

JUDGES NEWSLETTER

Fédération Internationale de Tir à l'Arc
INTERNATIONAL ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE #58

DECEMBER 2001



The Conference this year was held for the first time after the Championships on September 23 and 24,. It was done so as to allow the Judges present an opportunity to review all the "normal" rule changes from Congress. Unfortunately, there were very few changes other than to make most of the 160 or more motions into "By-laws" which will be studied by the appropriate permanent committees and then referred to Council for final change.

Only 35 Judges came to China for this Conference and several who had come as commission Judges could not stay because of the time commitment.

This was the lowest number of Judges who ever attended our Conferences which have been going on for 25 years or more, In Victoria we had close to 70 Judges attend.

I think the Judge Committee may have another look at the timing of the Conference. Several of the Judges who came to attend the Congress on September 13 and 14 complained of the huge cost of time and money waiting around for 10 days for the Conference.

Our chairman Mr. Spada had major surgery a short time before and unfortunately could not attend. Morten and Sergio will prepare a separate Conference information for all Judges shortly.

A message from the Chairman of the Judge Committee

Dear Friends.

The Congress in Beijing has modified the rules governing the activity of the Judge Committee. In particular, the procedures for the re-accreditation of the judges and for the selection of the "senior" judges to be appointed at the Olympics and as chairperson of the Judge Commission have been better defined.

Re-appointment at the end of an accreditation period (from a world outdoor championship to the next one) depends on fulfilling the following requirements: (a) regularly responding to the case studies contained in each issue of the Judge Committee Newsletter; (b) regularly responding to all official requests for Judge duty application and making themselves available for at least one Judge duty every two years; (c) returning the "Judge re-accreditation" application sent by the FITA office; and (d) pass a re-accreditation test sent by Judge Committee to all International Judges in the second year of the accreditation period.

Furthermore, special requirements should be fulfilled to be eligible to serve at the Olympic Games or to be appointed as the chairperson of the Judge Commissions at the World Championships and Games: (a) have been accredited for at least 5 years; (b) to be no older than 65 years (although the Judge Committee may consider, in extraordinary cases, older judges); (c) have served in FITA Championships, FITA recognised Games, FITA World Ranking Tournaments or other major events, in the last two years; (d) have responded with high quality replies to the case studies contained in the Newsletter in the last two years; (e) have received a high-level evaluation in the re-accreditation test; (f) have received a high-quality evaluation by the chairman of the Judge Commission or by the Judge Committee Observer in charge of the Championships or Games in which they served in the last two years.

The reasons of these additional requirements are easy to understand: to select the more experienced, updated and constantly trained judges for the more critical positions in FITA judging.

We think that these new rules will improve the image of the International Judges and of FITA Judging.

Gian Piero Spada

Chairman FITA Judge Committee

Notes from your editor on our Case Studies:

I am pleased to tell you that more and more of our good case studies are coming from "Judges in the trenches" (blinds that is). Cases in Newsletter #57 were for the most part submitted by Judges and I was asked by them to "Not change the way I have worded it". I have respected those requests, but that caused some confusion for our Judges in their replies. General observation: "The case study was not clear".

Good examples: Case study #1 - 57: It said "the allowed time ran out". It should have made it clear that "the digital clock time ran out". That would make it easier to arrive at the answers

Case Study 2 - 57 It said: "Archers numbers 63,64,65,66 were all tied". More correctly it should have said, "At the end of the qualification round four archers were tied for 63rd position."

I now feel that it is my editorial responsibility to make sure that all case studies submitted are clear and easy to understand (not always easy to answer, however). So in the future I will make sure they are! Sorry for the confusion. DML



The Judges who served at the World Games in Akita Japan in August 2001.

L to R top row: Frankie Hoong, Derrick Lovell, Tom Green (Chairman) Clifford Bluck, Hector Fuentes, front row L to R: Ron Saar, Don Lovo.

Kataro Hata and the All Japan Archery Federation did a fine job or producing a excellent Field Competition. The were, of course, ably assisted by their T/D Per Bolstad who is as you know, Chairman of the Fita Field Committee.

Tom Green, the Chairman, ran a smooth and organized Judge Commission. He was grateful to have the experience of the "Two Brits" Derrick and Clifford there to Judge. They Judge Field events in the GNAS almost every week I am told. Your editor was really happy to put on a "red shirt" and get back in the trenches (so to speak).

Some funny observations:

€ When I asked an archer, "What is a Judge?", he told me "A Judge is a person that stands in front of my telescope when I want to look through it".

€ When I asked a Judge "What is your Chairman?", he told me that, "My chairman is the person that suddenly appears behind my chair when I go to sleep for a couple of seconds".

