



JUDGING NEWSLETTER

WORLD ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE #97

November 2018

Content

1. Editorial
2. International Judges Conference in Lausanne, SUI
3. IJc and YJ Seminar in Lausanne, SUI
4. News from our Continental Judges Committee
5. Reply to Case Studies 96
6. New Case Studies
7. Pictures of Recent Judges Commissions

1. Editorial

by Sergio Font, Deputy Chairman

Dear Judges

This Newsletter will reach you while you are in the middle of your re-accreditation process. You have already completed and returned your exams, and our Committee is now busy marking them. As you know, the test is one very important component in this process, but for your re-accreditation our Committee will also consider your participation in one of the three International Conferences, your replies to case studies, and the reports submitted by your Commission Chairmen from the tournaments in which you have officiated. In addition, your test replies will need to be accompanied by a re-accreditation application form which must be signed by your national federations.

Your Committee has been quite busy in the last few weeks, among other things in the preparation and conduction of the third and last International Conference, which was successfully run at the WA Excellence Center in Lausanne. In this newsletter you will find an excerpt of the minutes taken, which we hope will give you an idea of what topics were discussed.

Once the re-accreditation process concludes on December 10, we will make the 2019 judge duty appointments. As you will read in the conference minutes below, we want to have strong commissions who can guarantee the highest possible level of judging at World Archery's major events, which in 2019 will include four Outdoor Hyundai World Cups, four World Championships, the Tokyo Test Event, and a few other international tournaments.

Your committee would like to encourage you to come to these events only after a profound study of the rules book, the latest bylaws and interpretations, and the current issue of the Guidebook.

As this will be our last newsletter in 2018, we would like to take the opportunity to wish you a very successful end of year, and a very prosperous and healthy 2019.

2. Internation Judge Conference in Lausanne SUI

Taken from the Minutes written by Sabrina STEFFENS

Introduction

The conference began with an introduction by World Archery Secretary General Tom DIELEN. He talked about the most important change for judges in the last year: the judges are wired now. There are microphones for the line judge and the target judge, which means that everything they say can be heard, not at the venue, but in the livestream and on TV. The reason for that is that the judges should be part of the show. Everybody should know what the judges are doing. It is of special importance for the target judge when calling a line cutter. Now, the audience immediately knows the value of the arrow.

After that, Tom talks about doing the right thing as a judge. "This year, several judging mistakes were made. Nobody is perfect and mistakes happen, but they should be avoided as much as possible. We accept that mistakes are made, but we do not accept covering up mistakes and not learning from mistakes. Judging mistakes can affect the outcome of the competition. Plus, the impression can arise that the judge was corrupted."

WA is happy that the judges are voluntarily doing duty for the International Federation and Tom expressly thanked them for that. Looking to the future, the plan for the next Olympiad is to have some professional judges. There will be a pool of judges who will get a compensation for their duties and, in return, will have to do more tournaments.

Then Tom talks about the Olympics: Being appointed for the Test Event does not necessarily mean that the judge will also be appointed for the Olympics. There are several conditions to fulfill: passing all relevant tests, getting good reports, providing very good answers to the case studies, not making mistakes while on duty, and being in a very good physical shape.

For the next Olympics in Tokyo, there are two major factors:

- Stress (TV, microphones);
- Weather (it will be very hot and humid).

In general, the President wants healthy and fit judges. Judges are part of the WA family. In making the appointments, WA strives for gender equity.

After Tom's speech, Sergio explained that Committee Chairman Morten WILMANN cannot attend the Conference due to health problems and wished him a quick recovery.



The Judges' Committee and Severine Deriaz at a Conference preparation meeting the night before

Right after that, 40 minutes were allotted for the participants to take an initial test, which included 32 multiple-choice questions. The results would be discussed at the beginning of the Sunday session.

Tasks of the Judges Committee

The next item on the agenda is the presentation of the committee's tasks by Committee Deputy Chairman Sergio FONT.

The Committee now consists of 5 members:

Morten Wilmann (Chairman)

Sergio Font (Deputy)

Indranil Datta

Sabrina Steffens

Robert Erica

Morten and Sergio were elected by Congress in 2015, while Indranil and Sabrina were appointed by the WA President at the end of 2015 until the next elections. Robert Erica was appointed to replace elected member Dion Buhagiar (MLT), who resigned last year.

At the next Congress in June 2019, all 5 positions are up for election. The top 3 in terms of votes will be in the committee for 4 years, the subsequent 2 will be elected for 2 years.

Tasks of the Judges' Committee:

- **Conducting Conferences.** Three Conferences have been held in this re-accreditation period. Medellin 2016, Bangkok 2017, and now Lausanne 2018.

There is a timed test at every conference, and the result will be considered for the reaccreditation, when the result of the reaccreditation test is between 88 and 90%.

At the conference in Medellin, 13 out of 16 judges achieved the passing mark and at the conference in Bangkok, 26 of 35 judges reached the minimum score or higher, which is alarming. The Committee has realized that some judges do not get prepared to come to the conferences in terms of rule updates and their application. Poor command of the English language is causing some judges not to understand the questions or to finish the tests within the time allotted.

- **International Judge Candidate and Youth Judges Seminars in the period:**

In the last accreditation period, 30 new IJC and 10 new YJ were accredited.

- **Appointments**

There are several factors to consider when making appointments

- Finding a good chairman
- Combination of experienced and young judges
- Gender equity
- Regional representation
- 3D + Field experience

For Youth judges, we will try to use some of them at events other than Youth World Championships and Universiades. Our Youth Judges need to gain experience.

