

**MAKE  
THE  
GAME**  
LIVERPOOL

# APPOINTMENT OF UMPIRES AND UAP's TO RANKING GAMES

## *THE PROCESS*



INTERNATIONAL  
NETBALL  
FEDERATION

**MAKE  
THE  
GAME**  
LIVERPOOL

DELIVERED BY:



# 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*