

championships scene in Riom. Zelma has been an outstanding "winning" Junior for many years. Why not? Look at her coach (her mom).

We will see a lot more of this gracious and charming young lady in the future.

I ask that any of our readers who can offer other examples please send them to me with the proper details

THE NEW JUDGE UNIFORMS HAVE ARRIVED

They consist of

- Polo shirt
- Sweater
- Pants
- Rain Jacket
- Rain Pants

The uniforms will be distributed by the FITA office on advise of the FITA Judge Committee. They cannot be purchased separatly and only one set will be send for each judge. They are made by Descente.



FITA JUDGE COMMITTEE NEWSLETTER

Fédération Internationale de Tir à l'Arc
INTERNATIONAL ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE #56

AUGUST 2000

The attendants at the Judge Training Seminar (and three of the teachers) held in Antalya: the new candidates appointed are the 4th(Mankhanov), 7th(Andersen), 9th (Galeyrand) and 10th (Villy) from the left.



From Your Chairman

FITA International Judge Conference 2001 – Beijing (China)

We are planning the organization of an International Judge Conference for next year. According to the majority opinion of the judges that attended the past conference in Riom 1999, the next conference should be scheduled immediately after the FITA Congress 2001 in Beijing.

The conference will not be hosted by the Organizing Committee of the World Championship as happened in the past; the FITA Executive Committee decided that it is up to FITA to organize the conference and not up to the goodwill of the organizing committee. A participation fee will be asked to each of the judges, the amount will be determined later but it should cover approximately half cost of the accommodation.

In order to finalize the organization of this conference and to prepare the budget for it, we need to know the number of judges willing to attend.

Therefore you are invited to return not later than October 15, 2000 the enclosed preliminary registration form. Address the filled form via fax, mail or e-mail to the FITA Office. The final registration form will follow in due time.

Supervisors of the Judge Candidates

According to our present rules (reported below), a supervisor has to be

assigned by the Judge Committee to each Judge Candidate when he is appointed to serve in a major international event. His report will be considered when the candidate will be evaluated to upgrade to the full judge status.

Obviously, we need to know the composition of the Judge Commission in order to do that.

I have asked the Continental liaisons to send me information about the JC composition as soon as they appoint a candidate in the events under the control of the continental association.

For events where the judges are appointed by FITA, the FITA Judge committee will handle this appointment.

I would like to thank all of you for the co-operation in this evaluation.

Book 1 - Appendix 3

4.3 Applicants successfully completing and passing the seminar examination will remain Judge candidates for a least two years, in any case until they serve at International events recognized by FITA and where International Judges are in control.

4.4 At each such event the Judge Committee will assign the candidate to a senior accredited International Judge who will be required to submit a report to the committee on the candidate

Gian Piero Spada

Chairman FITA Judge Committee

José and Rosalia attended several National and International Judge seminars through the years until they both became International Judge candidates in 1995. They are present at almost every National and International event in Mexico and often bring their children to help with scoring and other vital tasks.

Aurora Breton and daughter Zelma

Aurora Breton and Daughter Zelma just after Zelma won the open round at the Olympic Festival in Mexico in May, 2000

AURORA BRETON, of Mexico.

Best FITA 1293 (When that meant something!)

Few in the history of our sport can match her involvement and contribution.

Participated in four Olympic Games

Munich - 1972, Los Angeles - 1984, Seoul - 1988, Barcelona - 1992,

Participation in World Championships York-1971, Interlaken -1975, Canberra - 1977,

Long Beach, 1983- Kracaw, **Participation in Champ. of the Americas**

- Acapulco, Mexico, 1972, - San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1974, - Valley Forge, 1976, - Rio de Janeiro, 1978, Melgar, 1980,

Participation in Panamerican Games - San Juan, 1979, - Caracas, 1983- Indianapolis 1987, Santiago de Cuba, 1991, Bronze Individual

Aurora also shot in most every other major Archery event in the Americas in those years. A truly great lady and friend.

