

JUDGING NEWSLETTER

WORLD ARCHERY FEDERATION

ISSUE #93

December 2016

Content

1. Editorial
2. World Archery Meetings 2016 – International Judge Committee
3. Appointments
4. Upgrades to International Judge Status
5. Results of International Judges Seminar in Osaka, JPN
6. International Judges Seminar in Salt Lake City, USA
7. International Judges' conference in Bangkok THA
8. New bylaws and interpretations
9. Reply to Case Studie 92
10. New case studies.

1. Editorial

by Morten Wilmann, Chairman

Dear Judges,

When I write this editorial, the year of 2016 is close to its end. I would like to thank you for our efforts during the year and formally welcome the new ones. Our great event, the Olympics in Rio, was done excellently by the judges present.

It seems to me that our judges theoretically are getting more than before, so the question now will be how to perform without being obviously nervous, and with the authority of a judge as well as being cooperative and helpful.

Today and in the future, this will be more and more important, as spectators are getting closer to us by the means of TV, films, etc.

Those who are not on the wanted level of confidence should not be in finals, and the Chairman of the commission has the responsibility of putting the right person on stage, especially thinking of shoot-offs in the last part of the competition.

Having said this I wish you all a Happy New Year.

Morten



2. World Archery Meeting 2016 – International Judge Committee

World Archery (WA) recently hosted the second comprehensive meeting for all of its boards, committees and ad hoc committees, in Lausanne. This was held between Nov. 29th and the 1st of December 2016. At the beginning of this meeting the Secretary General, Tom Dielen, presented the vision for World Archery for the near future.

The Judges Committee used the meeting to carry out a number of its duties, in particular the allocation of Judges to the various WA International competitions in 2017. It also confirmed the upgrading of International Judge Candidates to International Judge status.

Future Developments:

We also took the opportunity to discuss our future work plans, and a number of tasks were discussed and considered. In summary these were:

- (i) The completely revamp the PowerPoint presentations found on the WA website. These presentations will be updated and comments would be added to each slide. The comments can then be used by the presenter to ensure that the right objectives are being addressed for each slide.
- (ii) The updating and issuing of the Judges guide book, which is presently in an advanced stage.
- (iii) We are also considering changing the format of the accreditation exam, and it is envisaged that the next accreditation exam will consist of three parts. One part will consist of an online multiple choice exam, taken against the clock. In addition to this, the Judges committee would like to prepare a set of audio/visual presentations related to judging procedures, and it is our intention to use these for training and examination purposes. We feel we should be making better use of multimedia to help provide a better Judging educational system. The third part will be a practical examination to determine the Judges response to actual situations on the field of play.
- (iv) More importantly, we will be carrying out a critical review of the Judges Educational systems in place today.

Several meetings were also held with other WA committees, this allowed us to get direct feedback about the quality of our judging at World Archery events, and enabled us to discuss issues of common interest.

The following is a summary of some comments and observations:

Committee Meetings

(a) Constitution and Rules:

During a meeting with C&R, the members of this committee explained the process of how interpretations as lodged and dealt with. We also discussed the possibility of preparing and maintaining an online chronological interpretation database.

(b) Athletes committee:

The feedback given by the athletes committee was positive and they expressed that the quality of International Judging has in their opinion improved, however, there were comments that the consistency of Judging needs to show further improvement. This was highlighted by an example regarding the number of officials on the field of play, or for instance team uniforms. In these case the athletes and team officials often observed that one judge would enforce a rule, whilst another judge will turn a blind eye, and let things pass. Comments about the quality and consistency of Continental Judging at other high profile archery tournaments were also made. In response to this observation the Judges Committee pointed out that it was the responsibility of the Continental Judges Committees to ensure consistency amongst archery judges. The International Judges committee pointed out that there were a number of presentations on the World Archery Web site along with the Judges guide book that could be used as a good training aid for aspiring Judges, and it would also be good for the preparation of athletes, officials and coaches. Other issues such as improved shooting layouts, use of the yellow card etc; were also discussed.

(c) Field committee:

The Field committee expressed their wish that a balance be found between experience and less experienced International Field Judges. It is a fact that very few International Judges apply for Field and 3D events, and this is probably due to the fact that many Judges do not have the opportunity to Judge at local/national events at home. The Judges committee agreed to look into this and find ways of better preparing a number of Field/3D judges. The issue of timing at the target during field events was also raised and it was decided that this would be reviewed further, and that better procedures would be formulated. The definition of an instinctive bow was discussed, at length, in the presence of members of the Technical Committee. The discussion centred on the type of instinctive bows being produced and in use today. It was agreed that a survey would be made at the next international event to see exactly what bows are being used, and how best to deal with the eventual definition of the instinctive bow.



