



## JUDGES NEWSLETTER

**WORLD ARCHERY FEDERATION**

**ISSUE #79**

**November 2011**

### **Content**

- 1. Editorial from our Chairman
- 2. Appointments for duty in 2012
- 3. Judge duties 2012
- 4. Upgrades to international status
- 5. New rules from 1 April 2012
- 6. Judges guidebook
- 7. Honorific titles awarded
- 8. Measuring arrows from the centre
- 9. Judges conference – Ogden, USA, June 2012
- 10. Case studies N°78 – Summing up
- 11. New case studies

### **1. Editorial**

**By Morten WILMANN, Chairman**

Dear judges,

As you may have noticed from World Archery Information we have had our yearly meeting in London combined with the London Classic Event (Olympic Test Event), where we have had to face the fact that some severe mistakes have been made by judges this year.

It is most unfortunate when such mistakes happen in critical phases of the competition. During seminars I always tell the attendants: "It takes maybe 10 years to build up a good reputation, and 5 seconds to break it down".



In many ways that is what has happened this year. The trust in judges and their abilities has been shaken.

This means that we have to take some steps in order to re-build the trust, also knowing that we cannot totally avoid human mistakes. But each one of us must be more focused on the job and be better prepared for the duties we will perform!

We have therefore suggested to the Executive Board (bylaw changes of appendix 4 – our guide) the introduction of a kind of stress-tests at our Conferences (checking the abilities to make correct judging decisions without much time to think) as part of the re-accreditation considerations to be made later on at the end of the four year accreditation period.

Today, when archers are getting more professional and more money has entered into the picture, we just cannot allow judges to "lose their head" by reacting wrongly or not reacting at all when necessary.

"Hard Talk"? I would rather call it a "wake up call" up front of a new year of important events: Olympics, Paralympics, World Championships and World Cups.

Morten



## **2. Appointment for Duty in 2012**

Your appointments for next year have been published and you have received some personal feedback in this respect from the World Archery Office.

Unfortunately we have not been able to give all of you a duty in 2012, and due to the large number of international judges and judge candidates you cannot expect to have a duty every year – also depending on where, when and how many events you have applied for.

In 2012 more than 25 judges did not get any duty (some are alternates), and we would like to say that not being appointed has nothing to do with your abilities or level of performance. It has only to do with fitting into a larger puzzle; to make appointments according to the many variables we have to consider.

## **3. Judge duties 2012**

### **Olympics Games London, GBR**

Dion Buhagiar	- Chair	EU
Matsiewdor war Nongbri	AS	
Linda Cockrell	AM	
Irena Rosa	EU	
Karla Cabrera	AS	
Susanne Womersley	OC	
Graham Potts	EU	
Fulvio Cantini	EU	
Cesar Araujo	AM	
Pedro Sanz	EU	
Schandorff Vang	EU	
Vladimir Dominguez	AM	
Myat Soe	AS	
Jean-Pierre Galeyrand – Dos	EU	
Alt: Victor Stanescu	EU	
Friedrich Karle	EU	

### **Paralympics Games London, GBR**

Morten B. Wilmann - Chair	EU
Charmaine Ho	AF
Katarina Plakouda	EU
Christiane Murphy	AM
Flemming Skjoldborg	EU
Richard Breese	EU
Marco Cattani	EU
Davood Nematinia	AS
James Larven	OC
Simon Wee	AS
Ranjan Bhowmik	AS
Petros Petrou	EU
Robert Pian – Dos	AM
Alt: Eddie Yip	AS
Buyantsetseg Namkhai	AS



**World Indoor Champ. (Vegas, USA)**

Jean Martens	- Chair	EU
Hannah Brown		EU
Celine Gravel		AM
Paola Praschker		AM
Michelle Ang		AS
Maya Shalaby		EU/AF
Mariya Larkina		EU
Wolfgang Böcker		EU
Robert Pian		AM
Jean P. Galeyrand		EU
Tanvir Ahmed		AS
Per Andersson		EU
Andrea Bortot		EU
James Larven	-Dos	OC
Alt:		
Macide Erdener		EU
Ahmed Roushdy		AF

**World Field (Val d'Isère, FRA)**

Karen O'Malley	- Chair	OC
Young Sook Park		AS
Patti-Jo Middlesbrough		AM
Friedrich Karle		EU
Nico Tomaselli		EU
Indranil Datta		AS
Shinji Egashira		AS
Robert Erica		EU
Tom Green		AM
David Martin		AF
David Tan		AS
Andjelko Praskalo		EU
Jay Ben-Ari		EU
Alt:		
Didier Gras		OC
Mahnaz Abdolkarimi		AS

**World University Champ.  
(Cordoba, ESP)**

Luca Stucchi	-Chair	EU
Kristina Melicharova		EU
Sajeevi Silva		AS
Adam Martinez		AM
Alt:		
Lena Fazzolari		AM
Indranil Datta		AS

**World Cup Final (Tokyo, JPN)**

Xiuzhi Zhang	-Chair	AS
Pecilius Tan		AS
Randall Jones		AM
Alt:		
Andrea Bortot		EU
Buyantsesteg Namkhai		AS