Families in Archery

The Lovell's

Usually it is the man who brings the wife into archery. Not so with Trish and Derrick. Trish started in about 1971. Derrick followed her to the range one day and casually commented: "That doesn't look so hard" (foolish words) The fact is he has been trying to beat her every since. After watching Trish shoot and observing the concentration and commitment she gives to her performance (to say nothing of the "results") >>>> I think Derrick should have taken up golf!

Like most really dedicated archers, they have given hundreds of hours to Coaching, Judging, and generally helping with the sport. First at County level but as time went by at "every level"

I first met him at the World Field Championships in England in 1982. He was on the work party that made the event a great success. I think that was my first exposure to John Kember-Smith as well. Don Stamp one of Fita's finest was already a legend and internationally accepted "Field Archery Guru" at that time. Derrick became an International Judge candidate in Cypress in 1993, and has worked all over the World as a Judge since that time, culminating with him being named the Chairman of Judges for the Olympic Archery Games in Sidney in 2000. His first international appointment was in Vertus France a year after he became a Judge. I did not know if he would keep at it, because there he, Pol

Ney and some archers was sprayed for "grape fungus" by an overly zealous local crop duster"

He was always a field archer at heart, and was recognized then and now for his expertise in that discipline. Fita elected him to the Fita Field Committee at about the same time he became a Judge. He, Skip Phillips and the Committee chairman Per Bolstad have helped to made Field a popular and respected part of Fita since that time. I was chairman of Field from 1969 to 1979 and I well recall the problems facing us at that time. After many years of being a Judge Committee chairman and seminar conductor, I went back on the line as a Judge at the World Games in Japan just a couple of months ago and it was a revelation to me. The committee have made Field Archery "user friendly" and I was really pleased to see the respect and camaraderie that now exists between the Judges and the competitors. Trish came onto the International scene with a silver medal in 1992 at the World Games in Holland and "hasn't looked back since" . She has won so many gold and silver medals at international events since then that they could start a foundry. Certainly at the top of her form when she won her first World Championships in Ober Gurgl Austria in 1998.and then an other World Gold in Cortina in 2000. "Good on yea" Trish.

Lawrence one of their three sons has also become a fine archer. He has made their national junior Field Squad and represented his Country twice internationally.

Wonderful words in closing. The Lovell's enjoy the Sport of Archery because: "it is something we can do together and we have made wonderful friends not just at home but all over the world." What better could be said about our chosen Sport. DML

Pictures from the Judge Conference





The Judges at the conference on the right side of the room



You be the judge...

RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS CASE STUDIES.

Case Study #1- 57 from previous newsletter

An archer has the correct two minute time allowed run out and he has not shot his last arrow. On checking, it is discovered that the yellow light was 10 seconds late coming on. He protests to Jury that he was denied 20 seconds of the 30 second yellow warning light. No other archer on the field was aware of, or was affected by the yellow light delay and all shot their three arrows well within time. You are on that Jury. What would be your recommendation to the other two Jurors?

Response from Judges to Case Study #1:

It was the majority response from our Judges that the archer did in fact have the full allotted two minutes time and that the yellow light only offered a time reference to the archer Giving the archer another 40 seconds (one arrow) would give the archer more time than all other archers who shot within the time.

Editors personal comments: I agree, for me I feel Article 7.4.2 states that : "The maximum time for an archer to shoot three arrows shall be two minutes". Moreover Article 7.2.3.2 says: "If any discrepancy exists between the acoustic and visual time control equipment, the acoustic time control equipment shall take precedence". Several judges correctly asked: "Was there a count down clock in use?" That was a good observation. In this case, yes there was. Lets say however that the only indication to the archer was the light control and a whistle. Would that effect your decision as a Juror? Please answer this as Case Study #4 - 58

The Judge Committee has already made an interpretation of this situation. And they feel that in any case the archer is allowed the full 30 second "yellow light" and they would give

the archer more time to shoot that last arrow. That then is the official procedure we must use.

Case Study #2 – 57.

At the end of the qualification round at a large international shoot, archers number 63, 64, 65, 66 were all tied. A single arrow shoot-off took place

Archer 63 shot 8

Archer 64 shot 6

Archer 65 shot 7

Archer 66 shot 10.

Archers 63 and 66 entered the elimination stage.

The O/C paired #63 with the #1 archer and archer #66 with the # 2 archer. The Team Captain protested, claiming the pairing was not correct.

If he was right, what should the pairing have been?

