

CASE STUDIES and QUESTIONS from the FITA Judge Newsletter.

Case study No. 67.1

At a recent Indoor championship 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 had shot two arrows/or that maybe that 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 situation on the target;

Upper centre 9

Middle centre 10

Lower centre 8

And a bouncer on the floor in front of the target.

None of the archers on the target had marked the arrow holes and there were several unmarked holes in the various centers, 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. As a Judge you are called to this target, how would you score the arrows?

Case study No. 67.2

At a FITA outdoor tournament there were four archers at each target, they shot in two details: AB–CD, then CD-AB, etc. The order of shooting was indicated on a visual electronic board close to the countdown clock. At one stage the archers on one target got confused, with the consequence that archers CD shot when the sign showed AB, and archers AB shot when the sign showed CD. The incident was noticed by a team captain of archers not involved on this target. He protested and claimed that all the archers on the target in question should lose all the values for that end, as they shot out of sequence. The judge called to the target agreed with the team captain and decided to score all the arrows as M's. However, all the team captains of the archers on that target protested, claiming that this was highly unfair. The incident was presented to the Jury of appeal. As member of the Jury of appeal do you agree with the Judge's decision in this case? Why?

Case study No. 66.1

At a National Championship two archers showed up at the equipment inspection with slings attached to the bow as shown in the following pictures. The judges were not sure whether to allow them or not. What would you have done? *[Picture shows slings attached to the bow]*

There was more or less total agreement among our judges in allowing the “bow slings” shown in the photos. Some judges remarked that they would look at it in practical use, to ensure that the slings did not have any other function than exactly that: being a bow sling, and not in any way strap the bow to the bowhand.

A couple of judges mentioned that by placing the “bow slings” on to the stabilizer instead of the bow, they were not really “bow slings” any more, but they correctly added that the function is precisely the same and therefore allowed according to our rules.

Case study No. 66.2

At a World Ranking Event only one judge was in charge of controlling the two teams in a match. The judge was not aware that the timing equipment used would not sound if the clock ever went down to zero. When there were only 5 seconds left, the last archer of

Team A drew his bow to shoot his last arrow. The judge was watching the archer while listening for a sound signal that was never given by the timer. The archer shot his arrow, and the judge, uncertain of whether it was shot within the time frame or after it, decided not to raise the red card and deemed the arrow as shot within time. The coach of Team B claimed that the arrow was shot after the clock had come down to zero, and filed an appeal against the judge's decision. What would you have done if you had been a member of Jury in this case?

The majority of the judges correctly mentioned that our rules more than once state or indicate that there shall be an audible signal to control timing, and that visual signals are therefore only additional aids in this respect. Attention was then drawn to the need for judges to check the venue equipment thoroughly. However, that has not always been the procedure when it comes to alternate shooting, and especially in the team event, where it would be strange perhaps to have a stop shooting signal while one team still has arrows to shoot. And in the alternating individual shooting you may say that the one beep signal is a start signal for the next arrow rather than a stop shooting signal if an arrow is shot late in a sequence. Maybe we have to clear up a bit here.

To the case itself; you may say that the judge should have placed himself in order to watch both the countdown clock and the archer, but the situation described is that the judge did not discover any late shot and he did not watch the clock at the actual moment. Good judging or not, we do know that most of jury decisions on matters like this, have been in favour of the archer (benefit of the doubt) – realizing that it is not easy to decide on late shots.

In this case there is also a point that the archer did not get any signal, and was not able to make a decision; shooting or not shooting. Losing an arrow, or losing the highest score, is not exactly the same.....So even if there was a late shot (we don't really know) the archer did not get the proper signals. In our opinion it would therefore be difficult for the Jury in this situation to decide on taking away the highest score.

A compliment to our judges for a lot of good reasoning related to this case.

Case study No. 65.1

At an International Tournament, a team from country A shows up with four recurve men archers. When the team reports to the equipment inspection, one of the archers is dressed with the same color pattern as his teammates, but he wears the name of his personal sponsor on his Polo shirt. None of the other archers has that name on their uniform, as that company does not sponsor them. The judges tell the archer that he cannot wear the name of than sponsor because all the members of the team must be dressed exactly the same. Do you agree with the judges? Explain.

Advertising is allowed within specific sizes, and nowhere our rules claim that all the archers from the same member association need to have the same sponsor (advertising). The request that teams should be dressed in the same uniform is a kind of "look good" and "being identified by nationality" request.

Normally advertising would not lead to identification problems – and wearing a sponsor's logo is quite common within sports and does not create any image problem whatsoever.

Some judges said that they would allow this for the individual competition but not for the team event – a position that would be totally impractical. The same considerations as above would also be valid for the team event, where the identification would be even easier as all the team members are situated in the same box/area.

You are of course aware that the Olympics have their own rules for advertising, which are communicated far in advance to the member associations, but this is another story....

Case study No. 65.1

At a national championship, there are two archers shooting at 50 meters on target 24. When the archers come to score their last end, one of the archers (24-A) realizes that she has all of the spaces for his 36 arrows filled with numbers, and there is no room to score her last three arrows. On the other archer's (24-B) scorecard there are three empty spaces for the last three arrows. Archer 24-B has been doing all the scoring during the whole distance. The archers call a judge to solve the problem. What would you do if you were the judge?

As most of you underlined, there may be various reasons for this mistake, and you certainly have to check all possibilities to find the mistake and correct it.

First of all, since this is a problem there must be only one set of scorecards, otherwise it would be easy to compare and find out.

Obviously one end has been taken down twice (for the same archer) or one end for both archers have been put on the scorecard in question. You may find out by checking the various ends – and if you are lucky it may also be possible to compare with the holes in the target, looking for specific hits or count back the scores. If there is no possibility of finding out where the error is, then you have to change the scores of the last three arrows entered in the scorecards to the values of the arrows still in the target (because this is obviously the last end – and in fact the only evidence you may have).

Newsletter 64, April 2006 - 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.

Case study No. 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 10th 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?

Fortunately 90% of the Judges showed a broader understanding of rules and procedures in this case and would give the necessary time for archer A to deal with the bleeding. To the few of you: you cannot apply rules blindly – a wording we often repeat.

The whole set up of our match system is for image reasons, and certainly we would try to keep as less “dead time” as possible. Therefore the rules say that there will be no stops for equipment failures (because the archer may have spare equipment at hand) or unexpected medical problems (because the archers should be fit for the competition).

However, this is an accident where archer A had no possibility of preventing the situation – and as some Judges correctly say; there would not be a good image if the Judge insisted that the bleeding archer must go on.

Other circumstances may also cause a stop even in an Olympic Gold Match – i.e. someone gets into the shooting field or the target face blows over.

Although it did not follow directly from the question, some Judges extended their reply also to say something about archer B here. Since this was a bronze medal match we must presume that the shooting is alternately, and even archer B must have been quite chocked by the incident. If we suppose that the breakage of the bow caused the arrow to fall down within the 3m line, the Judge should immediately see to it that she continued shooting (with her spare bow) within her time limit (not stopping), then care for the necessary time break of the procedures to deal with the injured archer.