- **Upgrades**

WA has a limited number of international judges, which is 70 as a decision of the Executive Board. From time to time, there are vacancies because of: suspension, age limit, voluntary resignation, or not passing the reaccreditation test. Then judges can apply to be upgraded from IJC status to full IJ status. Several judges applied for an upgrade at the end of 2018. The final decision will be made after the re-accreditation process is concluded.

- **Handling mistakes at major events**

The major goal is to avoid mistakes and to solve mistakes before they go to Jury. The right way is to come from knowledge to skill, to put knowledge into practice. Mistakes have a negative implication on the image of judges and the sport. Several mistakes happened in the last year:

- Showing a red card when arrow was not shot
- Difference between distance on the peg and actual distance in a Field event
- Not reacting when a yellow card is due.
- Making wrong arrow calls in finals.
- Incorrect use of measuring devices.
- Showing the wrong winner.

Tom Dielen says if it takes time to correct a mistake, then take this time. It is better than correcting the mistake afterwards.

▪ **Analyzing Chairmen of Judges's reports**

For the Judges' Committee, reports submitted by the CoJs are useless if they are too general and focus on irrelevant topics. The committee needs an insight on what happened, so that they can react and propose bylaw changes, correct procedures, etc. The CoJ is also expected to assess the judges in his commission. Judge assessments are not always objective and are sometimes too nice. Please be honest in your assessments. Sometimes the report mentions three or four mistakes made by the judges, without mentioning names. Then you read the judges' assessment and everyone did a great job. Who made the mistakes then?

▪ **Questioning Procedures:**

Current questions:

- Who should check that the scores are correctly entered in the scorecard in a finals match?
- Do we need an additional judge to observe the clock when the Line Judge is busy looking for possible yellow-card mistakes?

- Other tasks:
 - Submitting bylaw proposals
 - Making statements on submitted motions and proposals
 - Updating the guidebook
 - Preparing Newsletters
 - Keeping record of judges not replying to case studies (Severine does this very efficiently).

▪ **Preparing the reaccreditation exam**

From now on, the reaccreditation test is of a different type: there will be fewer questions relying on memory, but more on making decisions as a judge. The passing mark will be 90%. If a judge reaches between 88-90%, he will only be reaccredited in case of VERY good feedback from the CoJ and a VERY high performance in the conference timed tests.

A question was raised regarding who is making the assessment of the COJ. Tom Dielen replied that he and the Event Director give feedback on the CoJ.

The goal of the reaccreditation test is to improve the quality of judging worldwide.

▪ **Attendance at joint committee meetings 2016 and 2018**

Every two years, there is a joint committee meeting of all WA committees with the aim of exchanging opinions and find new ways, rules and procedures.

▪ **Urgent tasks:**

- Improve judges training, further raise level of judging around the world
- Train judges in 3D and Field events flawlessly.
- Strengthen the bonds with Continental Judges' Committees.
- Fine-tune judging procedures
- Train chairmen who can plan, foresee, instruct, control, assess and report efficiently.

3D and Field Archery

After a short break, Indranil Datta and Hannah Brown made a presentation on 3D and Field.

First, they pointed out the differences between Field and 3D.

- different bow styles
- different scoring systems
- target faces vs. targets
- different number of arrows

Then they explained the philosophy of field and 3D-competitions. Judges should time the archers only when they are causing undue delay. If not, the judge should not interfere when the competition is running smoothly. As a judge, you have to assess the situation and be sensible. After that, they explained the new elimination and finals system: After the qualification round, the top 22 athletes advance to the next stage, in which the top 2 athletes go directly to the semi-finals and the 20 other athletes will be divided into 4 pools of 5 athletes. For the finals, there is a marked course and the judge decides on every target, from which of the three pegs the archers shall shoot.

Indranil and Hannah explained some ways in which the archers may try to get an advantage in Field and 3D archery. For example, as a judge, you have to check that there are no marks at the back of the riser and of the limbs, because they can be used for estimating angles. Also the scopes must not be modified for the purpose of ranging.

While checking the course as a judge, there are several important factors to consider: safety, distances, targets (challenging, but not impossible course), paths, clearance (no branches, no hanging branches after the rain), footing (standing at the pegs must be equal for both archers), toilets, water stops, and safety paths.

When the judge has to go to the target while some of the archers are still at the peg, he should not walk straight to the target. The archers may count your steps and so they can estimate the distance. Observe the memoranda of the archers in the course and make sure it conforms to the rules. Have a look at the target faces, it has happened that team mates give information on the size of the target face by moving the target pins to another position.

Rule changes

In the afternoon, Indranil talked about the latest rule changes:

- If an archer is sure he cannot win the match, he can give up and congratulate the winner.
- 30 seconds per arrow for para-archers in individual matches shooting in alternation.
- There will be a second shoot-off **OUTDOORS ONLY** when both compound archers shoot an X or both recurve archers shoot a 10 (Xs to count as 10's in recurve first shoot-off arrows).

A question was raised if the judge has to change the target face for the second shoot-off?
Answer: Only if the cross is not visible, it is at the discretion of the judge.

- The organizing committee is not obliged to provide a practice field for archers who are not in the competition any more.
- The number of teams advancing to the elimination was raised from 16 to 24, and this is now included in the rules.
- Alcohol is not doping any more, but it is included in the rules that alcohol is not permissible in any archery competition.

