



# JUDGES NEWSLETTER

Fédération Internationale de Tir à l'Arc  
INTERNATIONAL ARCHERY FEDERATION

**ISSUE #64**

**APRIL 2006**

## Content

1. Editorial from our Chairman
2. New Rules
3. Keep focused when correcting a scorecard
4. Dealing with more than one mistake
5. First FITA Accredited Continental Judge Seminar, Jakarta, September 2005
6. Comments on the World Outdoor Target World Championships, Madrid 2005
7. Color change for the X ring
8. New Uniforms for the FITA Judges
9. Judges appointments for 2006
10. Rule History Quiz
11. My first event !
12. Replies to Case Studies no 63
13. New Case Studie

## **1. Editorial from our Chairman**

Dear FITA Judges,

After a long time the Newsletter is again in your hands with information and new case studies.

Last year the re-accreditation process was run in a slightly different way, according to the new rules approved by Council (and confirmed by Congress), including the age limit to obtain the International Judge title. This point created some concern in several dedicated and expert judges, especially because it appeared unexpectedly. The wording of the rules is indeed not so clear and it will be modified before the next re-accreditation.

One fellow judge wrote to me: *I am a bit puzzled by the judges' accreditation. In 1995 I joined the FITA team. One of the things I was told was: "As a FITA judge you serve FITA and not a Member Association". This was to ensure a FITA judge was impartial. Nowadays we need support from both the Continental Association and the Member Association to be reaccredited as a FITA judge. I think this is strange since an International Judge should operate under the governance of FITA, and FITA only in my mind. [...] But why do we need their support if we are not accountable to them?*

The point he raised is quite interesting and a clarification may be of help for everyone. The support of the MA has always been necessary. The first time that a section of the Rules Book has been dedicated to the Procedures for the Judge Committee was in 1994. In those rules it was for the first time explicitly written that the MA should send the applicant (and act on behalf of the individuals) to the training seminars given by FITA. Even before 1994 the procedure applied was the same. When I became a FITA Judge, my application was sent by my Federation. The reason for this behavior is that



FITA is a federation of national federations and not of individuals. All individuals with some office must be supported by their MA. This is valid not only for judges, but for all officers (e.g. FITA Council members).

After the introduction of the new serial system of judges (National Judges, Continental Judges, International Judges), it seems obvious that is necessary to have also the support of the CA being the CJ and IJ status strictly connected.

This procedure is not in conflict with the statement "as a FITA Judge (or a FITA Council member) you serve FITA, not your MA"; it was not in the past, it will not be in the future. If the MA's support never created problems, why should the CA's support create any?

Gian Piero Spada  
Chairperson FITA Judge Committee

## **2. New rules**

A number of changes have been made to the FITA rules to become effective on April 1, 2006. We would like to highlight a few of them which directly affect the judges' action on the field.

**3.7.3.1** *At FITA World Championships, a Member Association may enter no more than three (3) athletes in each category and division.*

This is a major change to reduce the number of participants at World Championships. For other tournaments, a team may be formed by three or four members.

**3.15.1.4** *During the Match Play Rounds at FITA Outdoor and Indoor Target Championships, only one coach per individual athlete or per team shall be on the Field of Play. That coach must remain in the designated area on the Field of Play.*

This rule is intended to keep a clean field so that the spectators can have a clearer view of the archers.

**3.22** *Dress Regulations. This article outlines the rules ref. dress regulations for World Championships and Olympic Games. There is concern around the world that these rules must also be applied at other international tournaments. Again, they only apply at World Championships and Olympic Games. Please go over these rules in detail.*

**4.5.1.4** *first bullet: The Elimination Round, in which the top one-hundred twenty-eight (128) athletes (mandatory for World Championships) are seeded according to their positions in the Qualification Round (see Match Play Chart Appendix 10 and Book ; Appendix 1.1). They shoot a series of matches in groups, each match consisting of four (4) ends of three (3) arrows or two (2) ends of six (6) arrows.*



Two changes are introduced with this rule: 128 archers going to the elimination round; and all matches will now consist of 12 arrows. After April 1 the elimination round, as the finals round, will consist of 12 arrow matches. The choice is for the organizers to shoot the elimination round matches in ends of three or six arrows.