Note from the editor: I was surprised to find that the Judges were quite divided on their replies to this answer. About 80% said: "Yes the O/C was correct. The archer who shot a 10 on the shoot-off would in fact be given the lowest ranking position of the two open (63) and shoot against archer # 2 in the first elimination stage. The archer who shot the 8 would cover position # 64 and shoot against the # 1 rated archer, as our chart indicates". Ed.

Note: Frankly as a Judge I agree with that. In my mind, each of the archers shot an additional one arrow end and they then had a new total score. Which would rank them # 63 and 64. Several Judges said that they would hold their ranking position i.e 63 and 66 (who would become 64) This case study as submitted to me probably should have said 4 archers were tied for position 63. (which is the simple fact). Then it would be quite clear that the higher score of those who made the cut should rank with the lowest of the two positions.

A few Judges indicated that: Once the shoot-off took place and the two archers where chosen to continue, they would then be ranked based on hits, 10s and Xs. (7.6.19.1).

This solution is correct based on Fita Information #9 Which is very long but simply states.

"Once a shoot of has taken place to decide who will continue to the next stage, the ranking will then be decided by hits, 10' s and X's"

The confusion amongst our Judges indicates to me that this situation must be clarified and defined within the rules book so that no confusion exists in the future. This official interpretation never went into the book and many Judges did not get or understand the #9 Fita information. I am very pleased that the responses from our Judges are often instrumental in correcting a point which is unclear.



Judges serving at the 31st IPC World Archery Championships
L to R Václav Lunáček - DoS, Um Sung-Ho, Pavel Prokop, Jennike Reyers, Arik Vamosh, Neil Dimmick.
With T/D Morten Wilmann on right

Case Study # 3 - 57

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

One team member was unable to complete her three arrows and stepped back across the line with the last arrow in her bow. Another archer from the team immediately took her spot on the line and shot her three arrows. Then the first archer returned to the line and shot the single final arrow of her three.

A National Judge showed her the yellow card while she was in the athletes' box when he saw her with the arrow in her hand. When she then went to the line and shot the arrow, he notified the Judges in that blind to deduct the value of that arrow shot. The team lost an arrow and lost the match even though they had shot a higher score.

Was the Judge's action correct?

Note from the editor: It was clear from most all replies that the National Judge was not correct in showing a yellow warning card while the archer was still in the box. I fully agree with them. Certainly any archer is allowed to have an arrow in their hand (to check it) while still in the athletes' box. Only a couple of Judges still wanted to give a yellow warning because she stepped off the line with the arrow in her bow. (claiming safety reasons) Some mentioned that if she went to the line with the arrow in her hand she should be penalized, but that was not the question here. The Judge gave the yellow card while she was still in the team box

Case Study #4 - 57

The 3-Metre Line – Scenario 1

During a FITA Round being shot at a National Championships in windy conditions, the 3-metre line has been marked using white plastic tape 5 cm wide and pegged to the ground every 2 metres using wide-head nails.

One competitor miss-shot an arrow, which landed with the nock lying approximately 2 cm inside the tape, the balance on the far side, with the shaft pointing towards the target.

Seeing the arrow is within the 3-metre distance the competitor continues to shoot all six arrows. Just before the DOS signals the competitors to proceed with scoring, a second competitor notices the arrow is beyond the 3-metre line and calls a Judge to indicate the competitor has shot seven arrows. Another competitor on the same target indicates he saw a gust of wind lift the tape and that put the arrow beyond the 3- metre line.

What would be your action as the Judge?

Reply to #4 - 57

Note from the Editor:

I was please to see that most all Judges who replied to this study would have given the archer the benefit of the doubt based on the testimony of the other archer. A couple of Judges indicated they would go to the line and see if the tape in fact was loose and not perfectly straight That in my mind is a sensible observation. A loosely fixed 3 metre line should have been corrected before the competition during the Judge control of the field. A loose line like this could easily cause and archer to trip and certainly to catch a foot under the tape and move it.

Case Study # 5 - 57

The 3-Metre Line - Scenario 2

At the same Championships another competitor miss-shoots an arrow which lands beyond the 3-metre line sticking in the ground at an angle of approximately 30°. He considers the arrow to have been shot and shoots five more, six arrows in total. There are five arrows in the target and one on the ground.

Just before the DOS gives the signal to proceed to the targets for scoring, the arrow falls back with the nock now clearly over the tape (inside the 3 metre line). The competitor calls

a Judge to indicate the arrow, and explains what happened. Other archers on the target and adjoining targets support the claim the arrow landed beyond the 3-metre line, but fell back across the tape in the windy conditions. The time runs out. The competitor concerned claims the arrow has not been shot (Article 7.4.4.1) and requests that he be allowed to shoot the arrow.