ZELMA NOVELO, Her daughter

Best FITA 1290

She appeared for the first time on World



many years He served on and survived the terrible World Field



Championships in Margraten. He worked at several World Target and Field Championships, and two Olympic Games (in 1984 and 1988) and will serve as Judge in Sydney in 2000. John is a truly base stone of Fita judging

Susanne Womersley became a national Judge in her homeland of Austria in 1986 and immigrated to Australia in 1988 Where she married John. Australia accepted her National Judge status at that time and she became as involved with judge development as John had before her.

She was subsequently named National Judge Chairman. I am proud to say she patterned her newsletter, case studies programme, and it looks like most of her basic programmes after our International Fita Judge Format. I take that as a personal compliment. In 1996 she organized and ran a very successful International Judge seminar with the capable assistance of her husband John. I was the head instructor there and in spite of having to organize everything from meals to transportation, she also took the seminar and became an International Judge candidate with very high marks. Susanne was upgraded to International Judge Status at the Judge Committee meeting prior to Congress in Riom in 1999.

I was just in Mexico for their Olympic Festival which was also a World Ranking Tournament and two came to mind. We had a fine husband and wife team working there.

José Herrera and Eva Rolalia Olmos



Sleepy judges?

by Morten B. Wilmann

This headline is of course only meant to draw your attention to an issue our Committee want to stress; When do the judges need to be on the field in the morning of the competition days?

The background of this question is the fact that nowadays we have a practice period of approx. 45 minutes (+ approx. 15 min. break) before the actual competition starts, and many judges question the need of being on the field before and during the practice.

We would like to settle the following standard; the judge shall be there on time to do the necessary control before practice starts, during practice and before the actual competition.

There may have been some changes during the evening and night, by accident or poor behaviour - but even more important is it to observe the practice shooting (and archers equipment) and prevent possible problems, or handle questions that might arise. In this way you may avoid cases that later on would lead to Jury matters, or in other ways seriously delay the competition. So, get up in the morning, you have a job to do.....

Attitude of Judging

by Morten B. Wilmann

During discussions (of case studies and around the coffee tables) I often get the feeling that we still have some "roads to walk" in order to be consistent in our attitude as judges, not only thinking about having judges acting in the same way, but also re a consistent action as individuals (from situation to situation).

I am of course talking about our basic "helping attitude" in order to assist the archer in trouble when he is a victim of circumstances he cannot influence. During the latest years I have seen and experienced several occasions re timing and signal errors putting an archer (or archers) into unexpected problems.

The classic case is when the timing is correct (4 min) but the archer didn't get a proper warning signal and lost his control of timing.

Some judges seem to believe that the timing (4 min) is superior to the warning signal ("because this is only a warning").

However, the rules do not say that. Some archers are using the warning signal as a shooting "trigger" for their last arrow, and may claim to have the right of a correct warning (the rules say there shall be a 30 sec visual warning signal).

The time rule (4 min in this example) is there to make an efficient tournament, and must be fairly handled for all. Therefore, if an archer uses more time, he is penalized. But this is, of

course, to prevent someone from taking an advantage over the other competitors. Archers, however, who are victims of organizers equipment failure, are not in this category. This is more like a personal equipment failure (then you get extra time).

Never forget your basic questions:

- did the archer try to get an advantage
- did he get an advantage (i.e. compared with a traditional equipment failure).

Normally your answer would be “no” and you would give the archer time to shoot the remaining arrow(s).

To make a decision!

by Morten B. Wilmann

Sometimes it strikes me that judges do not want to make decisions. They avoid taking positions in cases and refer them to the Jury of Appeal, and thus - in many ways - keep their path clean by their silence or by their strict interpretation (punitive?) of the rules. Thus they might be defending themselves more than defending the rights of the archer. I would like to use a case to enlighten the issue, perhaps to create a debate on our future role as judges. The case has a base in reality, but I have made some changes to stress the point.

During a championship the timer and light didn't work during one end (was accidentally unplugged) on one side of the field.

The shooting went on, and one archer did not reach to shoot one of his arrows before the DOS signalled end of 4 min. He approaches the judge close by, referring to the fact that no signals were given. The judge advised him of the possibility of appealing to the Jury. The archer, however, belonging to a small team without a non-shooting coach/TC, did eventually not do this and continued concentrating on the shooting, accepting the loss of an arrow. For sure we know that the coach/TC from the stronger teams would have appealed, possibly with a positive result since the other timer on the field would be difficult to see from this archer's position.