Case study No. 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 [3?] 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[3?]. The Judge, however, said that he should have shot three arrows in the first end. Give your consideration!

This case was certainly first of all a check if our Judges are updated on rule changes, and fortunately 95% seemed to be. The case as such is not so “easy” as it may look from the first view. Certainly the archer should have shot three arrows in the first end, but in this case he may have been confused by the statement of the Judge involved (the arrow being a part of the first end) – and that is a valid consideration.

Of course there are also arguments for acting strictly according to the rules here, and thus give 7.M.M – which was the final conclusion of approx. 80% of the Judges in this case.

The most important message here is that the directives given by a Judge must be clear and appropriate, and when we have new rules – as in this case – the Judge should definitively have told the archer to shoot three arrows in the first end of the competition in order to avoid any confusion.

63 series answers are from the Judge’s Newsletter, April, 2006

Case study No. 63.1

At a world ranking event, Team A shoots a score of 239 points in their match versus team B (234 points). The team captain of team B lodges an appeal claiming that the three archers in team A wore different clothes in terms of colour during the match. You are a member of jury. What’s your decision?

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.

Case study No. 63.2

At the same world ranking event, archer X completed only his 90 and 70 meter distances. At the start of the 50 meter distance he had a serious equipment failure which he could not repair before the 30 meters concluded. There are 62 archers in the competition, and byes will be allowed for the 1/32 elimination round. Would you allow this archer to compete in the individual Olympic Round? Can he be part of his team for the team round?

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.

Case study No. 63.3

At the same world ranking event, archer X completed only his 90 and 70 meter distances. At the start of the 50 meter distance he had a serious equipment failure which he could not repair before the 30 meters concluded. There are 62 archers in the competition, and byes will be allowed for the 1/32 elimination round. Would you allow this archer to compete in the individual Olympic Round? Can he be part of his team for the team round?

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.

62 series answers are from the Judge's Newsletter, November, 2004

Case study 62.1

The three archers shooting at one target cannot find an arrow shot by one of them and score it as a miss, but do not report the lost arrow to the judges. Three ends later the archers find the arrow protruding from the back of the target butt obscured by the target stand. A judge is called and he pushes the arrow back to find that the score is an X. The judge changes the value from an M to an X in the score card for the end in which the arrow was not found. Is this procedure correct?

Discussion: Different opinions came from the groups either for or against the judge's action. After the discussion a majority decision was taken in favour of giving the X to the archer, given that the three archers had agreed that the arrow found was actually the one they had not been able to find before. The minority of the Judges indicated that this could have been the fourth arrow of that end, but due to the given fact (confirmed by the other archers) that an arrow had not been found some ends earlier, it is most likely that the arrow found is the same arrow that was missing.

Case study 62.2

An archer is having trouble pulling and completing his shooting of an end of three arrows. He releases his third arrow after the allotted time but arrow falls within the three meter area. The other two arrows were a 9 and a 7. What score would you give?

Discussion: A vast majority agreed to score 9-7-M. Technically speaking, the third arrow was not shot, because it lay inside the three meter zone.

Case study 62.3 a)

An arrow rebounds from the target. Upon scoring, the other two archers find an arrow with a damaged nock hitting the 5 points zone, and an unmarked hole in the 9 ring. What score would you give to the rebounded arrow?

Discussion: Most judges agreed to give the highest score (9) given the fact that the nock in question could have been damaged by another arrow, and it would be unfair to penalize the archer. In fact the unmarked hole is that found in the 9 ring. If the unmarked hole had been found in the 5 ring and the damaged nock in an arrow hitting the 9 ring, the rebounding arrow would of course have scored 5 points.

Case study 62.3 b)

An archer has two arrows in the ten ring, and one in the seven zone. One of the arrows in the ten ring has a damaged nock. The archer claims the arrow in the seven hit the nock of the other arrow in the ten, and argues that he should have three tens. What score would you give?

Discussion: ALL the judges agreed to score 10-10-7. No further comments as this is in accordance with the rules.

Case study 62.4 a)

Arrow "B" imbedded in arrow "A" in the 10 ring, and both arrows broke into two. The point and front half of arrow "A" still remained in the 10 ring. The other half of arrow "A" with the front half of arrow "B" fell on the ground. The other half of arrow "B" with fletching hitting the 8 ring. What would be the score for arrows "A" and "B"?

Discussion: Most judges concurred that the values should be 10 and 10.

Case study 62.4 b)

Arrow "A" hits the 8 ring above the bull's eye, and is hit by arrow "B" as in case 4a) above. The back portion of arrow "B" is deflected and hit the 10 ring. The front half of arrow "B" is imbedded in arrow "A". How would you score these arrows?

Discussion: Both arrows should be scored as 8. In items 4 a) and b) the actual hits can be verified without a doubt, and the actual scores are then given accordingly.

Case study 62.5

The essence of this case study was to pose the problem of whether we can rely on the electronic (unofficial) scoring in case an archer forgets to write his score in the official score card but another archer in the target did enter the value of all of this archer's arrows in the electronic pad connected to the computers.

Discussion: Except for four judges, the vast majority agreed that the scores sent to the computers could be used to give an archer his/her scores. The judges also felt that a warning should be given to the "forgetful" archer so that this incident does not happen again.

Case study 62.6

The following happens in a quarter finals team match. In the second end of the match the first archer of team A shoots his three arrows, the second archer shoots one arrow with a low score. The coach of team A changes this archer by the fourth archer who crosses the line and shoots two arrows. The third archer shoots three arrows. This procedure is repeated in the third end too. The assigned judge did not do anything.

Discussion: It is obvious that the judge should have done something. But what? The judges at the Conference felt that the best solution in this case would be to disqualify the team, given that the rules say that only three archers can shoot one end. In this case a new rule is probably needed.

Case study 62.7

An arrow rebounds from the target in an indoor tournament making noise when hitting the target and the floor later. No unmarked holes are found at the moment of scoring. The judge gives an M to the archer. The archer appeals to Jury. Was the judge right?

Discussion: All the judges agreed that the score should be an M. No unmarked hole = a miss.

Case study 62.8

This was not really a case study. It was rather a question regarding the responsibilities of the archers while competing at a tournament.

Discussion: A list of responsibilities and/or duties was produced by each of the discussion groups. Ms. Lynne Evans, FITA Vice President, suggested that this list be sent to the competitors committee for their analysis. The answer to this question will be presented as a separate item in our next issue of the newsletter

Case study 62.9

An archer shoots an arrow some minutes before the start of the competition during the break between practice and competition shooting. He was pulling his bow with an arrow on the shooting line and released the arrow by accident. The arrow hit the 10 ring. A judge approached the archer and told him that that arrow would count as part of the first competition end, and that he would lose the highest scoring arrow of that end. While scoring was in progress for the first end, the judge comes over to take care of the previous mistake made by the archer. He finds that the archer had shot only two arrows: a 9 and a 7. The judge then said that the score should be 7-M-M. The archer protested, however, as his previous arrow scored a 10, and as it counts as part of the end, that was the highest scoring arrow, and that was also his reason for only shooting two arrows. He claims that his score should be 9-7-M. He further claimed that if he had shot three arrows, then he would have had four arrows in that end.