As the Judge concerned, how would you handle this situation?



Jay Ben Ari and David Wallace at the World Indoor in Italy. David is looking on with disbelief and I think saying, "I think he missed the bloody target", or something like that. The new O/C in Italy did a fine job with only a few months to prepare after the change in venue.

Reply to #5 - 57

We had several contradictory answers. Some would allow the archer to shoot another arrow others would not. In my mind regardless of when the arrow fell inside the three meter line, it was there before that shooting sequence ended and was a "not shot arrow". The archer correctly contacted a Judge. Should he not be allowed to shoot 6 scoring arrows?

Note from the Editor: This was a vague area in our wording. We changed the old "touch the arrow with your bow rule by adding a "marked" 3 metre line to make the decision clearer for all. It seems we only made it more complicated. I think this is the fourth scenario on 3 metre line situations.

The Judge Committee has in fact already addressed this problem by clarifying that the "not - shot" area is a 3-dimensional zone. This however does not totally simplify the solution. If the arrow was originally at 30 degrees, it might well have "3 dimensionally" (vertically) been out of the 3 meter zone and only entered it when it fell back. As I say, have we not just complicated the application of the "No shot arrow situation?"



A wonderful digital photo of the Great Wall in China. Digital Cameras have come a long way in the last few years.

Case Study 6 - 57

Quarter Finals Round – Shooting Out Of Sequence

During the Quarter Finals Round at a major international Tournament, with each match being timed individually by a National Judge two women competitors come to the line for the second end of three arrows. The woman competitor on the left side target asks the Judge if she may shoot first, as in the first end the competitor on the right side target had won the disk toss and elected to shoot first. The Judge indicated "yes" with a nod of his head. However, the competitor on the right side draws her bow and shoots first, at which time the other competitor looks confused, but elects to shoot second. The end is completed at which time the shooting sequence is queried by the competitor on the left side target. Effectively, both competitors had shot their three arrows out of sequence. As the Judge concerned, how would you resolve this situation?

Reply to #6 - 57

I was pleased to see that only a small number of the Judges responding to this study would penalize either archer, and the vast majority would score the arrows as shot.

Several sensible observations were made.

- a) The Judge had caused confusion by not clearly indicating who should shoot first on the second end when asked. Actually the archer on the left should not have had to ask the question.
- b) Both archers had shot the correct number of arrows within the time allowed, and alternating shooting was only introduced to satisfy the needs of television.
- c) Two responding Judges observed that the controlling Judge should have stepped up and stopped the archer on the right from shooting her arrow first when he observed her raising her bow.. (This would indicate that the Judge is responsible for controlling the alternating sequence! Is the archer not themselves responsible for knowing when to shoot? (We have made the observation several times that a Judge can not take the responsibility of when or how to shoot from the archer.)
- d) Neither archer had any advantage.
- e) Clearly the archer on the right had made a mistake but the other archer accepted it and also shot "out of sequence.

Note from the editor: In as much as arrows can never be reshot, I think the Judges have sensibly resolved this difficult situation. –

Case Study # 7 - 57

During the Olympic Team Round in a semi-final match in a national championship, Team A's first archer shot his first arrow but had an equipment failure and stepped back behind the waiting line.

The coach sent the second archer immediately to take up the shooting position. The second archer was a rookie on the team and did not realize that during alternated shooting each team should only shoot 3 arrows per end. He thought that his duty was to shoot his 3 arrows. He shot 3 arrows and stepped back behind the shooting line.

The third archer shot his 3 arrows and stepped back. The first archer shot his remaining 2 arrows and completed the end of 9 arrows well within the 3 minute time limit.

The captain of Team B protested right away quoting Article 7.5.2.4 bullet 3 and Article 7.6.9 and asked the Judge to score only the 3 arrows lowest in value. (The arrows were 10-10-9-7 while the number 3 arrow of the second archer was a 10). In the meantime, team B went ahead to shoot their nine arrows.

The competition continued without any further problem. Team A defeated Team B by 235 to 233.

The Judges studied the protest and also quoted Article 7.6.9 stating that an end of a team shoot is 9 arrows. Team A's number of shots in the first end is 9 arrows. Team A did not over-shoot. Therefore, there is no reason to score the 3 lowest value arrows of the first four shots. The Judges declared that Team A could advance to the gold medal final. Team B protested immediately to the Jury.

If you were the Judge in this championship, what would be your decision?

If you were the Jury, what would be your decision?

Reply to #7 - 57

The majority of Judges would not have taken any points from the team who did not shoot their arrows in ends of 3.

