

XVII 2019 Junior Squash Pan-Am June / Junio 16 - 22, 2019

Referee Education & Symposium

- Saturday, 15th Jun'19 – 4pm to 8pm,
Mayfair Lakeshore
- Sunday 16th to Saturday 22nd Jun'19 –
Daily Training in Morning meetings at
Mayfair Lakeshore
- Sunday, 23rd Jun'19 – 9am to 3pm,
Novotel Downtown Centre



The Sport of Squash...Referee's role

- Squash is played in a confined space, often at a high speed. Two principles are essential for orderly play:
 - Safety: Players (and Referee's...) must always place **safety first** and not take any action that could endanger the opponent.
 - Fair play: Players must respect the rights of the opponent and play with honesty.
- #3...Keep the play moving & continuous. Minimize the player appeals by firm decisions and meaningful answers to players questions

PSA's "Mission Statement"... (18Aug'14)

- "It is the goal and responsibility of every player and referee to make each game we participate in, flow to the best of our ability, helping to improve the image and watch ability of our uniquely exciting, dynamic and demanding sport".
- Improving the flow of the game goes hand in hand with the ever-increasing television exposure that the game is receiving.

Lee Drew - PSA Referee & Refereeing Director

SquashRef Appeal Stats - 2015

	Men:	Women:
JP Morgan Tournament of Champions 2015	= 23.3	= 19.6
Case Swedish Open 2015	= 15.6	= n/a
Guggenheim Partners Windy City Open 2015	= 20.7	= 14.2
Canary Wharf Classic 2015	= 20.8	= n/a
El Gouna International 2015	= 19.4	= n/a
Grasshopper Cup 2015	= 19.2	= n/a
Allam British Open 2015	= 19.6	= 15.9
British Grand Prix 2015	= 14.9	= n/a
Netsuite Open 2015	= 17.9	= 10
US Open 2015	= 15.9	= 15.3
St Georges Hill	= 19.5	= n/a
Qatar Classic 2015	= 16.5	= 14.6
	Men:	Women:
Hong Kong 2016 (Tri-Ref)	= 19.3	= 15.1
Nantes 2016 (Tri-Ref)	= 14.9	= 16.7
Al Ahram 2016 (Squash Ref with VR)	= 14.7	= 10.4
NetSuite Open 2016 (Squash Ref with VR)	= 10.7	= 11.8
US Open 2016 (Tri-Ref)	= 18.6	= 11.8

- PSA expect Appeal Averages in 2019 season: Men = 15, Women 10

SquashRef Stats – PSA Worlds Feb'19

- After two days. 15.3 decisions on avg per Match (Men & Women)
- 16% of MR calls overruled by VR
- 1.6 to 5 decisions per point in matches
- Decision breakout..
 - Stroke 35%
 - Yes Let 50%
 - No Let 15%

SquashRef Appeal Stats – 13.7 Avg at Canada Cup

07-Mar-19	Canada Cup, Toronto (\$81k)	F	D.Elias	9	P.Coll	7	3-2 : 11-8, 6-11, 11-8, 8-11, 11-7	98min, 23 D = 8 S, 14 YL, 1 NL
06-Mar-19	Canada Cup, Toronto (\$81k)	S/F	D.Elias	9	M.Shorbagy	10	3-0 : 11-7, 11-4, 11-4	31min, 3 D = 1 S, 2 YL, 0 NL
06-Mar-19	Canada Cup, Toronto (\$81k)	S/F	P.Coll	7	M.Abouelgha	8	3-0 : 11-8, 11-8, 11-2	48min, 20 D = 2 S, 17YL, 1 NL
05-Mar-19	Canada Cup, Toronto (\$81k)	1/4F	P.Coll	7	T.Richards	19	3-0 : 11-8, 11-4, 11-3	27min, 3 D = 2 S, 1 YL, 0 NL
05-Mar-19	Canada Cup, Toronto (\$81k)	1/4F	M.Shorbagy	10	R.Cuskelly	22	3-1: 11-8, 11-7, 5-11, 12-10	62min, 21 D = 7 S, 11 YL, 3 NL
04-Mar-19	Canada Cup, Toronto (\$81k)	2nd Rd	D.James	20	N.Adnan	34		65min, 24 D = 5 S, 18 YL, 1 NL
04-Mar-19	Canada Cup, Toronto (\$81k)	2nd Rd	M.Abouelghar	8	E.Ng	35	3-0: 11-6, 11-8, 11-7	34min, 8 D = 4 S, 1 YL, 3 NL
03-Mar-19	Canada Cup, Toronto (\$81k)	1st Rd	K.Fathi	46	M.McCue	109	3-0: 11-4, 11-5, 15-13	49min, 12 D = 2 S, 8 YL, 3 NL
03-Mar-19	Canada Cup, Toronto (\$81k)	1st Rd	N.Adnan	34	T.Harrity	44	3-0: 14-12, 11-7, 11-2	46min, 10 D = 2 S, 8 YL, 0 NL