What do you think?

Comments: We had lots of discussion about this case study. Some judges felt that the archer should shoot three arrows and lose the highest scoring arrow of the three shot within the two minutes. The majority, however, considered that the correct thing is to have the archer shoot two arrows only. The split opinions about this case show that it is important to have some better

wording in the rules book. The Judges Committee will follow up. Article 7.7.3.2 appears to need some further clarification.

Case study 62.10

The Chairman of the Judges' Commission at a tournament is taking an overview of the scoring procedure a few meters in front of the shooting line. He realizes that an archer (A) finds an arrow behind his target and walks to the target where another archer (B) appears to be asking archer A for that arrow, which he refuses to give archer B. One of the judges is called to the target, and the situation seems to be solved. Archer B now gets the arrow. The Chairman becomes interested in the incident and the next end is shot, he walks over to the judge involved and asks him what happened. The judge explained that he was called to the target because one archer (B) had shot 7 arrows in that end. However, when the judge approached the target, the scoring had already been done and some arrows had already been withdrawn from the target. So he was not able to investigate the claim.

The Chairman, who had witnessed the incident from his position, approaches the team captain of archer B in order to check the scorecard for the previous end. No M had been recorded in the scorecard for archer B, nor was there an M in any previous end. The chairman then decided to deduct the highest value of that end, convinced that a 7th arrow had been shot.

What's your opinion about the Chairman's action? How would you have solved this case?

Discussion: This was a tough case to solve. A number of judges indicated that the scorecard cannot be changed after the arrows have been withdrawn from the target. A slight majority, however, argued that the chairman was right to ensure a fair competition. The archer in question had shot a miss and it was not recorded. The case study does not explain whether the chairman made some further investigation before making his decision. It would have been good to hear what the other archers in the target had to say about the incident.

Case study 62.11

The Chairman is called to a target because an archer does not accept the call made by a judge who did not use his magnifying glass. The archer refuses to withdraw his arrows. If you were the chairman, what would you do?

Discussion: Though some judges said that the chairman should then make a "real" call with a magnifying glass, the majority of the judges in attendance went for not making a second call. The case study shows the importance of Judges using the correct procedures.

Case study 62.12

At an event the light and sound signals were manually operated by the DoS. On one occasion during the event, the DoS made a mistake and switched on the red light 10 seconds too early, and one archer standing close to the lights reacted and interrupted the shot (did not shoot). To his surprise, however, the DoS gave the sound signal according to the correct timing – 4 minutes. The archer called a judge to explain the situation, which had been noticed by some judges too. The archer asked for 40 seconds to shoot his arrow.

Discussion: All the judges in the conference agreed that the archer should be given 40 seconds to shoot his arrow.

Case study 62.13

During shooting at an event you suddenly discover an archer using an anchor plate on his tab that continued into a thin plastic rod which made a huge half loop. The half loop was hooked around the archer's neck and thus kept his drawing hand steady at the cheekbone upon release.

You approached the archer (and his coach) claiming that this anchor plate was not allowed due to its construction, giving additional release aid. The archer, however, said that he had

specifically shown his tab to a judge at the equipment inspection and got his permission to use it. He claimed it would be unfair to ask him to replace it in the middle of the shoot. The judge in question confirmed the incident and said that the rules do not specify the shape of the anchor plate.

- a) Do you agree with the judge who inspected the equipment first?
- b) In case you find the item illegal, would it be fair to ask the archer to change it when he has already been given permission to use it?

Discussion: a) The general feeling was that the item is illegal. b) It was also felt that the archer should change his plate in fairness to the other archers in the competition.

Questionnaire from April 2004 Newsletter, #62

1. In an indoor tournament an archer shoots two arrows in the upper face (values 9 and 8), and two arrows in the lower face (values 10 and 7). According to the present rules the score is:

- a) 0 9, 8, 7.
- b) 32 7, M, M.
- c) 9 8, 7, M.

FJC Comments: 78% of the judges gave the correct answer to this question regarding indoor scoring. This is probably due to the fact that indoor archery is not practiced by all FITA Member Associations. Three mistakes were made by the archer here, for that reason the 9 and the 10 become misses, and the archer loses the 8 because if four arrows are shot, only the three lower values are scored.

2. An archer reports a bouncer to the judge from the shooting line. Three archers are shooting at the target. The judge tells the three archers to stop shooting. At the end of the time sequence:

- a) 18 The judge and the archer with the bouncer should go to the target to score the arrow.
- b) 7 The judge and the three archers go to the target to score.
- c) 16 The judge, the archer with the bouncer, and the scorer go to the target to score.

FJC Comments: This procedure is described both in the FITA Rules (art. 7.6.2.6.1) and in the Judges' Guidebook. However, only 43.9% of the judges who completed the questionnaire gave the right answer. We have often witnessed judges calling out for the scorer to come to a certain target to score a bouncer. It is not necessary. Only the judge and the archer concerned walk to the target. This decision does not involve the other archers on the target.

3. An archer's bow sight breaks while shooting the last end of the 50m distance. The archer claims time to repair his sight based on the "15 minutes" rule.

- a) 19 The 15 minutes start when all archers have returned from the target after scoring the last end.
- b) 10 The 15 minutes start when the three beeps are given to go to the target to score the last end.
- c) 12 The 15 minutes start when the archer advises the judge that he is ready to start shooting.

FJC Comments: There was plenty of discussion around this question. Some of the judges marking option c) claimed that the question was not clear. Probably it was not the general consensus to punish the archer with the failure, and for that reason the discussion after the questionnaire moved towards option a). Maybe further specification is necessary in the rules so that the same procedure is followed everywhere in the world. The 15 minutes should be counted from the time all archers have returned from the targets after scoring the last end of the distance. The 15-

minute period after the end of the distance can be used to finish repairing the piece of equipment in question and to shoot the remaining arrows. It is suggested in the Guidebook that, once the archer is ready to shoot, the judges will tell him/her how many ends he will be allowed to shoot considering the time left. This is a practical procedure to avoid turning the whole process into a 100m dash race.

4. The line judge considers that an archer shot his last arrow out of time. The DoS, however, believes that the arrow was shot within the two minutes.

a) 13 The DoS's opinion prevails.

b) 24 The line judge's opinion prevails.

c) 4 Since there is a disagreement between the judge and the DoS, the decision should be made by the Jury of Appeal.