**World Cup Shanghai  
(Shanghai, CHN)**

Yip-kay Tang	-Chair	AS
Takeuchi Nobutomo		AS
Sabrina Steffens		EU
Roger Garrod		AM
Alt:		
Annamalai Murugason		AS
Pavel Prokop		EU

**World Indoor Cup Final  
(Vegas, USA)**

Jean Martens	-Chair	EU
Wolfgang Böcker		EU
Celine Gravel		AM
James Larven	-Dos	OC
Alt:		
Robert Pian		AM



## **World Cup (Antalya, TUR)**

Klaus Lykkebæk	-Chair	EU
Victor Stanescu		EU
Katy Lipscomb		EU
Ahmed Roushdy		AF
Alt: Georg Loh		AS

## **World Cup (Ogden ,USA)**

Dion Buhagiar	- Chair	EU
Laura Churchill		AM
Vladimir Dominguez		AM
Sunethra Senevirathne		AS
Alt: Katy Lipscomb Yap-Lee Chong		EU AS

## **4. Upgrades to international status**

The committee decided to upgrade the following judge candidates to full status:

Christiane Murphy	CAN
Robert Pian	USA
Katerina Plakouda	GRE
Hannah Brown	GBR
Katy Libscomb	GBR
Richard Breese	GBR
Klaus Lykkebæk	DEN
Charmaine Ho	RSA
Elsie Luk	HKG
Wolfgang Böcker	GER
Indranil Datta	IND

## **5. New rules from 1 April 2012**

We are a bit premature here, but if everything goes according to plans, there will be "new rule books" from the date mentioned.

In addition to be re-edited, there has also been an attempt to "clean up" the rules by better texting, avoiding too many double ups and proposing some necessary changes. The latter will be considered by the World Archery Executive Board within short.

We will of course cover "the news" in detail in our next Newsletter. So far we just remind you all of the latest bylaw changes – ref. World Archery News of November.

Your committee is looking forward to the new rule books with a certain optimism.



## **6. Judges guidebook**

---

Some of you have asked for an updated Guide Book, which is understandable as there has been some changes, both in bylaws and procedures.

Due to heavy workload among the committee members, we were a bit delayed this year – and now we consider it better to wait until the new rule books are in place, and thus avoiding launching a guide book that almost immediately would be outdated.

## **7. Honorable titles awarded**

---

The committee decided to award the following:

### **Judge Emeritus:**

Bei Guo	CHN
Sung-Ho Um	KOR
Yap-Jin Chong	MAS

### **Honorary Judge:**

Andrew Geno Omalla	UGA
--------------------	-----

### **Judge Committee Award:**

Jocelyn Acop	PHL
Ronaldo de Carvalho	BRA
Burak Demiralp	TUR
Norio Heya	JPN
Masatoshi Seki	JPN
Patrick Wiggeleer	BEL
Kam-Ming Yu	HKG

## **8. Measuring arrows from the centre**

---

In their meeting in London, the World Archery Judge Committee discussed the need to include in our Judges Seminars and Conference the topic of how to measure arrow distances from the centre of the target. This is mainly due to the fact that the present rules with so many potential ties make judges more involved in tie-breaking one-arrow shoot-offs. At several world class events this year, different procedures have been used by different judges, who have also used different gauging devices to measure.

It is then time that we established more precise procedures to ensure consistency in what we do. It does not look any good to see a judge do something and another judge do something different just two targets away.



International Judge Katerina Plakouda (GRE) measures arrow-centre distance with a divider.



International Judge Richard Breese (GBR) gets his equipment ready to measure.

## **9. Judges conference – Ogden – USA – June 2012**

The 2012 International Conference will be held in Ogden, Utah, United States of America (USA) in conjunction with the last stage of the World Cup to be contested there. The first day of the Conference will be the last competition day, whose finals matches have been scheduled for the evening. Observation of finals procedures will be part of the conference's program. All International Judges and Candidates from all over the world are invited to attend, arriving on June 22 and departing on June 25. Further information on costs and schedule will be made available to the judges as soon as details have been finalized. Do not forget that you are expected to attend at least one Conference in each four-year reaccreditation period.



Pictures taken at the Judges Seminar held in Bangkok (BKK) in 2011



## **10. Case Studies 78 – Summing up**

---

### **Case study 78.1**

At a World Ranking Event in which seniors and juniors took part in separate categories in the Olympic Round, practice was allowed for 30 minutes for both the women's recurve and the junior men's recurve. The first competition round, however, would be the women's recurve 1/32 round, and at this time the junior men would sit down and wait for the 1/16 round, in which they would have their first matches.

The DoS announced the start of the 1/32 round for women but did not indicate that the junior men would not be allowed to shoot at this time. Several junior men archers walked to the shooting line and stood in the positions that should have been occupied by the senior women to shoot their matches. When the green light came on, six women in different matches had not been able to place themselves in their positions because the junior men refused to leave the line. A couple of judges took action, but it was too late for four of these six women to be able to complete their three-arrow sequence. When the red light came on, the following situation occurred:

- a) The two women shooting their match on target 22 had shot only 2 arrows each.
- b) One of the women on target 23 had shot her three arrows, but her opponent had been able to shoot only two.
- c) One of the women on target 25 shot her third arrow after the beep indicating that the time had concluded.