- Book 2, 5.5.1.3: For Mixed Team 70m Round. If two athletes of the same gender shoot the same score, the athlete having a higher number of 10's and/or X's will be the record holder. In case the two have the same number of 10's and X's they will be joint record holder with the athlete from the other gender
- Minimum distance added for 3D 5meters, was omitted by accident and now added.
- Book 4: 22.1.5.5 concerning sight marks: "normal" was removed just for clarification.
- Book 4: 22.6.3 included that the archer can have the WA rules.

The rules which will come into effect on 01. April 2019 are:

- The target number will be 1 m in front of the 3-m-line, i.e. 4 meters from the shooting line.
- Clothing in finals: undershirts, compression shirts or sleeves may be used when they match the colour of the team uniform or are white.



Allowed – sleeves match uniform color



Allowed – white sleeves



Not allowed: Sleeves do not match uniform color and are not white

Some interpretations have been released in 2018:

- Judge can ask archer to dismantle equipment during inspection.
- Valid weights for barebow
- Classification card for disabled archers
- 1.25m space for wheelchairs is not mandatory in non-para events but in the discretion of organisers.
- Outsert pin nocks are allowed for longbow
- Allowing para-archers in non-para tournaments and conditions.

In this regard, it was the opinion of the judges that the interpretation is not clear enough regarding which conditions apply for para-archers in a non-para event. What can be interpreted is that whenever possible, organizers may allow sufficient space for the wheelchairs or stools in non-para events. Assistive devices in each archer's classification card may be allowed. The biggest concern now is with archers who have been regarded as Non-Eligible as Para Archers, but still have some disability that may require them to use some assistive devices. World Archery is currently working on a solution to these cases.

A question was raised when one person is deaf and blind and there is an agent, can this archer be allowed in the competition (safety)? What to do with deaf archers in general? Must he have a classification card? What are the conditions for health issues which are not covered in the rules? The Judges' Committee will consult with the other WA committees involved.



Other changes:

There are some changes in wording in the rules:

Previously, regarding the draw check indicator, it was written that "one draw check indicator, visible and/or audible, can be used". This changed to "one draw check indicator, audible, tactile or visible, can be used". In this regard, the Judges' Committee will request an interpretation from the Technical Committee and will inform the judges accordingly.

There was a question if an archer can have a picture of a politician in his quiver which is a political statement. We believe that the Events director should take care of that, not the judges.

Other points to solve are that the rules are not clear about W1 individual shoot-offs. Will the rule for them be to consider only the X's to go to a second shoot-off? Or will the rule for recurve arches apply here? Our Committee will funnel this through the proper channels and inform the judges.

Implementation of new procedures for judging:

We then continued with the next point on the agenda, the implementation of new procedures for judging. Sergio distributed a script prepared by the WA Events Team which includes what the Line Judge should say, followed by an active discussion.

Points raised during the discussion:

- Judges would like not to call the names of the archers, but target one or target two, or the names of the countries where the archers come from. Some names are hard to memorize, and pronunciation may be difficult to manage.
- If we focus too much on the script, we lose focus on the important judging actions.
- Judges would like not to say the score, but rather target one leads or the like.
- Will we comment the yellow card as well, e.g. crossing/arrow/release?
- In general, the feeling of the judges is that this script can only be a recommendation, a guideline, and a starting point to be improved, which was later confirmed by Tom Dielen.

The fact that judges are now expected to voice their signals, and that what they say is heard on the TV coverage makes our job more stressful, yet more visible and meaningful to the spectators. Never before have our skills in the English language been more important than they are now.

On venue assistant App

Subsequently, Robert Erica introduced the On Venue Assistant App for judges which shall replace paper at tournaments. At the moment a beta-version is tested. The App runs on the devices distributed by WA which will at the tournament be given to every judge only for the event. The app will show live results and the entry list by name, by target, by country or by session. As a chairman of judges, you have to instruct the judges when and how to use it. If you have any comments or recommendations, please write to Robert directly.



Entries

QUALIFICATION ROUND RECURVE QUA

RECURVE MEN **RECURVE WOMEN** COMP

Ses	Target	Athlete
1	34A	TAN Ya-Ting
1	34B	BROWN Mackenzie
1	34C	ZHANG Dan
1	34D	ROMAN Aida
1	35A	LEI Chien-Ying
1	35B	SHEPHERD La Nola

Matches

SCH

11:15 - 1/48 RM # 12

T	Match	NOC	Sc
20	TAYLOR Adam JAO Ting-Yu	IRL TPE	0 6
21	OGRODOWCZYK Mateusz DARCY Astin	POL AUS	5 5
22	AGUILAR Andres PEREZ Felipe	CHI CHI	6 2
23	VIKSTROM Antti Olavi POTTS Alec	FIN AUS	5 5
24	FULSANG Brad BARROSO DA CRUZ Lugui	CAN BRA	6 4
25	ADRIAENSEN Ben RUSS Caleb	BEL NZL	6 4
26	ALOTAIBI Fares Mater OONUKI Wataru	KSA JPN	1 7
27	NGUYEN Hamilton RAMIREZ Estiven	CAN COL	7 3
28	BINALI Abdaleiah MAIER Johannes	KSA GER	6 4
29	VAN DEN OEVER	NED	6

Matches

SCH

Day: 20 June

Sch

Schedule

- 09:15 - 1/24 CM,CW
- 11:15 - 1/48 RM
- 12:15 - 1/24 RM,RW
- 15:15 - 1/8 CX,RX
- 15:40 - 1/4 CX,RX
- 16:05 - 1/8 CX,RX

CANCEL OK

Case Studies

After a short break, the participants were divided into groups and discussed case studies. Here are the case studies discussed.