**7.3.3.1.3** *A brace or split cables are permitted, provided they do not consistently touch the athlete's hand, wrist and/or bow arm.*

It is important to notice the word "*consistently*", considering the possibility of an archer touching the brace of the split cables accidentally on one occasion. Please, refer also to article 7.3.1.1.2

**7.4.2.3.** *An arrow shot on the competition field after the DOS has officially closed the practice session (which is after the pulling of the practice arrows); or during the breaks between distances or rounds; will cause the athlete to lose the highest scoring arrow of the next scoring end.*

This clarification of the rule specifies that the archer is supposed to shoot three (or six) arrows in the next scoring end, and he/she shall lose the highest value of the arrows shot. The judges who attended the Conference in Lillehall will certainly remember we had a discussion on whether the archer was supposed to shoot three (six) arrows in that end, or if the arrow shot after practice would count as a miss for the first end so that the archer would only be allowed to shoot two (five) arrows in the end in question.

**7.5.2.2.** third bullet: *In the 1/64<sup>th</sup>, 1/32<sup>nd</sup> and 1/16<sup>th</sup> Elimination Rounds....*

The rules now allow up to 128 archers to qualify for match play eliminations.

**7.5.2.2** fourth bullet: *In single match play alternate shooting, the highest placed athlete in the qualification round will decide the order of shooting of the first end. The athlete with the lowest cumulative score will shoot first the next end. If the athletes are tied, the athlete that shot first in the first end shoots first in the next end.*

This bylaw had already been applied before it was approved by Congress. It is important to remember that when there is a tie at the end of the match, the first shoot-off arrow is shot by the archer who started the match.

**7.5.2.3** first bullet: *A team consists of three (3) athletes.*

This rule applies only to World Championships and Olympic Games. For other tournaments, as per 7.5.3.2, a team consists of three (3) athletes or four (4) athletes.



*An archer marking arrow holes at the World Indoor Championships in Aalborg. Hopefully the lines he draws are no longer than 3 mm long.*

---

**7.5.3.2** second bullet: *All members of a team must be announced prior to the start of the Qualification Round. Such members must take part in the Qualification Round and cannot be changed.*

The first part of this rule is vital at tournaments (World Ranking Events and other international or national tournaments) where a country fields more than four archers. It is recommended that the announcement of the four members of the team be made at the team captains meeting, so that all team captains know which archers will be part of the team. We, the judges, must make sure the team members are announced in due time, to avoid possible appeals.

**7.5.4.1** *Thirty (30) seconds is the time allowed for an athlete to shoot one arrow when shooting alternately in the Olympic Round matches.*

There is still confusion around the world regarding this rule change. Some archers, coaches and judges believe that the 30 seconds rule applies to every stage of the competition, including the qualification round. This is not so. The 30 seconds ONLY apply to matches with alternating shooting. Please also note that a shoot off in a match with alternating shooting will be conducted on the basis of 30 seconds per arrow, and not as specified in 7.5.4.2. For Indoor archery, the 30 seconds rule application is the same (see art. 8.5.3.1.)

**7.5.4.4** *Two minutes is the time allowed for (...) an Olympic Round team to shoot six (6) arrows.*

The team round now consists of 24 arrows: 4 four ends of 6 arrows. Each member of a team will shoot two arrows in each end.



**7.5.5.4** *If more than one match is held on the same field of play at the same time with alternating shooting, no sound signal may be given to indicate the start of each shooting period except for the start of the match.*

This was a necessary rule to give legal support to what has been done in the last three Olympic Games. There were two archers in Athens who almost lost an arrow because they were waiting for the sound signal. If you are appointed as line judge in a tournament where two or more matches are held simultaneously with alternating shooting, make sure your archers know that there will be no sound signals for the second and subsequent arrows in each end.