FIELD CASE STUDIES

Field archery tournament.

With his first arrow of an end, the archer shoots a 2. He is very dissatisfied. He puts his second arrow on the bowstring and, still angry with himself, strikes his bow with the hand - the arrow drops from the bowstring and falls about 3m behind the shooting line. The archer leaves the shooting line, picks up his arrow, returns to the shooting line and shoots this arrow. He then shoots his third arrow. These 3 arrows are shot in the allotted time. No warning.

When scoring at the target, the Judge decided to remove the value of the highest scoring arrow of that end advising that the archer, while shooting, is not allowed to leave the shooting line.

Was the Judge correct?

Reply to Field Case Study: I was disappointed to see more that one Judge agreed with the action of the Judge! There is not now, nor has there ever been a rule that forbids an archer leaving the shooting line. Moreover the 3 metre in front of the shooting line rule is concerned with whether an arrow was shot or not. Obviously an arrow could not be shot and end up three metres behind the line. Simple common sense has to apply here (as always). The Judge was very wrong.

Case Study #10 - 57: Identify Malgorzata and Ewa! Most all who knew them, correctly identified Ewa as the one sitting. Frankly, I knew and liked them both and I was not exactly sure!! The Judges and Fita will miss these two fine Judges.



I did not get Alojz Mauser and Sergije Markic in the previous picture. Sergije was enjoying a "good joke".

Editors note! He still has a bigger moustache than I do!! Personally I think he dyes it black. I know he fertilizes it.



You be the judge...

Case Study #1 - 58

An archer comes to the line with his arrow quiver attached to the tripod of his telescope which he places beside him within easy reaching distance on the line.

The Judge in charge advise him that article 7.3.3.10 does not permit him to leave his arrows or quiver on the line between ends. The Archer protested to Jury.

- a) Was the Judge correct?
- b) You are on the Jury. How will you find?

Case Study #2 - 58

At the recent Indoor World Junior Championships: A female archer had a bouncer. Confused by the incident she stopped shooting and turned to the Judge informing him of the incident. The Judge asked how many arrows she had left, but the archer misunderstood the question and answered by showing two fingers (meaning she shot two arrows/or that maybe this was her second arrow). The Judge then told her to continue shooting two arrows, which the archer did within the time limit. Upon scoring the archer now had the following scores:

Upper centre 9

Middle centre 10

Lower centre 8

and one bouncer on the floor in front of the target.

None of the archers on that target had marked the arrow holes and there were several unmarked holes in the various centres, the lowest unmarked hole in the upper centre was 7, in the middle centre 8 and in the lower centre another 7. There was also one unmarked hole in the paper outside, but close, to the lower centre - in the corner of the paper.

The Judge scored 9-8-M.

Was his decision correct? (This is not all that easy!)

Case Study #3 - 58

During an Indoor tournament at 18m with 40cm vertical triple faces, the flowing occurs:

In the qualification round an archer shoots:

1 arrow a 10 in the top face

2 arrow a 9 in the face of the middle

3 arrow an 8 in the lower face

A few seconds after the time runs out he shoots a fourth arrow which falls well within the 3 metre line!

As a Judge, how will you score this end?

Case Study # 4 - 58

During a very windy day in a National Championship a disabled archer was politely warned by a National Judge because the string of his bow was in contact with the wheel on the wheelchair. The National Judge, stated that this situation could represent an advantage and advised him against this action. The archer became confused and angry with the Judge and decided to continue shooting same way. A small meeting of the Judge commission took place and they by majority decided to disqualify him

Was the action of Judges correct?"



Klaus Shultz and Don Lovo. Goofing off for a day at the Great Wall of China. All of us were sad to have Klaus resign from his Fita positions including Judging. He will remain on the C & R Committee for the rest of his term (2003) where he does incredible work "redoing" the Constitution and rules book every two years (literally hundreds of hours).

Klaus became a Judge in 1982. He was the Chairman of Judges in Barcelona in 1992 and served many times at both Field and Target events. The Judge Corps will certainly miss him and his calm and gentle way. I will for sure. We served together for many years as Olympic Technical Delegates. Relax Klaus at your new "Country home" and enjoy.

IMPORTANT NOTICE

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

FITA, Avenue de Cour 135, CH-1007 Lausanne, Switzerland

FAX +41 21 614 30 55 E-mail: pjorn@archery.org or info@archery.org

We wish you the very best for 2002 with in the first place health and happiness and a Merry Xmas. Best wishes for 2002

Gian Piero Spada, Chairman of the Judges Committee
Morten Wilmann,
Sergio Font
Don Lovo
Tom Dielen
Elodie Hainard