer of Team A shot his arrow. The clock was stopped, but still showed that there were 107 seconds left (the first archer had used 13 seconds only). When the clock for Team A started again, it began to count from 107 down. Team B protested indicating that the rules say that when the clock is stopped, the team should be allowed 20 seconds for each remaining arrow, and that for that reason team A should have been given 100 and not 107 seconds. What is your opinion about this?

94.3

For the Men's Compound Gold Medal Match one athlete attempted to enter the Field of Play wearing a pair of binoculars. The Judge officiating asked the athlete to remove the binoculars. The International Judge believed that as Spotting Scopes are not permitted as such binoculars must also not be permitted. What is your opinion?

Replies to the case studies should be sent to sderiaz@archery.org before 31 August 2017

Pictures of Judges in recent events



Hyundai Archery World Cup – Shanghai, China



Hyundai Archery World Cup – Antalya, Turkey



Hyundai Archery World Cup – Salt Lake City, USA



As you know, WA judges are amateurs and is poorly paid as such.
Some judges try to find other income without taking bribes.....