**7.8.2.3** *An arrow shot before or after (...) This violation will be notified by the judge raising a red card.*

As a result of this rule, you will be expected to have your red card ready from the Qualification Round. This was also a necessary rule, as there was no visual signal to indicate that an arrow had been shot out of time. The same procedure applies to rule 7.8.2.5. Several judges forgot to make reference in their re-accreditation test to the fact that a red card is to be raised when an arrow is shot out of time in the team event.

**8.5.2.3** *third bullet: In the Indoor Match Round team event there will be two columns of 3 vertical triple faces, one center for each of the six arrows of the team. Each team member will shoot one arrow at a center of his choice.*

This rule is in line with the rule of 24-arrow team matches. Every match will consist of four ends of six arrows. As for the indoor round, there will be six centres in two columns of three. It is the choice of the team members to decide which archer will shoot at which center. The rule stating that there is a column of three centres for each team member is now gone.



A very wet Morten B. Wilmann during the World Championships for disabled in Pisa, Italy. Gian Piero must have been in the neighborhood (Bologna)

---

### **3. Keep focused when correcting a scorecard**

The following situation actually happened, and proves how focused we must be at the time of correcting a scorecard. We **MUST** see the arrows before we change a value.



The team competition at University Championships is conducted using a different target. It is a hit or miss target. In order to get one point the arrow must hit the 12.2 cm yellow zone (9 or 10 in the “normal” targets). The rest of the target face is red, and you score a Miss if you hit it. At the Universiade held in Izmir, Turkey, a problem occurred in a bronze medal match because the target judge did not do his job properly.

While scoring the second end, a correction in the scorecard for team B was made by the judge, increasing the score by two points in relation with the unofficial values entered by the scorer from the blind. At the end of the match, the score showed 11 points for team A, and 12 points for team B. Unexpectedly one of the archers and the coach of team A walked to the targets and started counting the number of holes in team B’s target. They entered into an argument with the judges, and then approached the chairman of judges. They argued that team B did not have 12 points, but only 11. The chairman of judges checked the target face and confirmed that there were only 11 holes in the yellow zone, and 16 holes in the red area.

Team B was already celebrating their victory around the shooting line, and one of its members had been taken to the doping control room for a test.

The chairman of judges talked to the target judge and the scorer for team B. The scorer (a national judge) said that she believed the target judge had made a mistake when correcting the score of the second end. She saw him change two Misses into Ones when only one value upgrade was necessary. The chairman of judges talked to the target judge who admitted he was not very careful and did not check the arrows on the face when he made the correction. Due to a language problem he had understood two values had to be changed, and so he made two corrections without checking the arrows.

If you had been the chairman there, what would you have done? Would you have solved the problem yourself? How? Would you have told Team A to appeal to Jury?

#### **4. Dealing with more than one mistake**

Judges are sometimes faced with situations in which an archer has made more than one “mistake”. The order in which you deal with the violations is very important. Let’s analyze some scenarios.

- a) one arrow too many and one arrow shot out of time. In a situation in which an archer has shot four arrows (50 or 30 meters), and one of these arrows has been shot out of time, you first deal with the number of arrows: four arrows, you enter the three lowest values in the scorecard. Then you deal with the time issue. Of the three values entered in the scorecard, you change the highest score into an M, using the customary procedure with the diagonal line in red. This is done so that the value remains there for a possible appeal to Jury.
- b) Indoors. Two arrows in one center, and four arrows total. You first deal with the center in which two arrows are found. The highest value in that center becomes a Miss. Then you have four values (including the Miss), and you take care of the four arrow mistake: You score the three lowest values. For instance: a ten in the upper center, a 10 and a 7 in the middle center, and a 9 in the lower center. The



10 in the middle center becomes a Miss. Then you have 10, 9, 7, M. You score 9, 7, M.