1. A. *In a recurve mixed team 1/8th team elimination, which was being shot with alternate shooting, during the 2nd set of the match, the clock for team A abruptly froze at 12 seconds. The archer, who was then at the middle of his draw, continued with the shot & the judge did not intervene. The clock abruptly started counting down again from 2 seconds & jumped to 0 directly causing it to blow the buzzer. The archer got panicked by the horn and released his arrow which was out of time. The judge then showed the red card and the highest scoring value was deducted. Was the action of the judge correct? How would you have dealt with the situation if you had been the line Judge?*

B. *The coach of Team A wanted to appeal for a reshoot stating that the buzzer caused the archer to release his arrow. The jury rejected the appeal saying an arrow shot cannot be reshot as an archer needs to be in control of his equipment at all time. Was the Jury decision correct? Had you been in the jury would you have acted differently or advised the coach differently?*

C. *In the same match in the following set (3rd set), the clock for Team A froze again but this time it was frozen at 36 seconds. This time the female archer had started the shot and was at full draw when this happened. The judge, this time also, did not interfere with the shooting and let the archer complete her shot. The clock came to life from 26 seconds and the archer had just completed her shot at that point. The Judge interfered at that point, stopping the match – with the male archer yet to shoot his arrow and communicated the problem to the DOS. The DoS and the Judge decided to go on with the sequence and complete the last arrow for team A. Was their decision correct? Had you been the Judge would you have reacted differently?*

Discussion on case study 1:

1A. No, the action of the judge was not correct, the judge should have stopped the match, because there might be an issue with the archer shooting out of time. Try to stop the archer from shooting. Talk to the archer directly, but do not shout. If the archer does not react and shoots, the arrow is valid. Because if he shoots, he should not be penalized, since he had no information about the time.

B. Yes, the decision of the jury was correct.

C. Yes, the judge's reaction was correct. In this case, there is no need to stop the match, because there are 30 seconds left and there is no issue with shooting out of time. The archer is at full draw, so let him shoot his arrow.

A question was raised if this is consistent with the latest case study in the newsletter. We came to the conclusion that we will make the following proposal for changing the rule in Book 3, 13.7.2:... unless the time when the timing stopped is known, then the exact time will be given, if it is more than 20 seconds per arrow. There was a consideration if we could use another judge for only watching the clock.



Case studies – Group discussions

- 2.** *During a mixed team alternate shooting match, the target judge at the blind was calling the arrow values which were being recorded by the scoring judge. Once the 3rd arrow of the 2nd team was shot, the judge with the scorer and agents would stand up in formation to walk out when the buzzer is sounded after the 4th arrow is shot. Once the last arrow was shot the Target Judge called it a 10, though it was clearly a 9. They went to score at the target and this mistake amazingly was not discovered. The arrow was kept as a 10. After the match was over, the analysis of the arrow holes on the target highlighted the fact that this error had occurred. Luckily there was no alteration of the set score and hence there was no protest.*
- A.** *As a target Judge what action do you deem necessary to avoid recurrence of such incidence?*
- B.** *As a blind-in charge (or deputy chairman) how would you resolve the situation? Is there any specific duty or process for the blind in charge towards ensuring correct scoring?*

Discussion on case study 2:

A. Proposals:

- Open up a new radio channel so that the results team can hear the values in an instant
- Don't do pre-scoring, but do the whole scoring at the targets
- The scoring judge (or scorer) should repeat the scores to the target judge
- Put better equipment in the blinds to pre-score
- Better train the agents
- Target judges need to be more focused and check what is entered in the scorecards. Emphasis was made on the need for the Target judge to check the scores entered against what is on the target. The scorers are not always judges, and the ultimate responsibility for the results on the scorecard must be held by the Target Judge, who is World Archery's appointed official to do this job.

- B. It was said that the deputy should make his own notes as a way to double-check.
- 3.** *In a mixed team gold medal match, the last archer of Team A was at full draw when the buzzer sounded indicating that time has ended, and he did not shoot the arrow. Mistakenly the Line Judge showed a red card to Team A. The target judge at the blind could not see the red card and was not aware of it. When scoring commenced the Line judge informed on the radio that there was a red card. The Target judge was confused because she did not see a "late" arrow hit the target, and asked the line judge to repeat the message. Luckily the Chair of the Judge Commission had seen the incident and interfered to clarify that the red card was not valid.*
- Had the chairman not been around, how could this difference of opinion between the line judge who made a mistake and the line judge be solved before the scores could be confirmed?*
 - How much does a mistake like this one damage the image of judges in general?*
 - What action would you, as another member of the judges' commission, expect from your chairman or deputy when mistakes like this one are made by a judge?*
 - Based on your experience, how could mistakes like this one be prevented?*

Discussion on Case Study 3:

3. a) As a judge, you must be more focused. Here are two situations to prevent. When you know the rules, the first mistake could have been prevented easily. But if the target judge does not understand why a penalty is being requested by the line judge when no arrow hit the target after the three beeps, he should ask several times why the line judge gave a red card. Communication between the two judges is vital.
- b) Yes, it damages our image, we do not seem to know the rules. If one judge makes a mistake, people tend to generalize it. Most of our judges are good, but if just one makes a mistake, everyone's image is unfortunately damaged.
- c) We expect the chairman to be around, and to discuss the issue with the judge concerned. This discussion should be a valuable opportunity for the judge to learn from the mistake. It may be necessary for the judge not to have a new duty for the next couple of hours or during the session in which the mistake was made.
- d) Better preparation before the event. The judges need to study and get ready.