SquashRef Appeal Stats – 8.5 Avg at Texas Open

31-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	Final	A.Sobhy	13	V.Lust	14	3-0 : 11-4, 11-2, 11-5	23min, 8 D = 2 S, 5 YL, 1 NL
30-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	S/F	A.Sobhy	13	O.Fiechter	52	3-0 : 11-5, 11-8, 11-8	28min, 4 D = 2 S, 2 YL, 0 NL
30-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	S/F	V.Lust	14	R.Grinhams	31	3-0 : 11-8, 11-2, 11-4	23min, 2 D = 1 S, 1 YL, 0 NL
29-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1/4F	A.Sobhy	13	N.Shahin	33	3-0 : 11-4, 11-4, 11-8	22min, 3 D = 2 S, 1 YL, 0 NL
29-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1/4F	O.Fiechter	52	H.Naughton	29	3-1 : 11-8, 5-11, 12-10, 12-10	38min, 10 D = 5 S, 5 YL, 0 NL
29-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1/4F	V.Lust	14	T.Gilis	43	3-0 : 11-2, 11-9, 11-9	30min, 8 D = 4 S, 3 YL, 1 NL
29-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1/4F	R.Grinhams	31	SJ. Perry	6	3-2 : 11-9, 11-9, 3-11, 6-11, 11-9	49min, 13 D = 1 S, 12 YL, 0 NL
28-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	2nd Rd	A.Sobhy	13	A.Serme	79	3-0 : 11-3, 11-5, 11-2	23min, 2 D = 1 S, 1 YL, 0 NL
28-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	2nd Rd	N.Shahin	33	H.Mendez	45	3-1 : 4-11, 11-8, 13-11, 11-2	35min, 4D = 2 S, 1 YL, 1 NL
28-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	2nd Rd	H.Naughton	29	N.Abbas	35	3-2 : 11-7, 8-11, 0-11, 11-6, 13-11	51min, 27 D = 11 S, 11 YL, 4 NL
28-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	2nd Rd	O.Fiechter	52	T.Evans	10	3-1 : 12-10, 12-10, 8-11, 11-6	54min, 16 D = 5 S, 10 YL, 1 NL
27-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	2nd Rd	V.Lust	14	E.Soini	66	3-0 : 11-8, 11-7, 11-3	22min, 4 D = 1 S, 3 YL, 0 NL
27-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	2nd Rd	T.Gilis	43	M.Heijden	29	3-2 : 11-4, 11-9, 7-11, 11-13, 11-8	65min, 12 D = 4 S, 7 YL, 1 NL
27-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	2nd Rd	R.Grinhams	31	M.Nasser	68	3-2 : 6-11, 11-3, 14-12, 8-11, 11-4	51min, 16 D = 3 S, 12 YL, 1 NL
27-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	2nd Rd	SJ. Perry	6	A.Loke	93	3-0 : 11-7, 11-5, 11-5	19min, 9 D = 3 S, 6 YL, 0 NL
26-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1st Rd	O.Fiechter	52	W.Low	117	3-0 : 11-6, 11-3, 11-1	17min, 2 D = 2 S, 0 YL, 0 NL
26-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1st Rd	H.Mendez	45	T.Sluis	91	3-0 : 11-2, 11-8, 11-3	20min, 2 D = 1 S, 0 YL, 0 NL
26-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1st Rd	A.Serme	79	N.Bunyan	65	3-2 : 11-5, 11-13, 11-7, 11-13, 11-1	52min, 5 D = 3 S, 2 YL, 0 NL
26-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1st Rd	E.Soini	66	N.Pfister	101	3-0 : 11-3, 11-8, 11-5	23min, 12 D = 6 S, 6 YL, 0 NL
26-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1st Rd	T.Gilis	43	S.Youssef	72	3-0 : 11-3, 11-8, 11-4	27min, 10 D = 1 S, 8 YL, 1 NL
26-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1st Rd	M.Nasser	68	J.Duncalf	96	3-0 : 11-4, 11-5, 11-9	21min, 8 D = 1 S, 5 YL, 2 NL
26-Mar-19	Texas Open, Dallas (\$55k)	1st Rd	A.Loke	93	C.Pelaez	74	3-2 : 5-11, 12-10, 9-11, 11-8, 11-2	40min, 10 D = 3 S, 7 YL, 0 NL