- c) Indoors. Two arrows in one center, four arrows total, one arrow shot out of time. The first two steps are as in situation b above. Then you take care of the arrow shot out of time. For this you take the highest value in the scorecard and correct it into a Miss following the usual procedure with your red pen. In the example shown in situation b above the score would then be: ~~9~~-M, 7, M.

### **5. First FITA Accredited Continental Judge Seminar, Jakarta, September 2005**

The first Continental Seminar for FITA Accredited Continental Judges was held in Jakarta, Indonesia on September 1-3, 2005. FITA Judge Committee members Morten Wilmann and Sergio Font conducted a seminar that was attended by 40 candidates from Hong Kong China, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand and Mongolia. Half of the participants wrote the exam for FITA accreditation, while the others took the test prepared by the AAF Judge Committee to become Continental Judges. Based on the results of the test and their input throughout the seminar, the following judges were appointed FITA Accredited Continental Judges:

- Kam Ming Yu (HKG)
- Damayanti Adhidarma (INA)
- Muriko San (INA)
- Arie Arceria (INA)
- Park Young Sook (KOR)
- Jung Mi Ja (KOR)
- Dr. Myat Tau Ya Soe (MYA)
- Mildred de Leon (PHI)
- Karla R. Cabrera (PHI)
- Fe M. Empaynado (PHI)
- Simon Wee (SIN)
- Frankie Hoong (SIN)



*Participants at the Judge Seminar in Jakarta, 2005*



## **6. Comments on the World Outdoor Target Championships, Madrid 2005**

The following comments paraphrase the report presented by Judge Committee members Morten Wilmann and Sergio Font, who acted as Judge Observers in Madrid. They are included here because most of these problems must be addressed and solved by the Tournament Judge Commission before they occur.

1. Regarding the equipment control area. We often see – also in Madrid – that the area designated for such a control is not 100% convenient for the judges and archers. It must be possible, i.e. in a manual to indicate how it should be designed; a place where archers can pass through, in order to avoid a total mess for archers coming in and out of the control area.
2. During official training a buttress blew over, obviously because the buttresses had not been properly fixed. During the competition, after the change of distances, the same happened again. May be the judges did not check this?
3. A Jury of Appeal decision was to the correct disfavour of the decision made by the Judges. The incident was as follows: Two Spanish female archers had been mixed up by the team captain as for back numbers and thereby position on the field, causing archer A to shoot at target B and archer B to shoot at target A. This was discovered during scoring of the first end – as the scorecards were distributed according to the correct names and numbering. The Judges removed the scores of the first end –giving 6 misses – referring to the rule re shooting at the wrong target, showing a complete misunderstanding of the intention of that rule. The Jury gave the scores back to the archers – fortunately.



*One of the judges making a call at the World Championships in Madrid*

4. Some judges had advertising material on their caps, which is not acceptable. Neither did many of them use white colour hats as indicated in the guide book.
5. The organizers scheduled too many team matches at the same time, which caused most judges to have to control three teams at a time. The chairman of judges should never accept to work under these circumstances. The O/C must coordinate their schedule with the Technical Delegates and the Chairman of Judges as well.
6. The procedure for the judges at the targets during the finals was often a real mess, mainly on the day of the individual finals. At times there was one judge standing by target 1, and two judges by target 2. Some other times the judges left the targets before the AA had withdrawn the arrows. This demonstrates the



importance of dealing with these procedures in the judges meeting before the start of each competition day. We must understand that we are part of the show, and good judge deportment adds to the image of archery as a sport.

7. The tournament was often delayed by the target judges who took a long time to check the scores on the targets. Again another problem that can be avoided, maybe by appointing the “quickest” judges to do this job.



8. There were no umbrellas for the target judges during the finals. This caused the “fainting” judges to have to stand outside of the blinds (facing the stands) looking for some minutes of shade and fresher air between matches. This is an issue to be dealt with by the TD and the Chairman of judges before the actual match play starts.
9. There were security problems during the finals. People walking behind the targets. This is also part of the judges’ job: to make sure the area is safe.