Second day: Case study discussions.

- 4.** *At the beginning of a Field Championship (Qualification Round Day 1) as the competitors are waiting for the start signal at their assigned post, 3 archers on Target 6 shot their arrows before the time signal was given. After shooting, they heard the start signal & proceeded to collect their arrows, return to the shooting peg and reshoot the target. Once shot for the second time, they scored the second set as a valid end. An archer from Target 5 observed the whole incident and informed the judge. The judge decided that because the first end was shot before the start signal was given, hence the 2nd set of scores will be valid. Was the Judge's decision ok? If you were the Judge involved how would you handle the situation?*

Discussion on case study 4:

4. No, the decision of the judge was not ok. We take the scores of the first end, when we can see the holes for 20 cm and 40 cm. For bigger faces, we can see by the score card, and for the remaining holes, we give the same score to all, namely the three lowest. In field, we do not react to shooting before the time like in target archery. You can compare this situation to shooting more arrows than allowed, e.g. 5 arrows instead of three.

The Field Committee and the Judges' Committee agree on this procedure.

- 5.** *In a team match play with alternate shooting there were 12seconds left in the clock for Team B. In a hurry, Archer 3 of Team B crosses the 1m line early. The judge raised the yellow card and signaled a time penalty but the team ignored the card and they continued shooting. Time ran out and the archer released the arrow after the "stop shooting" sound signal was given. What will be the penalty for Team B be in this case, if any? How will the procedure be handled?*

Discussion on case study 5:

5. The judges have two different opinions on that case:

It is only one mistake: 9 judges (only one penalty to be applied).

Two mistakes: the rest (two penalties – first violation not respecting the yellow card and cross the line with the intention to shoot. Second violation shooting out of time.)

The judges committee will request an interpretation from the target committee in this regard. .

- 6.** *At a World Cup Final Compound Gold Medal match, the last end, Archer A shot his second arrow which became a hanging arrow from the bottom of the 7-point scoring zone: a bad shot. His first arrow was a 10. While Archer B was getting ready to shoot his second arrow, he noticed Archer A talking to the judge about stopping the match and deal with the hanging arrow. The judge stopped the match and had the target judge and agents score both arrows for Archer A, removed the hanging arrow and re-started the match for the remaining arrows. At the end of the match, archer A was the winner by one point. So, Archer A's coach protested saying there is no equipment failure at finals and there was only 1 arrow left to shoot on Archer A's face and the chances of hitting the hanging arrow was very low. He argued that stopping the match including Archer A talking to the judge before archer B shot his second arrow caused disturbance to his archer, and as the pace of match stopped, his archer shot bad causing him to lose. Was the judge correct to stop the match?*

Discussion on case study 6:

6. There is no stop for bouncers in the rules, and for hanging arrows we follow the same procedure.

- 7.** *In an event the following happened and was witnessed by the DoS; an archer – maybe not quite satisfied with his shooting – was a little bit energetic as he pulled an arrow from his quiver, and thereby managed to hook on to another arrow that flew directly onto the field beyond the 3m-line. Do you consider this arrow shot – or not shot.*

Discussion on case study 7:

7. In this case, common sense has to be applied, the arrow is considered not shot.

- 8.** *An archer turned up for equipment inspection with wraps of his arrows, wraps that reached down the arrow shaft 25cm. His arrows were of X10 type with quite a small diameter. What is your action – if any?*

Discussion on case study 8

8. There is a recent rule change that says that the maximal length of arrow wraps is 22cm. This change in the wording of the rule in comparison with the previous wording is not very clear, and does not specify whether the 22 cm limit applies to all arrows, or only to those whose diameter is 9.3 mm. The Judges' Committee will request an interpretation.

- 9.** *At the end of the qualification round at a World Championship some archers were especially told by the announcer that they might have a shoot-off in the compound class, and should remain on the field. However, it took some time before the results were confirmed and it was noted that a shoot-off would take place, as 4 archers should compete for 3 places. The shoot-off was announced but only 3 archers were present at the shooting line.*

At the same time a judge noticed that the missing archer was about to leave the field on her way to the bus, and he told her that she should have a shoot-off. The 4th archer then rushed back to the shoot-off area and was given some minutes to re-set her bow and pick up her equipment.

- (a) *Should the judge have told her to come back for the shoot off?*
- (b) *Should the shoot-off have continued without any consideration for the missing 4th archer, with the consequence that the missing archer be declared a no show and thus the loser of the shoot-off?*
- (c) *If you consider that only three archers were present, would you let the archers shoot the "shoot-off"?*

What do you think?

Discussion on case study 9:

- (a) No, judges do not need to do that.
- (b) No, there should not be a shoot-off, it is the same as a forfeit match. The forfeit is declared when the match starts, e.g. when the decision on who shoots first is made.
- (c) No, there is no need for a shoot-off in this case.

10. *You are the Line Judge during the semi-final match of the women's team event at the World Outdoor Championship in which Team A and Team B are shooting alternately. The match is being controlled by electronic timer and acoustic signal. The DOS sounds two beeps for the archers to prepare themselves, followed by a single beep, at which point the first archer from Team A steps to the line, shoots and returns back to the team box, the second archer moves to the line and shoots her arrow, she too immediately returns back to the team box, allowing the third archer to release the third arrow. As the archers of Team A have shot their first three arrows and are now all in the team box, team B proceed to start shooting, however they realize that their countdown clock has not started and they immediately draw this to your attention as they stopped shooting. You also notice that the countdown clock for team A, had failed to count down during the first three arrows of Team A, and the clock indicates that there are still 120 seconds remaining.*

How would you deal with this situation?