My question is; Would it be better judging to acknowledge the archers problem caused by circumstances outside his control, and - possibly after a short discussion among judges (or at least with the chairman) - to give him the possibility to shoot and score this arrow?

I am quite sure if the archer did not shoot at all, using the red flag to call a judge to inform him of the field equipment failure, you would have given him 40 sec per arrow without question. Is there a big difference?

lose it? Even with the new rule it is more than 4 metres below his position?

- The Judge must also be a teacher

This is a vital duty of a Judge. Our rules and our interpretations of the rules change so often that many times an archer has not been given full information by their club or Member Association on “current rules.” Yes, it is easy to say, (and sadly some Judge do say), “Well that is their fault not mine.” But in doing so are you doing your job of “being a servant to the competition.” I think not!

In a simple statement. “Any time you as a Judge are able to save an archer from making a mistake that could cost him points and providing you do not interfere with other archers by doing so, you must help them. Example: An archer is preoccupied with something and fails to realize it his turn to shoot. Simply and quietly say if you notice, “It is your turn to shoot.” Again I will not give other specific situations because they could be applied as a rule and blindly enforced. You must analyze the problem at that time and insure fair application of the rules. The job is not easy, but a concerned Judge doing a good job is vital to Fita.

For many years in my active judging career I always tried to have a small meeting with the scorers to insure they knew their jobs. In a per-

fect world this should have been done by the O/C but is often missed and some times new O/Cs who have never run such an event do not have the experience to properly direct the scorers. You have! Be a teacher and a helper. Your job is to help the O/C and the DoS in any way possible. Yes, if a time and personnel problem exists, even helping them move butts and change targets. “It is not my job” some say. Who said so? A Judge's job is to make the event run smoothly and without interruption. Please each of you, “re-think” your responsibility to archery. I do constantly.

Families in Archery

By Don Lovø

I intend to do a series of articles over the next few issues on “Families in Archery”, parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters etc. who work together to make our sport better.

John and Susanne
Womersley

John Womersley became a Fita Judge in 1979 and has been vitally involved in the development of Judging in Australia since the beginning of their Judging programme. He formed the National Judges committee He wrote their first manual, etc. etc.

John was (is) a much respected International Field judge for

in handcuffs and will probably be sent to jail overnight. We do not want our children killed by such reckless behavior!

One morning a policeman stopped a speeding motorist in a school zone and found he was under the influence of alcohol and forthwith sent him to jail. That was the rule of procedure.

Two hours later the same policemen stopped a second car going even faster and found that the driver had just come upon a very bad traffic accident and was rushing a very badly injured child to the hospital. The child was laying unconscious and bleeding on the back seat. The same speeding rule had been even more seriously broken, but the situation and intent was much different. I hope none of our Judges would be a policeman who would take this driver to jail in handcuffs. Simply use common sense and take a fair look at the intent and interpretation of the rule. That was his job and that is yours!

I would be wonderful if all rules were as completely objective as is the calling of an arrow in the target (even that has some subjective exceptions). In many other situations a subjective enforcement must be considered.

Example: An archer shot out of sequence and time in match play. But the announcer, over the public address system had loudly and mistakenly called his name as being the next to shoot! Vital seconds were at

stake. The archer was confused by this, afraid he would lose his arrow, so he shot out of order. Do you as his Judge nullify his arrow and lose him the match? Would the Jury do so if it was referred to them?

I can't and won't try to give exact solutions to these examples because it would be dangerous and misleading to do so. Each situation and each circumstance will be different. The Judge must insure at the time a fair interpretation of the rule. Another simple example of common sense. An archer claims a "bounc-out" and you find his arrow sticking firmly in the ground ten metres in front of the target or inversely sticking firmly in a fence thirty meters behind the target. Do you allow him to score a unmarked hole if one is found even though it is clear the arrow never touched the target? We have now added to the rule in 8.6.12.4, but before there was no direction. We had to use common sense. Not always popular or easy!

In Field archery

For years an archer could re-shoot any arrow that fell from his bow if he could touch it with the bow without moving his feet from their position on the line (post) - same as target archery. However in Field Archery, often an archer shoots from a high elevated platform several metres above the ground. (not like in target archery) If he drops his arrow and it falls 4 metres below through a crack in the platform does he lose it? Should he

New Judges

Guillermo Jimenez and Alma Chong.