As you can see most of these problems can be avoided by the judges. They sometimes occur because we take things for granted. We must take each day of the tournament as a new tournament. Every piece of equipment must be carefully checked, and every procedure must be reviewed by the judges at the start of the morning session or in the meeting at the end of the afternoon session the day before.

### **7. Color change for the X ring**



FITA has asked FITA Licensed manufacturers to change the color of the X ring for Outdoor faces to be in a light grey or pattern so it is visible from close up but not on a camera. This will be introduced in steps but for instance the faces of the new German Manufacturer Krueger will already comply with it. These have been approved as such by FITA. This will avoid confusion in the spectators as to what this ring stands for.



### **8. New uniforms for the FITA judges**

Our judges will very soon have a new uniform. Chantal Steiner in the FITA office reports that the new uniforms will probably be ready in April, which will give us plenty of time for our judges to wear them at the three World Championships scheduled for this year. The uniform

*FITA Judge Sherlock Holmes wearing his fashionable uniform. as designed by Chantal Steiner.*



will consist of polo shirts in light blue and in white and grey (very nice colors, by the way). There will also be two zip-off pants, a rain coat, a jacket and a vest. We truly hope you like your new uniforms.

### **9. Judge appointments for 2006**

The FITA Judge Committee has made the following appointments for duty in 2006:

#### **FISU World Championships (June 2006, Vinicne, Slovakia)**

Luca	Stucchi	ITA	EU	M	<b>CHAIR</b>
Juan Maria	Charquero	ESP	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Ronaldo G.	de Carvalho	BRA	AM	M	<b>M</b>
Mau Sui, Frankie	Hoong	SIN	AS	M	<b>M</b>
Horst	Helfrich	GER	EU	M	<b>ALT 1</b>
Jeannot	Schoos	LUX	EU	M	<b>ALT 2</b>

#### **FIELD WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS (Aug/Sept 2006, Gothenburg, Sweden)**

Morten	Wilmann	NOR	EU	M	<b>CHAIR &amp; JCO</b>
Shinji	Egashira	JPN	AS	M	<b>M</b>
Carole Ann	Hicks	NZL	OC	F	<b>M</b>
René Paul	Koot	NED	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Fai Keong	Leong	SIN	AS	M	<b>M</b>
Derrick J.	Lovell	GBR	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Irena	Rosa	SLO	EU	F	<b>M</b>
Ron	Saar	ISR	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Myat Thu Ya	Soe	MYA	AS	M	<b>M</b>
Marty	Swanson	USA	AM	M	<b>M</b>
Manfred	Weinlich	GER	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Susanne	Womersley	AUS	OC	F	<b>M</b>
Xiuzhi	Zhang	CHN	AS	F	<b>M</b>
Schandorff	Vang	FER	EU	M	<b>ALT1</b>
Jean-Pierre	Galeyrand	FRA	EU	M	<b>ALT2</b>
Alojz	Mauser	CRO	EU	M	<b>ALT3</b>



**WORLD JUNIOR AND CADETS CHAMPIONSHIPS (October 2006, Merida, Mexico)**

Henrik	Larsen	DEN	EU	M	<b>CHAIR</b>
Jocelyn	Acop	PHI	AS	F	<b>M</b>
Spiridione (Dion)	Buhagiar	MLT	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Fulvio	Cantini	ITA	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Guillermo	Font Oliver	CUB	AM	M	<b>M</b>
Tom	Green	USA	AM	M	<b>M</b>
Johnny Alejandro	Hernandez Bolivar	VEN	AM	M	<b>M</b>
Friedrich	Karle	GER	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Vigdis	Landskaug	NOR	EU	F	<b>M</b>
Pedro	Sanz	ESP	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Rocky W. F.	Tam	HKG	AS	M	<b>M</b>
Israel	Vega Santiago	PUR	AM	M	<b>M</b>
Henk	Wagemakers	NED	EU	M	<b>M</b>
Vladimir	Dominguez Ambros	CUB	AM	M	<b>DOS</b>
Jean-Pierre	Gabarret	FRA	EU	M	<b>DOS DEP.</b>
Neil A.	Dimmock	GBR	EU	M	<b>ALT 1</b>
Jean	Martens	BEL	EU	M	<b>ALT 2</b>
Morten	Wilmann	NOR	EU	M	<b>JCO</b>