(d) Target committee:

During a meeting with the target committee, we discussed the possibility of reducing the size of the compound indoor target, so that the overall size of the target in relation to the smaller 10 ring would be proportional. It was eventually agreed that all scoring zones would be 20mm in width. It was also agreed that these target faces would be used during the Lausanne Archery Classic 2016, with the intention of obtaining feedback from the compound athletes. The two committees also discussed what is often seen to happen in individual and team finals where athletes find themselves in the situation where they cannot win with their last arrow. Today we still allow this arrow to be shot. However, we decided to look into this and to see if the match could be concluded at the point when the possibility of winning has been surpassed. There were suggestions by the target committee regarding alternate shoot-off procedures, and it was agreed that this would be the focus of further discussion. The target committee pointed that we do not have a "severe weather policy" in our rules and that maybe it was opportune that we had guidance on this matter. The meeting with the target committee was very fruitful and many other topics were discussed.

(e) Technical committee:

As mentioned above in the meetings with the field committee, much of the discussion centred on the definition of the instinctive bow and how to apply the present rules.

(f) Coaches committee:

The meeting with the coaches committee, turned out to be a very interesting encounter. The members of this committee outlined their program of work for the coming year and highlighted that they would be focusing solely on competition requirements, and that coach development would be carried out by another section of WA. The possibility of having an International athlete prepare as a judge was also discussed. The committee expressed that having international competition experience was beneficial but not essential. The coaches committee also raised the point of judging consistency on the field. We took note of this comment, and we also took the opportunity to highlight what we felt was a lack of co-operation by coaches with regards to the number of officials on the field and that we need more co-operation in this aspect. The Coaches also touched on the quality of national Judges, and again the Judges committee explained the responsibilities of national, and continental judges was of the respective entities. The coaches committee also asked us about the procedures when measuring for shoot-offs, and we explained to them how we expect the Judges to carry out this very important duty.

The second encounter of comprehensive meeting of committees turned out to be a very useful experience, as it offered all WA committees the opportunity to interact with other. We would like to thank WA for opportunity.

3. Appointments

For 2017 we are using a lot of judges due to the many international events, in fact nearly all of the judges who applied and would be available according to their own applications and rules that are governing our Committee.

However, we are not using judges who are not responding to case studies – at least 5 out of 6 cases. These case studies are assisting us in assessing the knowledge and rule understanding our judges have.

Indoor World Cup – Nimes, France

Paco GIMENEZ (ESP)	IJ	Chair
Hossein NASIRINEDJAD (IRI)	IJ	
Denis PAQUET (FRA)	IJ	
Tanvir AHMED (BAN)	IJC	Alternate

Indoor World Cup – Vegas, USA

Robert PIAN (USA)	IC	Chair
Sheri RHODES (USA)	IJC	
Roula TAMER (LIB)	IJ	
Carlos CERVANTES (MEX)	IJC	
Klaus LYKKEBAEK (DEN)	IJ	Alternate

Hyundai World Cup Stage 1 – Shanghai, CHN

James LARVEN (AUS)	IJ	Chair
Frankie HOONG (SIN)	IJ	Deputy
Jean MARTENS (BEL)	IJ	
Nestor BULOSAN (PHI)	IJC	
Laura Lynne CHURCHILL (CAN)	IJ	
Yuko OKURA (JPN)	IJC	
Abubakar JOHARI (MAS)	IJC	Alternate



Shanghai 2017

Hyundai World Cup Stage 2 – Antalya, TUR

Robert ERICA (NED)	IJ	Chair
Katy LIPSCOMB (GBR)	IJ	Deputy
Mariya LARKINA (RUS)	IJ	
Takeuchi NOBUTOMO (JPN)	IJ	
Shahrzad ALLAHYARI (IRI)	IJC	
Flemming SKJOLDBORG (DEN)	IJ	
Martino MIANI (ITA)	IJ	Alternate

Hyundai World Cup Stage 3 – Salt Lake City, USA

Sergio FONT (CUB)	IJ	Chair
Fulvio CANTINI (ITA)	IJ	Deputy
Linda COCKRELL (USA)	IJ	
Paola PRASCHKER (ARG)	IJ	
Rubens TERRA NETO (BRA)	IJ	
Junji OZAWA (JPN)	IJC	
Jesus GUEVARA (ESA)	IJ	Alternate

Hyundai World Cup Stage 4 – Berlin, GER

Schendorff VANG (FRO)	IJ	Chair
Randall JONES (CAN)	IJ	Deputy
Friedrich KARLE (GER)	IJ	
Martino MIANI (ITA)	IJ	
Young-Sook PARK (KOR)	IJC	
Christophe PEZET (FRA)	IJ	
Ringa BALTRUSAITE (LTU)	IJ	Alternate