Alma Chong and Guillermo Jimenez were nominated after a Judge seminar conducted by Sergio Font and Don Lovo in Mexico City in October of 1999. The full new judge Committee met at that time with President Easton and the retiring chairman, Don Lovo. These new candidates were both very active in the recent Olympic Festival in Mexico City. Alma is from Mexico City. Guillermo was the chairman and he will have a very large job at the Championships of the Americas which will take place in his country (Colombia) in August 2000

**Judge Training Seminar
Mexico City, October 1999**
Instructors: Sergio Font, Don Lovo

Guillermo Jimenez, COL
International Judge Candidate
Alma Delia Chong, MEX
Regional Judge Candidate

Judge Training Seminar Antalya, June 2000

Instructors: Gian Piero Spada, Morten Wilmann,
Don Lovo, Per Bolstad.

Stig ANDERSEN, DEN
International Judge Candidate
Jean-Pierre GALEYRAND, FRA
International Judge Candidate
Zorigto MANKHANOV, RUS
International Judge Candidate
Miroslav VILLI,
International Judge Candidate



You be the judge...

Review of Case Studies #55

As always, these responses are only a summary of what our Judges think. They are not firm rules. I give editorial comment only as another Judge.
Don Lovo

Case Study #1 - 55

In a 1/16 elimination match, archer A shoots the first end and due to problems with her equipment misses the target with all of her arrows. Archer B shoots 55 points. Archer A decides not to continue shooting the match and starts taking down her bow.

At the start of the second end, archer B moves to the shooting line and the judge tells her she cannot shoot because she doesn't have an opponent. Archer B is hoping to break the national junior record. Is the judge right in this decision?

It was almost a unanimous opinion that the Judge was wrong and the archer had a right to shoot her arrows.

Higher authorities than the Judges would have to decide later if the score could in fact be considered for records if not shot in actual competition. A few Judges mentioned 7.4.2.5 saying the Judge was correct. The vast opinion however said this rule would be applied before the match began not in the middle of the match. I agree.

*Lets face it, if the Judge would have allowed her to shoot and the World Ranking Committee or some one else officially decided to not allow the score, no damage would have been done. If however the match was stopped by the judge and a later ruling (by Jury if appealed for example) would have allowed the match, the Judge would be "in big trouble". **"Don't look for Trouble."** As I have mentioned many times, never take an archer off the Field or stop them from*

*shooting unless their actions effect the safety of others. Let them shoot and then deal with the matter officially after. "That is the safe and sensible way to work." **Be sensible"***

Case Study #2 – 55

At a Fita 18 Indoors, the rules require that the faces be mounted on the boss with specific distances between them. The Tournament Organiser produced licensed faces which are printed with four columns on one sheet of paper. To comply with the rules this paper must be cut into 2 pieces with 2 columns on each, or cut into 4 with single columns. This would mean one piece of paper with the official licence stamped on it, but not the others.

Are the other pieces of paper legal having no license stamp? I told the questioner that he was "splitting hairs" but the question needs to be asked. I can remember a meeting lasting over 1 hour at The Hague field event discussing a very similar question of faces with no license stamp.

Do our Judges have any comments on this query?

General consensus: The Judges were responsible for checking to see the faces were correct and licensed before the match began. If the face was legal when it was in one piece it is still legal when cut. Don't look for trouble that does not exist.

Case Study #3 - 55

At a local club "Fita Star" shoot, a fairly new archer makes a mistake on the scorecard. He corrects the mistake changing an 8 to a 9. He uses the proper system of correction that a Judge would use but does not involve a

- The Judge is the servant of the competition, "not its master".

When I took over the committee in 1989 we had a bad situation. Every tournament seemed to bring complaints and protests against the Judges. Some were even brought before Congress. Since that time we in the Committee have tried to train the new (and older) Judges that they must serve the competition, not totally control it. The director of shooting is the senior official on the field and the Judges job is to help the DoS insure the event runs smoothly and according to the rules in effect at that time. Here again is a problem which often repeats its self. Judges on occasion do not keep abreast of the changes and interpretations of our constitution and rules and try to enforce a rule which has been changed by a Congress motion. There is no excuse for that other than the Judge not paying attention to the information they receive directly from Fita and a further explanation of which always comes in subsequent Judge Newsletters.

