APPOINTMENT OF UMPIRES AND UAP’S TO RANKING GAMES

THE PROCESS
UMPIRE REQUEST FORM

• This starts the process, which also covers the Umpire Appointments Panel (UAP) – see slide 10
• The Form is completed by the Host Country and entered into netWorld
• Specific requirements plus any cost constraints (e.g. Host country UAP’s requested) are noted on the Form
• Past experience says that there should be a minimum of two nominees from each Country or Region who are accredited to complete the Form and enter into netWorld
UMPIRE REQUEST FORM

• The International Umpiring Manager (IUM) will normally action the request within one week of receiving the Form.

• The IUM asks ITP’s and ITP Cadets to input umpire nominations and informs the Regional Officiating Co-ordinators (ROC’s) who, later on, will convert the ITP nominations into recommendations.

• Via netWorld, ITP’s are requested to input nominations within 2 weeks.

• Only umpires who are available for a particular event will be listed in netWorld.
UMPIRE REQUEST FORM

- ITP’s will submit their nominations, normally in ranking order and usually with pertinent comments such as:
  - this event will help with the rehabilitation of an umpire coming back from an injury
  - this event is suitable for a newly qualified IUA
  - this event will benefit an ITID umpire working towards a screening
  - this umpire has not been available for work reasons so far this year
  - from the host country meaning lower travel costs

- For all umpire appointments to INF Ranking Events, neutrality is paramount
UMPIRE REQUEST FORM

• ROC’s receive notification of ITP nominations
• ROC’s will normally access netWorld towards the end of the second week (or when they know that all the ITP’s have responded with nominations) to submit recommendations
• Personally, as the Europe ROC, I always go with the ITP nominations unless there is a split vote – which does happen quite often with the third or fourth ranked nomination from ITP’s
• In these cases, I carefully consider the comments submitted by the ITP’s and then make a judgement call – I do not refer back to the ITP’s
UMPIRE REQUEST FORM

• The IUM will access netWorld and consider all the ROC recommendations together with any supporting comments or explanations

• As the ROC, this is my back stop as I know that the IUM will come back to me to discuss any issues or concerns re my choices (where I had a choice to make)

• This process is very easy to follow and complete using netWorld

• Umpire appointments (as opposed to nominations and recommendations) are the prerogative of the IUM
UMPIRE REQUEST FORM

• The IUM usually has a host of factors to consider before making the umpire appointments including, but not limited to;
  • Cost constraints, usually travel related
  • Other Host country caveats
  • Umpire development opportunities
  • Opportunities for Screenings and IUA Testings
  • Possible umpire rotation for higher level ranking events

• The IUM notifies the Host country and the ROC’s with details of the Umpire and UAP appointments (see slide 12)
UMPIRE REQUEST FORM

• That is not always the end of the process, though, as there are umpire withdrawals, usually due to either injury or late unavailability

• **What now?** The IUM has to find a replacement!

• Late withdrawals can be a problem especially if the Host Country or Region has imposed or requested cost constraints

• This can limit the options for the IUM in securing a replacement

• The IUM will usually consult with the ROC and Host country before appointing and announcing replacement(s)
UMPIRE REQUEST FORM

• Overall, the current process and procedure is to be commended – it works well but, as you will now realise, is very ‘people’ dependent

• The efficient working of the process depends on all the ‘contributors’ meeting timescales and complying with any specific requests or constraints

• Full details of the current process and documentation is available on the INF website under “Officiating”

• Access to netWorld, though, is restricted on a ‘need to’ basis
UMPIRE APPOINTMENTS PANEL (UAP)

• It is the responsibility of the ROC to make recommendations via netWorld

• ROC’s have access to all the event information that they need via netWorld, including any caveats and constraints (and will have been copied in to the process by the IUM – see slide 3)

• The Host country is expected to comply with current INF guidelines for the requested size of the UAP

• ROC’s will first check ITP (and, where appropriate, ITP Cadet) availability for the event
UMPIRE APPOINTMENTS PANEL (UAP)

• This is the process I then follow as the Europe ROC:
  • Compiling and updating an annual spreadsheet for all the UAP recommendations I submit for INF ranking events in a calendar year
  • These are the six factors I use in considering who to recommend for a particular event:
    • Availability
    • Past performance at recent ranking events
    • Level of the Event
    • Ability to be the UAP Chair (when appropriate)
    • CPD
    • Rotation
UMPIRE APPOINTMENTS PANEL (UAP)

• As with umpires, ROC’s only make recommendations: appointments to a UAP are the prerogative of the IUM who will have various factors to consider before making the decisions and notifying the Host country and ROC’s

• Again, full details of the current process and documentation is available on the INF website under “Officiating”

• Access to netWorld, though, is restricted on a ‘need to’ basis

• My personal experience is that the process, using netWorld, works well and I always have the help and support of the IUM as and when needed

• Thank you for listening and my apologies that I could not be with you today – Alan Anderson, July 2019