PSA Update #6 – Nov'15 (Lee Drew)

Blocking – There have recently been a number of examples and debates regarding players using their body during play at crucial times. During recent meetings at events we have been looking at examples of players using their body to block the opponent out compared to examples where the player lets the opponent through cleanly.

It is important for everyone to be aware that Referees are being asked to look for exaggerated movements or movements that do not fit with the flow of the game. The directive for Referees is to penalise offending players for obvious or unnatural movements that are intended to prevent access to the ball.

The Rules state that a referee can award code of conduct in unacceptable and extreme circumstances even if the shot was an outright winner.

This is in accordance with Rules:

15.5 Players must not behave in a manner that is Unfair or in any way detrimental to the Sport

15.6 If a player's conduct is unacceptable the referee MUST penalise the player stopping play if necessary

With the above in mind, we would encourage everyone to ensure continual clearance especially towards the end of games which is becoming a significant focal point. This will minimise the risk of a point being award against for using the body in an unsportsmanlike way.

PSA Update #7 – Oct'16 (Drew/Gingell)

Interference & Direct Access – One of the main discussion points at the US Open was that there have been many examples of players being penalised in accordance with rule 8.6.5 (if the striker would have been able to make a good return but the opponent was not making every effort to avoid the interference, a stroke is awarded to the striker).

Referees are also being encouraged to look for the incoming player's movement once rule 8.6.5 has been enforced, especially as it can encourage the incoming player to look for the back of the opponent rather than take a genuine line to the ball.

If a player does move towards the opponent rather than taking a direct line then rule 8.8.1 (if there was interference but the striker did not make every effort to get to and play the ball, no let is allowed) will be applied.

It is also worth remembering that there can be simple lets; rule 8.6.6 (if there was interference that the opponent was making every effort to avoid and the striker would have been able to make a good return, a let is allowed)

PSA Update #7 – Oct'16 (Drew/Gingell)

- **Interference & Direct Access** – Language expected during the above situations:
- For the incoming Player
 - Look for the ball, do not look for your opponent (rule 8.8.1)
 - Go to the ball, do not go to your opponent (rule 8.8.1)
 - Play the ball please (rule 8.8.1)
- For the outgoing player
 - The player was making every effort to clear (rule 8.6.6)
 - If you hit a ball you that you have not attempted to clear, then you may be penalised (in
 - this instance shot selection is very important) (rule 8.6.5)

PSA Update #7 – Oct'16 (Drew/Gingell)

- **Freedom to strike the ball to any part of the entire front wall** – this is an area where referees are continuing to be encouraged to get players to hit the ball when it is safe and possible to do so.

Strokes will only be awarded if there is obviously no straight or crosscourt line for the opponent to hit, otherwise a let or no let comes into play.

- **Racket Preparation** – it is important to make sure that when a player is asking for a decision, that there is always a genuine attempt to look to hit the ball at all times, this is achieved by using an appropriate racket preparation in relation to where the ball is on the court.

For example, there is no need for the racket to be head height if a player is moving into the front corner for a counter drop. Referees are being encouraged to identify this kind of excessive or exaggerated swing.