Discussion on case study 10:

10. Talk to the DOS and give team A 60 seconds for their remaining arrows.

11. In a men's team event simultaneous shooting, the teams had lined up before start. When you as a judge walked down the line to check the pairing and byes, you realized that one team had a lady among their archers. You pointed out that this was not legal, upon which the coach explained that one of their male archers was ill and they did not have more male archers. However they very much would like to shoot the team event. When you insisted on the lack of legality, they concluded that then they would use only two archers for the event.

What do you say then?



Discussion on case study 11:

11. A team is composed of three archers. If there are fewer than three, the team is not present, and they lose by forfeit.

12. During an end of shooting at a WA 1440 Star event where archers are shooting 3 arrows in 2 minutes there is a technical failure after 1 min 37 seconds and the traffic lights go out. The clock, however, continues to display and count down the time. At the conclusion of the end the DoS blows a whistle when there are still 2 archers on the line with arrows to shoot. The archers appeal, stating the lights went out and they should have had their 30 second warning and demand 40 seconds to shoot their final arrow. Do you allow the arrows to be shot?

Discussion on case study 12:

12. No, because the archers have information on the time left, so they are not allowed to shoot the arrows.

13. During a team elimination match, simultaneous shooting, a judge is standing about 1 meter behind the 1 m line to be able to observe the teams crossing the one meter line. One of coaches approaches the judge and tells him to move back because he is hindering his team. The judge refuses to move and as a result the team insists on standing right in front of the judge, effectively blocking his view of the one-meter line. How would you have handled this situation? What do you think of this action of the team?

Discussion on case study 13:

13. The judge should position himself where he can see the line, not necessarily in the teams' area. As a judge you step back, because you do not want to disturb the teams. In this case, it is different, because they are rude to the judge. Advice: Let's avoid that. Step back. Be there during warm-up so you see how the teams rotate.

14. During a big junior archery event there is a good atmosphere on the stands with lots of groups cheering for their favorites, quite loudly. One archer has problems in receiving guidance from his coach and thus leaves the shooting line now and then during shooting to shortly discuss something with his coach, then returning to the shooting line. How would you react?

Discussion on case study 14:

14. No reaction. First of all: observe. If it is disturbing, talk to the coach and tell him to be careful to not disturb the other archer.

15. A series of sound signals are suddenly given in the middle of an end because a dog is entering into one side of the large field. All archers stopped shooting. However, one archer realized that the dog is far away from his target, so he shoots his last arrow of that end while the shooting is "on hold". How would you handle this?

Discussion on case study 15:

15. It is not up to the archer to decide if he shoots or not. But when he shoots, it is a shot out of time. Warn the archer.

*16. You are called to a target because one of the archers at that target started to withdraw the arrows before scoring. He was stopped in doing so by the other archers on that target, but he had already withdrawn two arrows not belonging to him. There were several unmarked holes in the target face, and the archer did not recall exactly the value of the arrows but indicated that they might have been in the yellow area.
How would you deal with the problem?*

Discussion on case study 16:

16. Most of the judges agree that you get the highest score if they belong to one archer. If they belong to two different archers, they both get the highest value (benefit of the doubt).

After feedback on the initial test (3 judges got 100%) there was the suggestion that in the finals, another judge should take care of the coach so that he does not leave his box. This may be the same additional judge who can be checking that the timers are showing the correct time.

At 10:30 the participants took the timed tests, consisting in 123 questions, five of which dealt with Field and 3D rules.



Timed test

After the lunch break Graham Potts talked about E-Learning for judges.

E-Learning

The World Academy of Sport is a Sports Education Company that WA wants to deliver E-Learning for judges. E-Learning is a complementary way of learning theory.

The reason to introduce this is to have more time during seminars and conferences for practical sessions. The items to be included initially are:

- Venue Equipment and Inspection
- Athlete Equipment and Inspection
- Competition structure and shooting
- Scoring
- Penalties

More modules will be developed at a later stage, including 3D, Field and Para-archery.

How will it work? After a Login, there are training modules with pictures, videos, hyperlinks to the rule books and an exam module before advancing to the next module. In case of new rules, it can be easily updated. There may be a possibility to translate the contents into other languages, and access to continental judges may be given.

It is in the developing stage at the moment, but will be ready for testing by the end of this year.

Para-Archery

Indranil Datta then made a presentation on Para-Archery.

First, he talked about the different classes and said that there is a classifiers' manual according to which the archers are assigned to classes. For example, W1 is treated as recurve with exceptions (draw weight, peep sights not allowed, level device not allowed, release aid permitted, full target). The classification is made by WA-approved classifiers. The rules say that the classification card can be shown at an event in electronical form.

For wheelchairs, there are special rules about the back support. We agreed to raise an interpretation for clarification on the measurement of the additional 100mm side support for para W1 archers. The picture in the rule book shows it from the back of the chair but the normal procedure has been from the front of the frame. And in such cases where the wheel chair curves in and reached the mid of the torso, if we start measuring from there, it is an unfair advantage. The Para Committee has been already informed about it but a ruling or interpretation is yet to be received about this.

A wheelchair archer in non-para events has to show his classification card because he has an assistive device the others do not have.

At the equipment inspection, the judges can ask the classifiers about the devices if they are in doubt. The classifiers have to be there for the equipment inspection but they cannot interfere.