Based on the circumstances above, the judges decided that the archers who had not been able to shoot their arrows would be given 40 seconds each for the arrows not shot, and that the arrow shot out of time by the archer on target 25 would be considered valid.

Two appeals were lodged, one from the team captain of the archer who did shoot her three arrows on target 23, and another one from the team captain of the archer who had shot her three arrows within time on target 25.

- What's your opinion about the judges' decision?

### **Reply:**

As most cases, this one is also very special, and the main training is to teach our judges to be aware of the "big picture" in archery judging, namely being protective when it is possible (not giving any advantage).

First of all, we are pleased to see the many descriptions on how judges would act to prevent the problems mentioned, as prevention is often much easier than solving a problem.

However, the case happened and we have to deal with it, whatever caused it, and we are happy to see that 97% of the judges would give the ladies the relevant time to shoot their non-shot arrows.

The only "difficulty" must be the lady on target 25 who shot after the stop shooting signal, and here the judges group split in their views – a small majority would accept the shot as such, of course only if it is verified that this lady in fact was prevented from starting full time to shoot.



We agree with this small majority; because: The intention of the rule (losing the highest score of the end) is to avoid anyone taking an advantage by using more time than allowed. In this scenario the archer certainly did not try to get an advantage, as she was prevented from using the complete shooting time by a situation outside her control. Possibly the shot was not as good as it would have been, if she had stopped by the signal, she would have been given 40 sec. as happened with the other archers. We do not reshoot, as a shot arrow is a shot arrow – but to additionally take away the highest score seems far too harsh in this situation.

But if an archer gets a stop shooting signal, should he not stop? Yes, that would be the best solution for everyone, always easy to handle. But you do not lose the highest score for not acting according to the signal, but for using too much time. Due to the circumstances, the ladies in question did not get their correct timing as they were prevented from starting in time.

The case did not tell us if the junior men also shot any arrows, maybe or maybe not, but that would be another case.....

### **Case study 78.2**

At a National Championship, an archer claims a pass-through when he gets to his targets, arguing that there is an unmarked hole in his target face. All three archers look for the arrow, but after 5 minutes the arrow has not been found yet. The judge decided that since there was no evidence of a pass-through, the "arrow" would be scored as a miss. The archer's team captain submits an appeal to jury, but jury refuses to handle it claiming that a "judge's decision on the value of an arrow" is final and cannot be appealed. The score of a Miss was then kept in the scorecard.

Three ends later, another archer shooting at the same target found in the grass, 3 meters behind the target, an arrow belonging to the archer who had claimed the pass-through. The latter, of course, called the judge and asked him to give him the value of the unmarked hole found on the target three ends before.

- 1) Was the reply given by Jury correct?
- 2) Would you consider replacing the Miss by the value of the unmarked hole after three ends?

### **Reply:**

This case had actually two questions; first of all; to those judges who agreed with the Jury; there are only two incidents where the judges' decision cannot be appealed, and that is

- 1) The decision of an arrow value still in the target (a line-cutter).
- 2) The yellow card given (or not given) in a team match.

Consequently, as we in this case are talking about a pass-through, the decision may be appealed and should be handled by the Jury.

Then, if an arrow has been reported as a pass-through and no arrow has been found, it will be recorded as a miss (as in this case). The judge, however, has to check as much as he can, in case the arrow is found later. In our case an arrow was found, and if the investigation (traces) may convince the judge that this is the arrow that passed through earlier on, the arrow should score (according to the impact found earlier in the face).

Again we try to protect the archer's score (and you understand the value of noting down everything in your notebook.)



However, the judge must do his job conscientiously so that he does not give a score where no score should be given. He must be "convinced" that it is the pass through arrow which is found.

Even if there were different opinions re the conclusion here (based on various conditions), most of you seem to understand what has to be done. The learning must therefore basically be that the fact that "things" may be discovered later in the event does not automatically mean that no changes in scores can be made.

## **11. Case Studies 79**

**79.1** In the first set of a finals match with alternate shooting, the 10 second standby count has started for the first archer when she realizes she does not have her tab, which she may have left in the practice field 50 meters away. She turns to you, the judge, and asks for time to go get her tab. What would you do?

**79.2** In a team finals match with lots of cameras and photographers, one of the photographers has moved away the sign indicating where the shooting line is so as to be able to get a better view of the archers for his photos. There is no Shooting Line sign visible to the archers now. When the first team starts shooting their first three arrows, they stand on the 1 meter line and not on the Shooting Line and shoot their three arrows. The other team's coach claims to the judge that these three arrows should be forfeited because they were not shot from the actual shooting line. What would you do?

**THE DEADLINE FOR REPLYING TO THESE CASE STUDIES IS 30 JANUARY 2012**



*The Judge Commission at the 2011 Pan American Games in Guadalajara*