FJC Comments: 58.5% of the judges gave the correct answer. The judge is in most cases closer to the archer than the DoS, who is mainly focused on the time control device rather than the archer. If the judge believes there has been a problem with the timing device, he should of course consult the DoS before he makes a decision. By no means should the decision be passed on to Jury. The archer, however, has the right to appeal against the judge's decision afterwards.

5. A judge is called to decide the value of two arrows which are embedded in the target. The nocks are not visible, and no unmarked holes can be identified.

a) 10 The judge should try to give a value without touching the target, by comparing the position of the shafts in question on the back of the target with other shafts whose value can be clearly identified.

b) 30 The judge should push the arrows from the back of the target to make a better judgment.

c) 1 The judge should try to locate the nocks by searching into the target with a thin pen.

FJC Comments: A follow-up discussion in the conference showed the judges' preference not to touch the target even in extreme circumstances like this one. Option a) could be perfect whenever possible, to avoid touching the target. Option b) is often necessary. In such cases the judge should make sure that all the other arrows in the target have been scored before he pushes an arrow from the back of the butt. When in doubt, the archer gets the higher score (benefit of the doubt).

6. If you realize a countryman of yours is shooting at one of the targets under your supervision during match play.

a) 4 You must inform your chairman for him to make a change in judge allocation to targets. You advise the DoS to delay the start of shooting until the change is made.

b) 19 You ask a judge next to you to trade targets with you and advise your chairman of the change.

c) 17 You remain in the targets you were originally assigned. You are a FITA Judge and thus you have no nationality.

FJC Comments: As international judges we should always act in all fairness to everyone on the field regardless of their nationality. But each of us comes from one nation. What happened in the men's team finals in Atlanta showed that some action needed to be taken to avoid giving food for the thought that a judge would benefit an archer or team from his own country. Commission chairmen normally see to it that no judge should be in control of targets with archers from his own country. You, as a judge, are also responsible that this ethical principle is followed before a series of matches starts.

7. A third arrow shoot off is required in a quarter finals match. One archer per target. Both archers shoot a 9.

- a) 3 Judge A measures the distance to the center for archer X, and judge B measures the distance for archer Y. Both values are recorded and compared to determine the winner.
- b) 10 The same judge measures the distance in both targets. He measures one target first, takes down the distance in his notebook, closes the divider, and then measures the other target following the same procedure.
- c) 28 The same judge measures both targets. One target first, and then, holding the divider open with the distance already measured, he superposes the divider to the distance in the other target just to compare them.

FJC Comments: A majority decision was taken in favor of option c). Some judges raised important issues like the need for a device (either a caliper or a divider) that would allow to fix the first distance so that it is not changed while trying to compare it with the second one.

8. In your opinion, what should be marked on the shooting line?

- a) 19 The centre of the three shooting positions (one per archer).
- b) 17 The zone (80 cm minimum) for each archer.
- c) 5 Both of the above using a different color for each kind or mark.

FJC Comments: This question also created lots of discussion. It was really intended to get a feeling from the judges as to what is really necessary on the shooting line. Option a) is what the Rules Book says. However, several judges attached much importance to marking an area (b) for each archer. During the discussion some Judges preferred to have both options, then the position is indicative but the area tells the archer that he may move a bit within the area as long as there is no space problem. Today, however, we cannot request this from the Organizers. It would be interesting to know what the archers prefer to have. We will submit this issue to the Competitors' Committee for input.

9. After the completion of the 1/32 elimination round, a mistake is found in the results of the FITA round for two archers, which brings about several changes in the final results list of the qualification round. These changes will of course result in a new pairing chart. What should the judges do?

- a) 28 Make a new pairing list with the changes and shoot only those matches whose participants have changed.
- b) 6 Make a new pairing list and shoot all the matches as if the 1/32 matches previously shot had been cancelled.
- c) 6 Make a new list of results of the FITA round with the corrected scores. Proceed, however, with the 1/16 round without making changes to the original pairing chart.

FJC Comments: Most judges favored option a). It is in fact the best to do. Those matches with the same opponents do not need to be shot again. It would be very unfair to do it. Under exceptional circumstances, however, it is not possible to use another half an hour (or more time in case the mistake is found after several stages of the elimination round have been shot) for one or more series of elimination matches (not much daylight time left to complete the day's program, for example), and then you will decide in coordination with the organizers to go for option c).

10. Give values 1 (very important), 2 (important), 3 (not really important), 4 (useless) to each of the following items in terms of the importance you attach to them for a judge commission debriefing meeting at the end of a competition day.

- a) Number of faces replaced. (02-08-20-09)
- b) Problems with the field crew. (23-12-02-02)
- c) Number of scorecard corrections. (07-14-13-05)
- d) Number of bouncers (07-21-08-03)
- e) Number of equipment failures (01-16-17-05)
- f) Name or back number of archers who have lost arrows on the field. (27-05-06-01)
- g) Number of arrow calls made. (03-06-19-11)

h) ____ Another you consider very important.

FJC Comments: This question was intended to elicit from the judges what is really necessary to keep record of and discuss at the judge commission meetings at the end of a competition day. The figures above speak by themselves. How much time do we spend reporting how many calls we have made? Item a) may be of value to the organizers whose stock of faces may be limited. Some judges do not seem to care much and change faces that can be used longer. The problems in item b) need to be handled immediately with the O/C to avoid trouble the following day. Scorecard corrections tell us how well trained the scorers are (if scorers are used). d) may tell us that there is some problem with the butts in use and that they should not be used in other world class events. The number of equipment failures does not really matter much, unless we are speaking of the same archer causing delay to the tournament on several occasions. The name of archers with lost arrows does matter and should be given to all judges so they are ready to take action if an arrow is later found on the field. In reply to item h) some judges included such important issues as safety problems, appeals lodged, number of pass-throughs, problems with team captains and coaches, as well as schedule and arrangements for the following day.

11. At a World Ranking Event the judges find out that for some reason all 122 cm target faces are 2 mm larger than the tolerance for this kind of face. It is not possible to purchase new faces before the competition starts. What can be done?

a) 0 Cancel the tournament as the size of the targets is not right.

b) 10 Hold the tournament but suggest to FITA that it not be considered valid for World Ranking Status.

c) 28 Hold the tournament but not consider any scores as world record if they exceed the current record.

FJC Comments: No judge considered the possibility of canceling the tournament. It is obvious that scores shot at targets which do not meet the size requirement can not be considered for world record. The decision as to whether the tournament is valid or not for the world ranking is not in the hands of the judges, but they should report to FITA about the problems with the faces. It is important that an announcement be made at the team captains meeting regarding the wrong size of the targets though.

12. During an elimination round match an archer shoots one of his six arrows after the signal to stop shooting. Scoring should proceed this way:

a) 27 The six arrows are entered in the scorecard, but the judge should draw a diagonal line over the highest value and then write an M.

b) 14 The 5 lowest values are entered in the scorecard, the last space is filled with an M.

FJC Comments: 65.8% of the judges gave the right answer. It is important that the value of the highest scoring arrow be left in the scorecard, just in case an appeal is lodged with jury.