Summer Universiade – Chinese Taipei

Robert PIAN (USA)	IJ	Chair
LEONG Fai Keong (SIN)	IJ	
Douglas BLYTH (GBR)	YJ	
Yasuhiro SHIWAKU (JPN)	YJ	
Karen PAN (TPE)	IJ	Alternate
Indranil DATTA (IND)	IJ	Alternate



World Cup Finals – Rome, ITA

Sabrina STEFFENS (GER)	IJ	Chair
Alexandre VECCHIO (BRA)	IJ	
Andras HEGEDUS (HUN)	IJ	
Andrea BORTOT (ITA)	IJ	Alternate

World Games, Wroclaw, POL

Hannah BROWN (GBR)	IJ	Chair
Robert ERICA (NED)	IJ	Deputy
Klaus LYKKEBAEK (DEN)	IJ	
Andjelko PRASKALO (CRO)	IJ	
Kristina REITMEIER (CZE)	IJC	
Irena ROSA (SLO)	IJ	
Mariya LARKINA (RUS)	IJ	
Patti-Jo MIDDLEBROUGH (CAN)	IJ	Alternate



3-D World Championships, France

Hannah BROWN (GBR)	IJ	Chair
David CATALAN (ESP)	IJC	Deputy
Mildred de LEON (PHI)	IJC	
Jose del TORNO (ARG)	IJC	
Didier GRAS (FPO)	IJC	
David TAN (SIN)	IJ	
Drasko MIHINJAC (CRO)	IJ	
Bjarne STRANDBY (DEN)	IJ	
Joris UMMACHERIL (IND)	IJC	
Carlos CERVANTES (MEX)	IJC	Alternate

Para World Championships, Beijing, CHN

Henk WAGEMAKERS (NED)	IJ	Chair
Carla CABRERA (PHI)	IJ	Deputy
Graham POTTS (GBR)	IJ	DoS
Dave MARTIN (RSA)	IJ	
Tanvir AHMED (BAN)	IJC	
Ringa BALTRUSAITE (LTU)	IJ	
Maren HAASE (GER)	IJC	
Alison HAGAMAN (AUS)	IJC	
Lais NUNES (BRA)	IJC	
Denis PAQUET (FRA)	IJ	
QU Yinan (CHN)	IJC	
Angelina CHAN (SIN)	IJ	
Ahmed KOURA (EGY)	IJ	
Michael NOYET (MAS)	IJC	
Ghazeleh RASSOULI (IRI)	IJ	Alternate
Ranjan BHOWMIK (IND)	IJ	Alternate

Youth World Championships, Rosario, ARG

Luca STUCCHI (ITA)	IJ	Chair
Adam MARTINEZ (PUR)	IJ	Deputy
Vladimir DOMINGUEZ (CUB)	IJ	DoS
Celine GRAVEL (CAN)	IJ	
Nina HERCEG (CRO)	YJ	
Cesar ARAUJO (MEX)	IJ	
Klemen CEZAR (SLO)	YJ	
Robert POTTS (GBR)	YJ	
Katerina KONCALOVA (CZE)	IJC	
Pecilius TAN (SIN)	IJ	
WANG Lian (CHN)	IJ	
Aslihan UNSAL (TUR)	YJ	
Saruul ENKHBAT (MGL)	IJC	
Elena MORILLAS (ESP)	YJ	
Charmaine HO (RSA)	IJ	Alternate
Ghazaleh RASSOULI (IRI)	IJ	Alternate



World Championships, Mexico City, MEX

Pedro SANZ (ESP)	IJ	Chair
Indranil DATTA (IND)	IJ	Deputy
Irena ROSA (SLO)	IJ	DoS
Davood NEMATINIA (IRI)	IJ	
Andrea AGUILAR (GUA)	IJC	
CHEN Ting-Ni (TPE)	IJ	
Mike CULLUMBER (USA)	IJ	
Marisa AUSTRIA (PHI)	IJC	
Lena FAZZOLARI (ARG)	IJ	
Katerina PLAKOUDA (GRE)	IJ	
Lorraine Van Der WESTHUIZEN (RSA)	IJ	
Guillermina GARCIA (MEX)	IJ	
Jesus GUEVARA (ESA)	IJ	
Petros PETROU (CYP)	IJ	
Vladimir DOMINGUEZ (CUB)	IJ	Alternate
Katy LIPSCOMB (GBR)	IJ	Alternate

4. Upgrade to International Judge Status

The following judges were upgraded from International Candidates to International Judges

- Michael CULLUMBER (USA)
- Bjarne STRANDBY (DEN)
- Ghazaleh RASOULI (IRI)
- David MARTIN (RSA)
- Francisco GIMENEZ (ESP)
- WANG Lian (CHN)
- Laura Lynne CHUCHILL (CAN)
- Angelina CHAN (SIN)
- David TAN (SIN)
- Jesus GUEVARA (ESA)
- Guillermina GARCIA (MEX)
- Alexandre VECCHIO (BRA)

5. Results of International Judge Seminar in Osaka, Japan

An International Judge Candidates' Seminar was held in Osaka, Japan, on September 23-25, 2016 with 13 participants and 9 sit-ins from Australia, Chinese Taipei, Czech Republic, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Mongolia, the Philippines and Singapore. World Archery Judge Committee Members Morten WILMANN and Sergio FONT conducted the lectures and practical sessions.