Then Indranil talked about the rounds. There was the question when there is a shoot-off in the W1 division, are we looking for 2 arrows in the ten or in the X? It needs clarification. The Judges' Committee will request an interpretation in this regard.

Exchange with Chris Marsh

Following that, WA Events Director Chris Marsh joined us and addressed various matters.

- Falco Eye: will be used until the end of 2020. WA is working on a camera-based alternative system.
- Script: There are microphones for judges now because a judge is part of the show. Now, the audience sees that the judge is in control of the match.
- Coaches' boxes: The boxes will be made taller to prevent coaches from stepping out.
- Telescopes: WA will provide telescopes with microphones for the coaches in the finals.
- Athletes' monitors: there will be no athletes monitors any more.

Judges' Commission Chairpersons

Later on, Sergio talked about the role of the Chairperson. The Committee wants to encourage new and younger judges to be CoJ.

As a chairperson, you have to deal with WA staff, the organizers, archers, coaches and officials. A chairperson needs special skills for identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the judges, and to create confidence among the judges commission.

Some of the tasks of the chairperson are:

- Providing as much information as possible.
- Discussing procedures every day, but making meetings too long.
- Giving constant feedback.
- Preparing for the team managers meeting e.g. address that agents should be knowledgeable, etc.
- Coordinating procedures with the Results Team and the Events Manager.
- Assigning specific tasks to the deputy.
- Giving a final assessment to each judge.
- Combining judges in groups considering their experience.
- Attaching importance to the Friday evening rehearsals before the finals.
- Submitting concrete and useful reports.

A question as raised if the CoJ should also include equipment issues (with pictures) in the CoJ reports. The answer is yes, we need to share as much information as possible.

Various matters

At the end of the conference we discussed several issues:

- Athletes' uniforms: who is to check the uniforms of the teams as they prepare to enter the Finals Field of Play: the marshal, or should there be a judge assigned?
- Mixed teams: uniforms for both members and the coach should be the same.
- Team Managers' booklet: the CoJ can contribute to the TM booklet, it is sent around about 1 or 2 weeks before the event by the WA-Events Director.
- High or unsafe draw techniques are also reported to the development department so they can raise it with the MA involved.
- Mixed teams' uniforms should be mentioned in the TMM (same for quality of agents used in the finals).
- Does water (raindrops) in a compound scope or peep constitute an equipment failure? No, something should be broken in order to qualify as an equipment failure. An interpretation on what an equipment failure is will be requested.

- The Jury of Appeal members will have a separate accreditation card which will allow them to be on the FOP (but should not be coaching their team when they are on the FOP as Jury member)
- Regarding the number of officials on the FOP, there is the consideration if the rules should be changed so that we can have one coach per athlete (a maximum of 4 etc.).

After that, the judges committee thanked all the participants for their attendance and wished them a safe journey home.



3. IJc and YJ seminar in Lausanne, SUI

An International Candidate and Youth Judge Seminar was held in Lausanne, on September 28-30. It was conducted by WAJC Members Sabrina Steffens and Robert Erica, who were joined by International Judge Graham Potts as a presenter.



Thirty-three participants attended the lectures and practical sessions. As a result of their scores in the exam and their contribution to the seminar discussions, the following have been accepted as International Judge Candidates or Youth Judges:

International Judge Candidates:

Helmut POELL	(AUT)	Bettina KRATZMUELLER	(AUT)
Anthony HILLAIRET	(FRA)	Aslihan UNSAL	(TUR)
Robert POTTS	(GBR)	Nataliya RODIONOVA	(UKR)
Pry EKHOLM	(FIN)	Rolf VOLUNGHOLEN	(SWE)
Liz PEREZ	(MEX)	Barry BROPHY	(IRL)
Nasrin GASHGHAEI	(IRI)	Niko YLIPELKONEN	(FIN)
Christoph SCHILLINGER	(AUT)	Christina TIFLIDOU	(GRE)
Marleen KROEDERS	(NED)		

Youth Judges:

Zahra FAHIM	(IRI)	Ana Luiza DE MESQUITA	(BRA)
Niels BUITENHUIS	(NED)	Logan ANDREW	(NZL)
Taavo ALLIK	(EST)	Iriati ZURBANO	(ESP)
Oda BEER-MOLSLETT	(NOR)	Shannon RUSSEL-COWAN	(GBR)
Arata AMAMIYA	(JPN)	Nanaka MATSUYAMA	(JPN)



A practical session in the IJC and YJ seminar in Lausanne

4. News from our Continental Judges Committees

WORLD ARCHERY EUROPE - CONTINENTAL JUDGES SEMINAR

On November 16 - 18th a seminar for WAE CJ was organized at the premises of the German Shooting and Archery Federation at Wiesbaden, Germany. 24 candidates from 15 countries attended the seminar. All did a pre-seminar test before they could finally register. Participants were welcomed by Mr. Klaus Lindau, representative of the DSB and chairman of the archery division of the DSB.

The seminar was run by WAE Judge Committee members Jean Martens (BEL), Luca Stucchi (ITA) and Klaus Lykkebaek (DEN). On Saturday they were joined by Mrs. Sabrina Steffens, member of WAE EB and our liaison with WAE.

During the first 2 days the members of the JC delivered different presentations on the current archery rules. The candidates discussed case studies and went through a practical session on scoring.

On the third day the candidates took an exam. This time the exam consisted of two parts. The first part was a "Closed book" set with 53 questions, while the second part was an "Open book" test with 5 case studies upon which the participants must give their opinion of how they would solve the described situations.