13. During a team match, team A has four archers. When the signal to start shooting is given, the four archers are in the team box.

a) 0 The team loses the highest scoring arrow.

b) 32 The judge asks the coach to remove back one of three archers who are not shooting while the first archer is on the shooting line.

c) 9 The judge raises the yellow card indicating that the first archer must cross back the 1-meter line until the fourth archer leaves the area.

FJC Comments: Nowhere in the Book there is an article specifying what to do in such a case. Option b is then the best solution. You cannot penalize an archer or team without a rule to back you up. Our committee will prepare a motion for a by-law in this regard.

14. An international tournament is held on a field that cannot accommodate many archers. It is necessary to have only 80 cm per archer on the shooting line. Some archers use

telescopes with tripods that occupy too much room on the line, making it impossible for all three archers and their telescopes to stand on the 2.40 m area.

- a) 16 The judge should tell the archers with such telescopes not to use them.
- b) 23 The judge may allow the archers to place their telescopes 1 meter behind the shooting line. The archers will then have to walk out of the line and then go back whenever they want to spot an arrow on the target.

FJC Comments: The general consensus was to do everything possible so that the archers could have their telescopes on the line or as close to it as possible, making sure that the ins and outs of the archers do not cause disturbances to the archers around.

15. When teams alternate shooting, a team shoots four arrows in a sequence where only three may be shot.

- a) 36 The judge raises the red card to indicate that the team will lose the highest scoring arrow for that end.
- b) 5 The judge will warn the team but will take no further action because in the next sequence of three arrows the team shot only two.

FJC Comments: This question had to do with a case study recently used in a newsletter. The judges in the conference referred to several articles in the Book to back up their choice for item a). There is, however, no rule specifying what to do in this special case, much less indicating that we should take away points when the team shot 9 arrows in their three minutes. The general feeling from the judges, however, was that a penalty must be given. The FJC will prepare a motion for a by-law and submit it to council for approval.

61 series answers are from the Judge's Newsletter, April, 2004

Case Study 61.1

At a team match with alternate shooting, team A has already shot two sets of three arrows and their clock has stopped with 67 seconds left. Team B is now shooting their second set of three arrows. In their first set of three arrows, each member of the team shot one arrow. Now on the second set, archer 1 steps on the line and shoots an arrow, archer 2 steps on the line next but has a hard time going through her clicker and steps out of the shooting line to allow archer 3 to come onto the line to shoot one arrow. So now archers 1 and 3 have shot one arrow each on this second set. Archer 2 steps on the line and shoots one arrow (the third arrow for the team in that set), and immediately after that shoots the fourth arrow for her team in that set. Once this has happened the count-down clock comes to zero, indicating that the time for the team has expired. The judge for this match did not do anything.

- a) What violation did team B make?
- b) What should be the penalty?
- c) How should the judge have indicated that?

Unfortunately approximately 10% of the Judges had misunderstood the case, so it is important that you read the cases carefully (as it is important to understand a real situation before you make decisions).

Furthermore, from the answers it is obvious that some Judges are not quite familiar with how an alternate team match is conducted.

In short, in this case Team B made a mistake by not shooting the prescribed three arrows in one segment (they shot four). However, the team did not shoot too many arrows (they score nine arrows in spite of only having shot seven due to the expiry of time), no archer shot more than three arrows (as prescribed) and they did not shoot out of time (as the time is running as long as the archer is on the shooting line).

The question is merely what to do based on the fact that the team shot four arrows in one segment when they should shoot only three. The majority of the answers (approx 80%) would deduct the highest scoring arrow of the end.

(Some also referred to the possibility of taking away the score of the actual arrow, as there are Judges in the blinds notifying the individual scores of the arrows – however this part of the article(s) is not any longer valid – as it was changed one year ago by Council and confirmed by Congress)

Those who refer to the rules are all quoting Art. 7.8.2.5, referring that this fourth arrow is shot “out of sequence” and thus the highest score should be deducted. However, the minority of Judges (approx. 10%) say that this shot is not “out of sequence” and the rules don’t specify any penalty for this violation (just a warning is relevant). This means that we have to look at the term “Out of sequence”. This term is also found in Article 7.4.2.3 – for individual matches. Then we understand that the term is not related to the number of arrows shot (the situation of the team match cannot occur in the individual match), but to the shooting sequence A-B-A-B-A-B, which means that B cannot shoot when it is A’s turn. In our team case, team B did not shoot when it was team A’s turn to shoot, so team B did not shoot “out of sequence”.

Consequently, team B made a mistake, but the rules don’t specify any penalty for that kind of mistake – thus we cannot deduct any scores.

(FITA Judge Committee acknowledge that there is a general “feeling” that there should be a penalty for such an infraction of the rule, as a Team may speculate and achieve some advantage by shooting more than the prescribed number of arrows in one segment. Therefore, we will take steps to include such a penalty into the rules, but this must not be applied until it is actually there...)

Case Study 61.2

There are three archers shooting at target 33. The archers had agreed that one of them (A) would mark the holes and remove all the arrows on that target in every end. Another archer (B) would enter the scores in the official score-card, and the third archer (C) would enter the arrow values in the electronic pad for the computers. For some reason the score of archer (A) in the fourth end was not entered in the official score card. She did not realize that in that very end, but in the following end when scoring was to take place. She calls a judge. The judge says that nothing can be done and she should get M-M-M because the arrows are not in the target. Archer A claims that the scores were entered in the electronic pad (unofficial scoring – as had been informed in the Team Captains Meeting), and she appeals to Jury. What would you do if you were in Jury?

We are happy to learn that the vast majority of Judges would do their utmost in order to safeguard the scores of this archer, who suffered from a mistake of one of his competitors. As we have stated before, it is a good basic rule for Judges only to act according to what can be verified (arrows in the target). But again – nothing must be applied blindly. The question must always be if you can be reasonably sure (find acceptable proof) of the score.

In this case, it is unlikely that the input on the electronic score pad should be anything different from the actual scores – and as some judges mention; especially if the rest of the input seems to be according to the scorecard.

Some Judges also indicated that it may be possible to count back the hits on the face comparing them with the scores, and thus find the actual score. Unless the face is also used during warm-up, this is a pretty good idea – as you then could replace the face and use some time for checking while the shooting proceeds, in order to avoid delays. Some judges indicated that the acceptance of the electronic scores would depend on the acceptance of the archers on that target. We don’t think this is relevant, as in that situation the competitors may see a possibility of “questioning” the scores.

60 series answers are from the Judge's Newsletter, October, 2003

Case Study 60.1

At a tournament, a judge was called to a target to correct the scorecard. Upon checking the values of the arrows with the scorecard, he/she realizes that one of the arrows noted as a 7 could hardly be more than a 6. He/she pulled up his/her magnifying glass, checked that arrow properly, and declared it to be a 6.

One of the archers, however, blamed the judge for intervening without having been called for that purpose, as the archers on the target have agreed on the value. How would you consider the Judge's action?