The introduction of the Judge Conferences every two years and the detailed report to the judges which follows was to insure consistent use and interpretation of the rules. Again there is no excuse for this lack of attention by a Judge. I believe the current committee will one day soon require a Fita International Judge to

properly "re-qualify" on a regular basis. That was always on my agenda. I was always aware that a few maintain the "title and badge" without the dedication required of "keeping current." This was often obvious because they did not ever (or seldom) respond to the vital re-training case studies. Our Constitution now makes this mandatory and that was long overdue. It is simply morally wrong to name a Judge to serve the archers who has not "done their home work" and maintained their complete commitment to the honorable position with which they were entrusted.

- The Judge must be "Protective not Punitive"

The main duty of the Judge is "To assist in conducting a smooth running competition and protect the archer and their score." You must make certain that a "level playing" field is insured with equal interpretation and protection for every competitor. This does not in any way mean that you are not required to insure the rules are followed, but you have a great responsibility to insure the purpose and the intent of the rule is enforced. You must make sure that the rule you are going to enforce fits that situation.

I repeat a perfect example, I have used so many times.

In my country a motorist who speeds through a school zone at a high reckless speed is stopped, and often put

Important notice

Please address your case studies replies to the FITA Office in Lausanne that take care of the official data base of the Judges' activity.

FITA
Avenue de Cour 135
CH1007 Lausanne
Switzerland
Fax +41 21 614 30 55
E-mail: fita@worldcom.ch

I remind you that, according to our rules, judges' re-accreditation depends, inter alia, on regularly responding to the training questions.

If you wish you may also send a copy to Don Lovo of your case studies so he can start to work on them promptly for the next newsletter.

Gian Piero Spada
Chairman FITA Judge Committee

BACK TO BASICS

By Don Lovo
Honorary Chairman FITA Judge Committee

I recently received a letter from an old friend and president of a National Association. He was very upset. So am I! The letter read:

"Dear Don. For some reason the International and Regional Judges in my Federation have become a "Police Force" The archers are often afraid of them and become angry with them to the point of it affecting their performance. They are stern, act superior, never offer any suggestive help and unnecessarily penalize the competitors too often. I think they feel they are the masters of the competition and indeed our Federation. It is hurting the growth of Archery in my country and my Federation."

What can I do?"

I am sure all of you who really know me will understand how personally upsetting this letter was for me. Moreover it was hard to believe, because every one of them were my students and had heard me lecture many times on the basic responsibilities of a Judge. What they were accused of doing did not reflect what they were told or how they were initially trained. **What happened?**

I have repeated the basics so often at every seminar (more than 100 in 30 years) I can recite them in my sleep. However repetition of a good thing never hurts so lets **"Go back to basics"**

Duties and responsibility of a Judge

Judge or the other archers on the target.

The correction is noted by the tabulation people when the score card is turned in and the card is turned over to you as a Judge for action.

What would your action as the Judge be?

This seemed so simple I was surprised at the number of different and varied responses received, some very hard - all the way from "Give him a "M" and teach him a hard lesson for tampering with the score card", to " Be a teacher for a new archer and find out what actual value was shot". "Check with others on the target and the other score card if double scoring took place." "Allow the score actually shot and explain the need for a rule in this case. "

The Judge responses were about 50/50 on this question.

*I ask all to read the question again. "Local club shoot"! "new archer"! It even says he "made a mistake on his score card" not on calling the value. The intent of this question was to put matters into proper perspective. **It was not the Olympic Games!** It would have been a fine opportunity for a Judge to Teach, be fair, help a new archer understand the rules and develop a respect for the office of the judge, not teach him a hard lesson and score a lower value that he shot. Those early impressions of our job can effect a new archer for life. Yes, it was safe and simple to take away the 9, but at*

that stage in his archery career was it not sensible to try and find out what he actually shot?