*The judges who officiated at the World Indoor Championships in Aalborg, Denmark, 2005*



### 10. Rule History Quiz



Test your knowledge of rules in the present and the recent past. Tick the correct answer and send your replies to us.

1. At the Barcelona Olympic Games in 1992 the qualification round was:
  - a)  a 70 m Round
  - b)  a FITA Round
  - c)  a Double FITA Round
  
2. The Elimination Round consisted of 18-arrow matches for the first time in Olympic Games in:
  - a)  Atlanta 1996
  - b)  Barcelona 1992
  - c)  Sydney 2000
  
3. At the 1996 Olympic Games the penalty for a second minor violation in the team event was:
  - a)  the team would lose the highest scoring arrow.
  - b)  the archer who made the violation had to return behind the 1 meter line and cross it back again.
  - c)  the team would lose two points of its total score for that end.
  
4. At the 1996 Olympic Games, coaches in the team event:
  - a)  were not allowed to use any kind of binoculars while standing in the box.
  - b)  were allowed to use handheld binoculars only, while standing in the box.
  - c)  were allowed to use telescopes on a tripod, while standing in the box.
  
5. At the 1992 Olympic Games, during the elimination and finals rounds the head judge:
  - a)  confirmed the scores as called by the archer's agent to the scoring judge.
  - b)  called the scores according to the position of the arrows in the target.
  
6. The ten-ring at 70 meters for the compound division at the 1997 World Championships measured:
  - a)  12.2 cm
  - b)  8 cm
  - c)  6.1 cm



7. At the Barcelona Olympic Games, the number of archers who qualified for the Elimination Round in each class were:
  - a) \_\_\_\_ 32 archers
  - b) \_\_\_\_ 64 archers
  - c) \_\_\_\_ 16 archers
  
8. In only one of the following Olympic Games all the scoring judges were from the host country:
  - a) \_\_\_\_ Barcelona 1992
  - b) \_\_\_\_ Atlanta 1996
  - c) \_\_\_\_ Sydney 2000
  - d) \_\_\_\_ Athens 2004
  
9. Before the yellow cards were used, the judges indicated a minor violation in the team event by:
  - a) \_\_\_\_ raising a yellow flag
  - b) \_\_\_\_ blowing the whistle
  - c) \_\_\_\_ saying "violation" out loud
  
10. The three-judge call rule was last enforced at the Olympic Games in:
  - a) \_\_\_\_ Atlanta 1996
  - b) \_\_\_\_ Sydney 2000
  - c) \_\_\_\_ Athens 2004



*Tom Green, the Chairman in Aalborg, watching from the stands.*



**11. My first event !**  
**by Dion Buhagiar**



Having been selected by FITA to participate in my first international event, the 8<sup>th</sup> Junior World Championships, Lilleshall, UK July 2004 and having now allowed the dust to settle, I can truly say that it was an experience which will be hard to forget. It was so encouraging to see the strength and enthusiasm displayed by of over 400 junior and cadet archers, hailing from forty-seven nations; the future of our sport, there right in front of us, future champions who compete for their nations with such genuine determination, pride and above all good hearted sportsmanship.

As I arrived two days in advance of the competition I was able to witness the transformation of the designated fields into what was to become a highly organised and well presented tournament venue. Even the weather was kind, not a drop of rain the whole week, which for this part world is surely a miracle. The field crew worked tirelessly at all times to ensure that the venue was kept in best appearance at times.

