

INTERPRETATIONS

WORLD ARCHERY CONSTITUTION AND RULES

Book 3, Chapter 12, Articles 12.2.4, 12.2.4.1 and 12.2.6, Chapter 15, Article 15.2.2, Book 4, Chapters 24 and 27, Articles 24.5, 24.5.1, 24.6 and 27.8.1 and Book 5, Chapter 32, Articles 32.2.4.2 and 32.4.6.2.

The Judges Committee has requested an interpretation as to what constitutes “equipment failure” as used in the Constitution and Rule Book, including Articles 12.2.4, 12.2.4.1, 12.2.6, 15.2.2, 24.5., 24.5.1, 24.6., 27.8.1, 32.2.4.2 and 32.4.6.2. While not limiting scope of the question, the Judges Committee noted that there have been inquiries as to whether or not water on lenses in a compound bow sight or an athlete not having a sufficient number of arrows in his or her quiver is “equipment failure”.

The Constitution and Rules Committee (“C&R”) finds the question presented to be within the terms of reference of C&R after consultation with the Athletes Committee, Coaches Committee, Field and 3D Committee, Technical Committee, and Para Archery Committee.

C&R has determined that the following interpretation is not contrary to the existing rules or Congress decisions.

Response from C&R:

The basic definition of equipment failure is the physical action of the athletes’ equipment that fails to a point where it will no longer function properly and either needs to be repaired or replaced. However, whether or not “equipment failure” has occurred for purposes of the World Archery rules will depend on the item being considered and the circumstances surrounding the claimed failure of the item in question. In order to be “equipment failure” for purposes of the World Archery rules, the item must reasonably related to the athlete’s performance and must not be something that is reasonably common or expected to occur during a competition and must not be due to the athlete intentional or negligent actions.

Equipment listed under Athletes Equipment in Books 3 and 4 and assistive devices as listed in Book 3 (Article 21.6) are subject to “equipment failure” for the purposes of the Rule Book.

Factors which need to be considered are the following:

- Is the failure unexpected and not routine? For example, a broken nock is a common occurrence and athletes should be checking their arrows before the start of the next end, accordingly, this would not be equipment failure. However, an equipment failure could be called if during a competition the target mat falls over and breaks the athlete’s arrows. In that case, the athlete should be given an opportunity to retrieve additional arrow/s from his or her tackle box or borrow arrows to complete

INTERPRETATIONS

WORLD ARCHERY CONSTITUTION AND RULES

the event. In the first instance, this “failure” should be reasonably anticipated to occur while in the second instance, this occurrence is not reasonably expected to occur. Although a string breaking may occur from time to time, it is rare and not reasonable to anticipate occurring at any given time and is equipment failure. Rain or water in the athlete’s scope is not a failure of the equipment, but rather a common challenge of the elements and should be treated similarly to the sun being in an athletes’ eyes, wind, cold or excessive heat.

- Is the cause of the failure the result of negligence or athlete action or error? If the alleged “failure” is not due to the item failing to operate as reasonably intended but due to the athlete’s negligence or failure to have a necessary item, this would not constitute equipment failure. For example, not having a reasonable number of arrows is the fault of the athlete not being prepared and the loss of a tab, release or sight settings is not equipment failure.

- Is there a failure in the item in question that reasonably affects performance? A sight, arrow rest, stabilizer, bow, limb, string, scope on a tripod, broken chest protector, or binoculars breaking is an example of an item of equipment not performing as reasonably expected which affects performance and results in equipment failure. However, if the item is in the same condition as when manufactured but the athlete is experiencing difficulty using the item due to other circumstances, this will not normally be equipment failure. For example, an athlete should not be claiming equipment failure if a scope of a bow sight is unusable due to rain drops. In this situation, there has been no failure in the item as originally produced and rain is an expected occurrence at a competition.

Ultimately, while the foregoing are matters to consider, whether or not there is equipment failure depends on whether doing so is fair to the athlete.

Constitution and Rules Committee, 24 September 2019