Case Study # 4 – 55

In the finals round, an archer shoots a 10 - 10 - 7. The last arrow, in the opinion of the Judge is shot after the time. He advises the target Judge in the blind to deduct the highest scoring arrow (a 10) .

Is this the correct procedure ?

This was an easy one and I was surprised to find a few Judges missed it. 7.4.2.2 clearly tells us that (with Judges in the blind) you deduct the arrow in question not the highest arrow.

Case Study 5 – 55

When an archer and Judge go to the target to locate an observed bouncer, they find the arrow on the ground in front of the target, On further checking they find two badly damaged arrows in the target face - a 10 and a 7 **As a Judge, how would you handle this situation**

We received many very interesting replies. Many Judges related the situation to "unmarked holes in the target" (7.6.14.4) where the new rule says you score the lowest. "unmarked hole." Should that apply here? I don't think so. What do you do when there are two bouncers on the ground in front of the target and two unmarked holes in the target, a 7 and a 10? We have discussed this for hours at conferences. We give

the archer the benefit of the doubt, a 10, One for sure shot a 10. Tell me how that situation is any different? When you are unable to clearly score the arrow, the archer gets the benefit of the doubt. It is a good rule.



You be the judge...

Case Study #1 – 56

Our rules book tells us that there will be no equipment failure allowed in the “Match Play “ Competition.

The following incident occurs:

Archer “A” in an alternate shooting sequence shooting on the right side of the match has his bow break just as he shooting his arrow. A piece of the limb hits his opponent archer “B” in the head along side of his shooting eye. He is confused and temporarily blinded by tears that form in his eye. The DoS who does not observe the situation, starts archer “B”s timing sequence. The rules now require that he shoot immediately. Obviously he can not see and can’t shoot. The time runs out.

a) You are the Judge controlling this match. **What would be your action at this time.**

b) Let us suppose the problem is not a broken bow but a large insect that

flew into the shooting eye of archer B and also temporarily blinded him. Please again tell us your actions in such a situation?

Case Study #2 – 56:

An archer shoots his arrow and it has exploded. (blown up into pieces) at the moment or release. The forward piece with the point flew 1/2 way to the target (approximately 40 meters) and the balance of the arrow with it’s nock and fletch fell within the 3 meter line.

You are the Judge assigned to that target. Would you consider the arrow shot or “Not shot”?

Case Study #3 – 56

When an archer is shooting at a In-door triple face the following occurs: He shoots four arrows.

Top face —————10 points
Centre face —————7 points

He then shoots two arrows at the bottom face scoring 9 and 8 points.

How will you score that target?

How would you score the target if he had shot four arrows as follows:
Top face —————10 points
Centre face —————7 points
Bottom face —————8 points.
The fourth arrow was a miss outside the scoring area.

Case Study #4 – 56.

An archer during the scoring of a three arrow end is observed by the Judge picking up a fourth arrow behind the target. You become involved. The archer and the other two archers on the target advise you that the arrow had been lost on the previous end.

What would your action be?

Case Study #5 – 56.

An archer goes to the shooting line to shoot with a cellular handphone attached to the belt. He believes it is turned off. Unfortunately it starts ringing just as the archer beside him starts to shoot his final arrow. The archer takes his bow down and calls a Judge, requesting another 40 seconds to shoot the final arrow.

You are the Judge what would your actions be?

Case Study #6 - 56

During a Team finals event at a large International event the following happened.

One team member was unable to complete her three arrows and stepped back across the line with the last arrow in her bow. The other archer took her place and shot her three arrows then the other archer

according to the DoS returned to the line with her arrow in her hand and, well with in the time, shot the final arrow (15 to 20 seconds left on the clock). The National Judge in question said that she returned to the shooting line with the arrow still on the bow. This Judge says he showed her and the coach a yellow card while she was still in the athletes’ box when he saw her with the arrow on her bow. Further questioning of the Judge indicated that in fact he had not given the warning when the archer was in the box but after the archer was on the shooting line. The archer’s coach says he never saw any yellow card. The athlete says she had the arrow in her quiver. The Judge advised the target judge in the blind to remove that team’s highest arrow value. The team lost an arrow and lost the match even though they had shot a higher score. It was immediately appealed.

If you were on the Jury, How would you proceed with the case and what would be your recommendation for a Jury decision?