Correctly enough a huge majority of Judges stated the principle that the Judge have an overall responsibility of the conduct of scoring – ref. art. 7.9.1.6.

Therefore – in principle – it is not only a right for the Judge to correct errors he observes, it is his duty to do so. There may even be situations where it is necessary to follow up some targets closely, if there is a suspicion of cheating or frequent mistakes. This is not contravening our basic procedures.

The rules describing how archers shall act at scoring are there to take care of how the archers shall perform their duties, realizing that it is impossible to have judges verifying all the scoring which would have required a judge almost for every target – for time reasons.

In this specific case one Judge made an interesting point re the Judge's action. Based on the fact that he arrived after the scoring basically had been done, he must certainly be careful in changing questionable values on his own initiative, as both arrows and/or target face may have been touched after the archers have decided the values.

Case Study 60.2

Regarding the team event, you may find these scenarios:

a) The second archer of the team is crossing the one-meter-line too soon when his/her team-mate is returning from the shooting line. Due to the stress of the competition, the team and their coach did not take notice of the yellow card given by the judge, and the archer shot his/her three arrows.

The judges decided to take away the highest score of that end when scoring. However, the other team in the match filed a protest claiming the team to lose the three highest scores, as the archer shot three arrows after the yellow card was given before returning behind the one-meter-line. What is your opinion regarding this protest?

b) The third archer of the team removes his/her arrow too soon when moving forward to the shooting line. The judge gives the yellow card and calls the name of the team. Due to the stress of the competition and noise from the spectators, the coach and the team were not aware of the card until after the archer had shot one arrow. Discovering the card, the coach then asked his/her archer to return behind the one meter-line to then move forward again to shoot his/her remaining two arrows.

The judges decided to take away the highest score of that end, as the archer had not reacted immediately to the yellow card.

The team, however, filed a protest against the judges, claiming that the team did not get any time advantage because the archer returned behind the one-meter-line and then came into the line again to shoot his/her remaining two arrows.

What is your opinion on how to handle this case?

c) A team is getting short of time and decides to let their third archer move forward to shoot even when their second archer is still on the shooting line. The judge, of course, immediately shows the yellow card, but this was ignored by the team. Consequently, the team had two archers shooting two arrows each at the same time. The second archer returned behind the one-meter-line when he/she finished shooting, and the third archer remained on the shooting line to shoot his/her remaining arrow.

The judges discussed the situation, but found nothing in the rules regarding this specific situation and decided to deduct the highest scoring arrow of that end. In spite of that, the team won the match two points ahead of their opponent.

The opposing team filed a protest claiming that such behavior was against the intention of the rules, and that the team had deliberately done it in order to save time.

What is your solution?

d) During the last end of a team match, one of the archers in Team A was clearly observed to cross the one-meter-line too early. However, the judge unfortunately overlooked the incident and the match went on to conclude that team A won the match by 5 points.

Team B protested to Jury, and named several independent witnesses to the situation, including a video tape of the match.

What is your solution to this case?

e) In a team match, an archer crossed the one-meter-line too soon and removed his/her arrow from the quiver before standing on the shooting line. The judge raised his/her yellow card and the archer returned behind the one-meter-line accordingly – but only once.

Do you see any problems here?

Here we found lots of possible scenarios from the team event – and these cases also showed that a lot of our Judges are not so familiar with team events and their rules.

a)

Our rules are quite clear here, the team will only lose the highest scoring arrow as the Judge in question decided.

Be aware of the intention of the rules; a team shall not have any time advantage over the other team, and this is related to the crossing of the one meter line when going forward to shoot – not to the number of arrows shot (after the yellow card is given).

From the answers we would like to underline the following:

1) You must not “invent” any punishment. A possible punishment must follow from the rules.

2) If a team obeys by the yellow card and return behind the one meter line, no further action is taken - even if this is repeated several times during a match.

The punishment is carried out by the loss of time on each occasion the team’s archer has to return behind the one meter line.

b)

In this situation the team seems to realize a mistake and tries to make up for it by returning after the shot is made. Approximately half of the Judges would accept the shot and half of the Judges would not accept it – in spite of a possible “good will” from the team in question.

In many cases we train our Judges not to be punitive but protective. However, we must be aware not to “jump to a conclusion” too easily. Even here we must stick to the basic rule and take away the highest scoring arrow based on the following reasoning:

- It gives a significant advantage to be able to continue the shot (mental preparation and performance of the shot) compared with having to interrupt the shooting.

- It opens up for “tactics” from the team if the team itself can choose when to take the punishment.

As the rhythm of the team can vary, the archers may shoot one, two or three arrows, returning behind the one meter line after a shot may not necessarily give a time punishment at all.
- - Probably the Judge would already have given the red card (for not obeying the yellow one) and thus indicated both to spectators and the other team the loss of the highest scoring arrow - which may influence the match.

c)

Here we face a situation which as such is not covered by the rules. Certainly the rules describe that only one archer at the time shall be on the shooting line, but indicates no consequence if not. Again be aware of the following;

1) Do not invent any punishment, you do not have the right to do that.

2) Even if the rules are referring to the Organizers Manual (a bit unfortunate in this respect), the introduction of a time penalty in the team event, made all previous references to take away 2 points per yellow card invalid (some Judges indicated this as a possibility in this case....).

Then, is it no possibility to meet such an unfair shooting behaviour as shown by the team in this case? Yes, in fact it is. According to our rules the team may be disqualified if they are considered to break the rules knowingly.

In this situation we consider it proper to take this article into consideration.

d)

A majority of Judges caught the important point of view in this case, where a Judge overlooked a mistake re crossing the one meter line too early. The important point is that the team, possibly not knowing about their mistake, did not get a chance to make up for the time advantage.

In most of the cases a time penalty is handled by the team within time (they speed up if necessary), and therefore it would be totally unfair to take away any points at the end of this match.

In this respect, line judging is very much like a soccer game – the situations cannot be restored. The situation is certainly unfortunate, and our line Judges must really be awake all the time.

e)

A huge majority of the Judges clearly see no problems in this situation where the team made two crossing the one meter line mistakes, got a yellow card and returned behind the line (once) according to the rules.

Don't forget that the team only had "one time advantage" since they made the mistakes simultaneously, and rightfully got only one yellow card and consequently returned only once.

To the minority of the Judges; do not apply rules blindly; look at the intention of the rules.

Ask yourself: why is this rule there?

Case Study 60.3

a) At an equipment inspection you find a fiber optic sight pin of approx. 5cm long. However, this sight pin extended towards the archer and not towards the target as usual. The judge claimed that the pin was illegal, and the archer protested due to design mentioned.

b) At the judges meeting in the evening after the equipment inspection, upon the information of the case above (a). One of the other judges informed that he/she had checked a fiber optic sight pin that extended towards the target almost 5 cm before it curved and ended outside the sight vision. The judge accepted this sight pin because it ended outside the sight vision.