From the 24 candidates, 17 of them passed and gained the status of WAE CJ



Seminar participants in Wiesbaden, Germany

WORLD ARCHERY AMERICAS -CONTINENTAL JUDGES' RE-ACCREDITATION PROCESS

World Archery Americas conducted their Continental Judges re-accreditation process. 59 judges took the exam, and 47 of them were re-accredited. The exam was very similar to the one the International Judges and Judge Candidates sat in the last few days. The Continental Judges who were re-accredited come from 14 countries in the Americas.



Continental Judges Andrew Neville (USA), Christiane Murphy (CAN) and Fernando Wolff (BRA) wear the World Archery Americas Judges' uniform at a Para WRE in Salt Lake City.

5. Replies to Case studies N°96

96.1 A recurve archer shows up at an equipment inspection **at a local shoot** with a string with two knots about 10 cm from each of the loops. The knots are made with the same string, probably to shorten it. Would you allow these knots?

Most of the judges who replied agreed that the rules refer only to attachments to the string (i.e. one attachment is permitted to serve as lip or nose mark), and that the bowstring will not assist in aiming. The knots are not attachments, but are part of the string as such.

Therefore the knots are allowed. Some of our judges suggested to advise the archer not to use the knots at future tournaments, as it is possible that some judges (hopefully not international) may consider the knot illegal.

96.2 An archer shot an arrow which broke into 3 pieces, 1 piece ended up behind the shooting line, 1 piece fell at her feet and the other piece ended up 20 meters out front. The judge allowed her to shoot another arrow by the wording of rule 12.5.1. Was the judge's decision correct or incorrect?

There were split opinions here, but the majority of the judges quoted rule 12.5.1, especially to the phrase ...a part of the arrow shaft lying within the shooting line and the 3m line. This rule does not say it has to be the complete arrow. It is true that if a portion of the arrow was found 20 meters in front of the line, there must have been some actual shooting here, but since another part is in the 3m area, the archer is entitled to shooting another arrow.

96.3 Are these two items considered camouflaged?"



As regards the feathers, most judges would not consider them to incorporate camouflage. The colouring is slightly irregular, but it does not look like causing a camouflage effect, and does not certainly resemble the most common camouflage patterns you can find if you browse on the internet.

The vast majority of the judges said the riser is not a case of Camo. Two of our judges gave the following explanations, which certainly summarize the reasons for their answers:

(1) Under the interpretation on the definition of Camo, issued in January 2016, abstract designs or multi colours which are not in a camouflage pattern are allowed. I would accept this as being an abstract design, and thus not considered as Camo.

(2) From the picture, I would not consider this a camo but more a modern decorative style. It is not a standard camo pattern in an unusual colour.

CAMOUFLAGE IS STILL A VERY SUBJECTIVE AREA, AND THERE ARE MANY GRAY-ZONE DESIGNS. JUDGES: AVOID MAKING ONE-JUDGE DECISIONS ON DIFFICULT CAMO CASES. DISCUSS EACH CASE WITH OTHER JUDGES IN YOUR COMMISSION BEFORE YOU RULE AN ITEM OUT.

6. New Case Studies

97.1 In an individual recurve cadet match at 60 meters, the judge finds out that at the end of the fifth end the score shown on the flip boards and the score card is 4 set points for each archer. When the judge checks more closely, he realizes that in the third set, archer A has three blanks in the scorecard for that set, while archer B shows 8, 7, and 7. Archer B does not show 2 set points for that set in his scorecard. When the judge asks why, archer B says that archer A had an equipment failure and had to replace his bow limbs during that set, and was not able to shoot any of his arrows. They did not enter any scores because both archers thought Archer A would get time to shoot his three arrows due the equipment failure. What would you do if were the judge here?

97.2 The 1/16 Elimination Round for compound men has concluded. All scorecards were totaled and signed by the archers. The announcer calls the names of all the archers shooting the 1/8 with their respective target numbers. When the whistle to start the 1/8 is blown archers A and B (in the same match) walk to the line. Archer B shoots one arrow. Unexpectedly, the archer who shot the 1/16 match versus archer B walks to the shooting line, and tells archer B that the results announced are wrong, and that archer B has to leave the line and allow his previous opponent to shoot the 1/8 match. Archer B is confused and stops shooting. When the two minutes are up, the judge gets radio confirmation that the results announced were correct, and that archer B was actually the winner of the 1/16 match. Archer A shot three arrows, archer B shot only one because of the incident. What would you do as a judge here?

97.3 In a recurve women's team match the score is 4 set points for each team at the end of the fourth set. A shoot-off is necessary. Both teams start shooting simultaneously and do not notice that the clock started counting down from 120 seconds, instead of 60. The judge does not realize either. The members of Team A are able to shoot their three arrows in the first 60 seconds, but the third archer of Team B shoots her arrow 13 seconds after the first 60. There was no action from the judge at any time during the 73 seconds. When this last archer shot her arrow, team A complained that she had shot out of time. When the judge went to the targets, he deducted the highest score for team B, which caused this team to lose the match. An appeal came from team B.

- Was the judge's decision to deduct the highest score correct?
- What would your decision be if you were part of the Jury at this event?

97.4 More on camouflage. Would you allow the following items?

97.4.1



97.4.2



Replies to the case studies should be sent to sderiaz@archery.org before 15 January 2019

11. Pictures of recent Judges Commissions



Hyundai World Cup Stage 4, Berlin



Youth Olympic Games in Buenos Aires