From an organisational point of view, it gave me the opportunity to meet FITA officials who till the time of this event were merely a name at the end of an e-mail or letter. In retrospect I could not have asked to be assigned to a better group of International Judges, full of experience and dedication, lead by our able chairman Luca Stucchi who ensured that teamwork was the order of the day. Luca has certainly given me a good example of what a chairman should be; a challenge I look forward to performing someday.

The daily routine of wake, breakfast, briefing, assignment of duties, debriefing, dinner and of course distressing sessions held at the local watering hole, was also a lesson in teamwork, teamwork on and off the field, it is evident that both are extremely important. It is always nice to see that archery is truly an international sport, and above all a way of life, as can be attested by the numerous discussions that were held every evening.

And our Judge observer, Morten. His presence and his eye for detail was put to use many a time, as was observed on numerous occasions as he silently penned his remarks on the numerous of sheets of paper that he manage to fill with his jottings.

How would I summarise first impressions; a pleasure in being able to making new friends, an event that was extremely well organised, tasks that were extremely enjoyable, disputes few to mention, all resulting from good teamwork, teamwork as displayed by all those people involved in the making of this event. I certainly look forward to someday repeating this experience although I believe it will be hard to beat.

A final word, thank you, FITA, for this opportunity.



## **12. Case studies from Issue 63**

63.1

Almost all the Judges replied correctly that the uniform issue would not influence the result of the match.

Certainly the uniform issue should have been handled beforehand, and due to the appeal it would probably be handled before the next match to shoot by team A.

63.2

It was the opinion of the vast majority of the Judges that the archer in question would be allowed to participate in the Elimination Round ranked according to the score he has achieved - and as he has participated in the qualification round (although not completed it as such) he can also be a part of a team.

Some judges considered the issue of fairness to the higher ranked archers or teams, as the archer in question may be a very good archer and team archer.

However, it would be impossible to consider all aspects that might happen in a competition.

An example, at a World Championships some years ago, a very good compound archer shot three tens in the wrong face, causing him "to lose" 30 p. He ended as no. 64 and thereby met the winner of the qualification round in the first match - and won (as he was normally as good as the other archer).

Is it unfair to the winner of the Q.R? Maybe - but what could you do? Archers will qualify with the scores they have achieved, having a good day or a bad day.

Besides, no archer or team would prefer to meet the best archer or team of the Q.R. in the first match - so this will hardly be done speculatively.

## **13. New Case Studies**

64.1

In a bronze medal match archer A is 10 points ahead after 9 arrows. Archer B is aiming at the target to shoot her 10<sup>th</sup> arrow when one of her bow limbs breaks and hits archer A in her chin, causing her to bleed. There is lots of blood running down from her chin. Archer A asks the judge to stop the match for a couple of minutes so that her coach can help her stop her bleeding. She says she needs a band-aid in her chin, mainly because that is her anchoring position. The judge says that the rules are clear: no additional time can be given to an archer for any reason whatsoever. What would you have done if you had been the judge?

64.2

Some minutes before the start of the competition, in the break following the practice period, an archer was on the shooting line pulling his bow loaded with an arrow. By accident he shoots and the arrow hits his target – a good shot in the 10 ring.

A nearby Judge immediately approached him, telling him that the arrow would count as part of the first shooting end of the competition, and that he will lose the highest scoring arrow of that end. The Judge referred to Art. 7.4.2.4

When scoring the first end, the Judge approached the archer's target in order to take care of the previous mistake and found that the archer had shot only two arrows – a 9 and a 7. The Judge then said that the scoring would be 7-M-M.



The archer protested, however, as his pre-shot arrow scored a 10 and as it counts as a part of the end, this is the highest scoring arrow – and that was also his reason for only shooting two arrows. He claimed to score both of his arrows and thus get 9-7-M. He further claims that if he had shot three arrows, then he would have had four arrows in that end – also referring to Art. 7.4.2.4. The Judge, however, said that he should have shot three arrows in the first end. Give your consideration!



*FITA Judge Committee Member Sergio Font, observing a candidate who is trying to make an arrow call.*