Would you accept these fiber optic sight pins? Explain. Do not just say Yes or No.

60.3

The text, the interpretation and the explanations have obviously not made the whole issue re fiber optic sight pins totally clear. Neither is the English language always easy to understand for us "foreigners" (like the FITA Judge Committee and the many Judges around the world).

Some main points have to be clarified:

- a) When the rules are talking about “a fiber optic pin in line of vision towards the target”, “towards the target” is referring to line of vision – the area between the eye and the target.
- b) The maximum of 2 cm is to avoid using the item to check a possible torque or level of the bow. This has nothing to do with a possibility of more than one aiming point, which is another limitation.

In our case, none of the fiber optic pins are legal – as they are giving more than 2 cm “in line of vision towards the target”.

The first one is 5 cm and the second one is 5 cm before bending (and then ending outside the vision). In other words, both these pins are giving the possibilities of checking a possible torque or level of the bow, exactly what the limitation of 2 cm tries to limit.

(See pictures and explanation to a certain example in this Newsletter).

Case Study 60.4

During the inspection of the field the judges overlooked that the individual shooting positions were not marked on the shooting line. During practice before the competition started, one of the judges realized so, and came up to the chairman of judges.

The chairman, however, was not willing to possibly delay the start of shooting in order to correct the field, and said that they would just wait and see if somebody protested. Give your thoughts in this respect.

The marking of shooting positions. This mistake should certainly have been discovered by the Judges far before the Practice Session.

However, the attitude of the Chairman of Judges in this case is certainly not acceptable. It is our primary work to prevent problems, instead of cure the problems (which often at that point have increased considerably, creating inconvenience at a large scale).

Therefore it is also a kind of “Golden Rule” re field layout that everything that can be corrected shall be corrected. This time we are talking about marking of shooting positions, a problem that can be easily taken care of without creating much delay – as indicated by the majority of the Judges. If there for some reason should delay the start of the tournament with some minutes, a cooperation (information) with the Team Captains is a good advice.

59 series answers are from the Judge’s Newsletter, January, 2003

Case study 59.1

In the first end of a match round of an indoor competition, in alternate shooting, Archer A shot his first arrow in the 10 when time expired just after the audible signal. At scoring, the judges said that the highest score of the three arrows would have been forfeited.

Archer A protested, saying the procedure was not clear and there were no lights and no count down timers. The match was indeed controlled by two judges behind the archers, who were timing and giving verbally indications about when time was started; the signal of time expired was given with a whistle. Archer B (the opponent) said that he was accepting the ten from Archer A. So the Judges accepted Archer B’s decision and the 10 has been scored.

A) Was the action of judges correct?

B) May have any relevance the opinion of a competitor in the final decision?

We appreciate the number of Judges who would look carefully into the possibilities of safeguarding the points of the archer, by considering both the information about the procedures in use and the time of the shot with regard to the expiry of time.

However, we know that in situations where the procedures differ from the rules laid down, information on the matter will be given during a Team Captain Meeting. So for further discussion

of this case, we suppose that the procedure was well known and that the arrow in fact was shot clearly after the expiry of time.

From the answers we would like to underline that archers cannot claim a 30 sec. warning when shooting a 40 sec. end – ref. art. 8.5.3.6.1.

Based on the “fact” that the arrow of archer A was shot after the expiry of time limit, he/she will lose the highest scoring value of that end. If there are judges designated to spot arrows, he/she will lose the arrow in question. (In this case – a 10 – would give no difference). Be aware that it is not enough that a judge incidentally sees and may identify the arrow. Here we have established quite a rigid procedure in order to treat all similar situations in the same manner, regardless of the possibility for a Judge to spot the arrow or not.

Then to the question if the “good sportsmanship” of the other archer shall lead to a different solution? Certainly not!

The reason is quite obvious, and possibly not in the mind of the “sporty” competitor; if archer A loses the match, these points will influence the ranking and may give an unfair advantage.

He/she may even gain national or - if he/she wins - international records. And it will not do any good to our sport if there are “whispers” around saying that a champion in fact won by a mistake. The Judges must stick to the rules!

Does this mean that we shall never listen to the competitors in certain cases? Certainly not, their input may often be of great value – but we cannot change or overlook our rules.

Case study 59.2

At 8th final of a match play, two competitors did not show up. The first end was shot and then archers went to scoring.

At that moment, the two missing competitors arrived, and claimed that they were not informed the match was going to take place immediately after the other one. The judges, with the agreement of the two opponents, have decided that the match was going to be re-shot for them. It means that the two

late archers and their opponents went back to the shooting line and shot the match (again), and so it was scored.

- A) Was the action of judges correct?
- B) Which action would have you taken?

Let us start the discussion of this case by imagining what might have been the result of the fact that two archers don't appear by the start of the matches. For sure, byes are declared (and, as such, the opponents will be declared winners of the matches). According to common procedures, the “winners” are not allowed to shoot on the competition field, but on the adjacent training field and no scores are taken down. Based on the field set up etc. the “winners” may have shot on their respective match-targets, but these targets are then considered practice targets and still no scores are taken down. According to Art. 7.7.2.5., late archers are not allowed to make up arrows in the Elimination or Finals Rounds.

Consequently, no extraordinary efforts should be made to re-establish these matches.

Again we have the question if the “sporty attitude” of the opponents accepts to shoot the match? Should we disregard the rules based on that? In our opinion: “no”. Imagine what you would do if one of the opponents accepted to shoot the match, but not the other one? Who are to decide; the opponents or the Judges (after DOS has accepted the circumstances as valid)? Besides, it is fair to the opponents to refer to their sporting attitude, after they have left their mental preparation phase?

What if the Organizers have changed the starting time without giving proper information? Of course there may be circumstances which might lead to a different conclusion, but we should all learn one thing from cases like this: never change time schedule, and certainly not into an earlier start than previously stated.

Case study 59.3

During an end the first arrow of an archer is a "miss-shot" for some reason, and the arrow falls down clearly within the 3-meter line. The archers then shoot five arrows, but when aiming with his 6th arrow he is blown off due to the expiry of time. He then takes down (do not shoot), but pick up the red flag calling a Judge, claiming the right of an "equipment failure" and asks for 40 seconds to shoot his 6th arrow due to the "missshot".

How would you handle the situation:

- A) in a Qualification Round?
- B) in a Finals Round?

Let us start by confirming that all Judges agreed upon the fact that during Elimination and Finals no extra time will be given for equipment failures (or miss-shot arrows within the three meter line).

As for the Qualification Round – in our case – a majority of Judges (approx. 60-40) would not give extra time due to various reasons.

We find it necessary to underline that arrows that drop down (miss-shot) within the 3-meter line may be handled as an equipment failure, just because it might have been just that; an equipment failure (i.e. broken nock). This may not be discovered by the archer from the shooting line during shooting. So, in fact, we give the archer the choice; continue shooting within the time limit or stop shooting and call a Judge (equipment failure procedure).