Resulting from the exams written and the judges' performance along the course, the following new International Judge Candidates were named:

OZAWA Junji	JPN
KONCALOVA Katerina	CZE
OKURA Yuko	JPN
REITMEIER Kristina Anna	CZE
HAGAMAN Alison	AUS
NAKANO Maki	JPN
BULOSAN Nestor	PHI
PARK Young Sook	KOR

6. International Judges Seminar in Salt Lake City, USA

An International Judge Candidate Seminar will be held in Salt Lake City, USA, on June 17-19, on the occasion of the Hyundai Archery World Cup. Further information on schedule and costs will be distributed as soon as available.

7. International Judges' Conference in Bangkok, THA

As part of the re-accreditation process International Judges and Candidates need to go through, the 2017 Judges Conference will be held in November 2017 in Bangkok, Thailand. More specific information on this Conference will be provided very soon.

8. New bylaws and interpretations

Dear Judges, be informed that new interpretations and bylaws have been added in the last five months. Please use to the following links to keep yourselves updated.

<https://extranet.worldarchery.org/documents/index.php/html/?dir=151>

<https://extranet.worldarchery.org/documents/index.php/html/?dir=63>

9. Repy to Case Studies 92

92.1

Question:

This question (real situation) came from a fairly new WA Member Association. A recurve team match showed a 4-4 score. The teams went again to shoot a 6 arrow set, only realizing after that it should have been a shoot-off. The team that lost the match claimed that the set should be cancelled, and that a "real" 3-arrow shoot-off should be shot. It was insisted by the Chairman of Judges that the arrows were already shot and so that end could not be discarded.

What is your opinion of the decision made by the chairman?

Answer:

The replies from judges in this case seem to show several options, however there is not.

Some judges are mentioning that the match should have been stopped (by the judge or Dos). Yes, but that is not the question here. We have a situation that has to be solved.

The last end - the extra one - is not valid. There has to be made a proper shoot-off. A shoot off means that the mental stability of the archers are differently than just shooting an end. The match might have got a different outcome.

Another issue; some of you are referring to "never reshooting", which is a good rule. However, the rule is to avoid that archers are shooting in order to get more score, or in order to get some advantages over their competitors. But in this match there is no "reshooting".

92.2

Question:

In a team match an archer is preparing to shoot the team's last arrow of the set. For some reason the archer has some trouble shooting this arrow, and (probably thinking he was not shooting the team's last arrow) he walked out of the shooting line and crossed the one-meter line. His teammates pushed him back to the line to shoot his arrow. As he crossed the line in again he did it with his arrow nocked in the string. The judge did not raise the yellow card, and though the rules state that a yellow card decision cannot be appealed, the opposing team verbally complained to the chairman of judges claiming that a yellow card should have been raised.

What's your opinion about this case?

Answer:

Here we believe that we have to use "the intent of the rule". The purpose of yellow cards is not just to show a card; it is to prevent a team from getting a time advantage by walking in too early.

In this case – due to the circumstances – the team would not take any time advantage (he had already gone forward according to the rules – but went back and forth).

10. New Case Studies

93.1

Question: At a World Ranking Event the 1/48 Round for recurve men is shot in two details (AB – CD). A match between archers A and B, and a match between archers C and D. When the first set begins, archer A starts walking to the shooting line 10 seconds after the beep to start shooting was given because he was fixing something in his bow. To his surprise, his position on the shooting line is occupied by archer C, who has already shot one arrow. Archer A lets the judge know, and archer C realizes he was not supposed to be shooting now, but two minutes later. Archer C walks out the line, and archer A steps in. He manages to shoot his three arrows within time. Archer C asks the judge what he should do in his own two-minute sequence. Will the arrow already shot count as part of the end? Will it be considered as an arrow shot out of time? What would you reply to archer C in this situation?

93.2

Same situation as in 93.1, but in this case archer A is not able to complete his three-arrow end because archer C has taken his position for a few seconds. Archer A asks for 40 additional seconds to shoot his pending arrow. What would you reply to him?

**Replies to the case studies should be sent to
sderiaz@archery.org before 28 February 2017**