NB! The latter applies even if there actually is no equipment failure.

(Check your Guide Book which states pretty well the idea of a previous official interpretation on the issue).

In our case, the archer made his/her choice – and he/she himself is responsible for shooting the necessary arrows within the prescribed time. Therefore he will not get another 40 sec.

Case study 59.4

At a windy tournament one of the butts falls to the ground with the face down during an end. All the arrows in the face broke into pieces or were severely displaced, and one archer (B) claimed to have just released when the butt fell over, causing him to hit nothing (as the butt disappeared while the arrow was in the air). There were three archers on the target, and the Judge did the following;

Archer A was given 10-9-9

Archer B was given 8-7 and told to shoot one more arrow as the arrow mentioned above was considered not having been shot.

Archer C was asked to "re-shoot" all three arrows as the Judge found it too difficult to decide their values.

- A) Archer A is asking for a second call. Is he entitled to have a second call in this situation?
- B) Furthermore he (A) is protesting against the judgement given re "the arrow in the air" which he doubts would have hit the target at all. Is he allowed to file such a protest?
- C) What is your opinion about the Judge's action(s) in this situation?

Some Judges base their answer to this case on a presumption that it must be indeed difficult to score arrows that have broken into pieces and are severely displaced. It is not possible to discuss these difficulties without actually being on the scene and looking at the target.

In this case, we were (a little bit) more interested in the principles, and we may say that our Judges again separated in two groups of equal size; those who said that the Judge did his/her

absolute best out of a difficult situation, and those who insisted that all archers should “re-shoot” this end.

First of all, Art. 7.4.5.1., second bullet gives the authority to the Judges to “take whatever measures they deem necessary, etc.” There is no doubt that the Judge acted according to the rules, the question may be if he/she made the best choice? Possibly he/she should have consulted other Judges in such a difficult and peculiar situation. Those Judges who voted for all archers on the butt to “re-shoot” the end, referred to fairness”.

But, if we look closer at the term “fairness”; would it be “fair” to archer A, who had a very, very good end under difficult wind conditions, to tell him/her to “re-shoot” if his/her scores in fact could be identified?

We are of the opinion that the “fairest” judgement that could be made, is to try to identify the scores actually shot, and only “deem arrows not shot” if there is absolutely no possibility to identify the scores.

Can archer A ask for a second call related to position of arrows in the target face? Even if this is not an ordinary situation, we cannot deny Art. 7.10.1 (7.10.1.1). He/she has the right to ask for a second call!

Can archer A protest against the ruling of archer B’s “arrow in the air”? Yes! Never be mistaken about the fact that an archer can protest (handled by the Jury of Appeal) against any Judge’s decision except for the value of an arrow in the target face. Art. 7.11.1.

58 series answers are from the Judges Newsletter, May 2002

Case Study 58.1

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?

The answers to this case study showed that the answer was not that simple. Again we are facing some rules that may seem a bit contradictory. We have the rule saying that the archer not shooting shall remain behind the waiting line with their equipment (7.7.4.1, Ed. 2002), but on the other hand the same rule is saying that the scope can be left on the shooting line providing it does not create any obstacle to any other competitor.

We also have an old rule re equipment allowing a ground quiver, and from the beginning these were quivers stuck into the ground, of course always permanent on the shooting line.

Looking at the first rule, there may be several reasons for wanting the archer to bring the equipment away from the shooting line;

- 1) As mentioned by several Judges; to avoid any obstacle for other archers to shoot.
- 2) To give a signal to the DOS that in fact the archer has finished his shooting.
- 3) To avoid accidents, like a bow left on the line is blowing over and hitting an archer during shooting.

The latter reason has, however, become invalid as we nowadays accept leaving scopes and all experience is telling us that accidents in this respect rarely happens.

Looking at the situation from the DOS side, we believe that leaving some arrows on the line would not cause him to interrupt his normal procedures. Leaving a bow, however, would be a different matter, and possibly the law-makers at that time were basically referring to the bow.

Looking at the modern judges' approach; not being overzealous, the best solution would be to allow the quiver attached to the scope, unless it creates any obstacle or possible danger to other competitors.

This solution is also according to the majority of our Judges and is supported by the Judge Committee.

Case Study 58.2

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!)

Here we suddenly experience another – and more complicated – situation related to the triple face indoor shooting.

A lot of Judges is mentioning the “misunderstanding” between the archer and the Judge re the number of arrows. Maybe the Judge could have handled the situation described differently (i.e. just telling the archer to go on shooting - as she is alone on her target).

However, an archer in a competition should know the procedures of a bouncer, and for sure know the number of arrows to be shot (and keep control with that). It would hardly be fair to the other competitors to allow such a mistake which *might have given an advantage*.

Therefore we have to consider this as an “ordinary” four arrows situation, although the scoring is complicated by the fact that the holes were not properly marked and we have a triple face.

According to our rules a bouncer – in a situation without properly marked holes – shall be given the score of the lowest unmarked hole in the target (face), this is a 7.

Because we have a triple face, we now have two aspects;

a) This means that there are suddenly two scores in one of the centres, causing the highest one to become a Miss.

b) In our situation, this will vary according to which 7 we are choosing. If we use the upper centre, a 9 would become an M – but if we use the lower centre, an 8 would become an M.

In such a situation the benefit of the doubt should be given to the archer, so we chose the lower centre, which then will give a 7 and an M.

We have now found our four scores; 9 (upper), 10 (middle), 7 (lower) and M (lower). And when we have four scores we only count the three lowest; the result is 9-7-M. (The smart Judge would also notice that if the bouncer could have been positively identified as a regular Miss – that is, if that arrow would have rebounded from a non-scoring area of the butt - the archer in this situation

would have got one more point, because then we would not have had the “two arrows in one centre”-situation. It would be 9-8-M).

Case Study 58.3

During an Indoor tournament at 18m with 40cm vertical triple faces, the following 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?

The Judge Committee is really surprised by the punitive action many Judges would have taken in this respect.

An arrow within the 3m-line is deemed not having been shot! Therefore this arrow does not count and thus there is no shot after time limit and no four arrow issue. Certainly such an arrow doesn't change validity just because it ended there after the time expired; if that was the matter the rule would have said so.

Maybe this archer was lucky, maybe it was a compound archer trying to take down when the signal sounded but released the arrow on his way down. Did he have any advantage to the others? This is one of the first questions you should ask in tricky situations.

In this case you have only three valid shots – all made within the time limit – and the score for that end will be 10-9-8. We of course agree with the Judges who would remind the archer to keep control of the number of arrows he is shooting.

Case Study 58.4

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?"

57 series answers are from Judge's Newsletter, December 2001

Editor's comments about Case Studies 57.x

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."

Case Study 57.1

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?

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 57.2

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.

Case Study 57.3

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 57.4

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?

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 57.5

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?

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"?

Case Study 57.6

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?

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 57.7

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?

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?

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.