PSA Update #8 – Oct'17 (Drew/Gingell)

Use of the Body:

During the daily meetings held before play commenced at the 2017 US Open **use of the body** was one of the main talking points. Many examples reviewed, showed players using either their body or movement in the shot to move their opponent away from direct access or to prevent the opponent from having access.

It is important to note the following from the Rules:

- **8.1** – a player must make every effort to clear
- So that...
- **8.1.2** – the opponent has unobstructed direct access to the ball

PSA Update #8 – Oct'17 (Drew/Gingell)

Please also note that, the quality of the opponent's previous shot is not referenced at any point and is therefore not relevant in this situation (This was...Position of Advantage rule...removed in 2014)

The **Referee** has the following considerations:

- Was it poor movement and was the player making every effort to clear?
- Was it deliberate poor movement and was there a lack of effort to clear?

Stroke – can be awarded against a player if every effort is not being made to provide 'unobstructed direct access to the ball'; even if it is deemed to be a 'winning return'.

No Let – can still be awarded if there was interference (that the player was making every effort to avoid) but the striker would not have been able to make a good return.

Yes Let – will still be awarded if there was interference that the opponent was making every effort to avoid and the striker would have been able to make a good return,

In the case of 'poor movement' being deemed deliberate, the referee can award a **Stroke** as described above, **and also** use 'Conduct' rule **15.5** stating that players must not behave in a manner that is **unfair**, dangerous, abusive, offensive, or in any way detrimental to the sport. Therefore it can be a **2 point** penalty if the Referee deems the action to be deliberate.

PSA Update #9 – Sep'18 (Drew/Gingell)

1. Stroke being awarded after a ball rebounds off the back wall:

It has been noticed that strokes are very rarely awarded if a ball bounces off the back wall, even when the opponent is encroaching preventing a shot straight or cross court.

Moving forwards:

- A player encroaching will be penalised with a stroke if the position is preventing a cross court or straight option.
- In addition to assessing the non-striker's position, the referee has to be sure that the player can hit the ball when awarding a **stroke**. This can be judged by how far the ball has bounced off the back wall, as well as the striker's swing and position in relation to the ball.
- **If a player stops and appeals for a let and the opponent is not encroaching or there is not sufficient interference or the risk of injury, then a no let will be awarded.**

Please note that this is a clarification of the interpretation, rather than a rule change.

PSA Update #9 – Sep'18 (Drew/Gingell)

2. Hitting the opponent with the ball:

If point 1 above is applied, then a player should stop before hitting an opponent.

Rule 9.1.2 essentially states that if the ball is travelling towards the front wall and hits the opponent, then the referee will award a stroke, unless it is deemed as dangerous play.

Moving forwards:

- If the non-striker is encroaching and limiting options, then a stroke will still be awarded. If a stroke is awarded, then the referee can ask both players to be careful but should not warn the striker.
- **If the referee feels it is necessary to warn the striker, then a stroke should not be awarded.**
- In addition, if the referee assesses that it is dangerous play, then a code of conduct must be awarded against the striker.
- If the striker is looking to gain an advantage by deliberately hitting the opponent, then a code of conduct must be awarded.
- Players can still refuse the stroke and opt to play a let should they not wish to be awarded a point for hitting an opponent but this must not influence the referee's decision with regards to dangerous or deliberate play.
- **Successful application of point 1 above should reduce the number of times players are hit with the ball.**

PSA Update #9 – Sep'18 (Drew/Gingell)

3. Hitting the opponent with the backswing:

This is always a very grey area, so to help clarify when it is a no let, a let and when it is a stroke here is a brief description:

- No interference at all.....**No Let**
- No contact but a justified fear of hitting the opponent.... safety – **Yes Let**
- No contact but the striker is unable to complete a reasonable swing, including the backswing or the follow through, because of the opponent's position... **Stroke**
- Interference which **affected the swing by slight contact** (which is not severe enough to prevent the swing but sufficient to have some slight effect on the swing or flight of the ball) ...**Yes Let**unless the striker would have made a winning return, (there are a few instances when this situation would be obvious such as when both players are right up at the front corner and all the striker just needs to do is hit a cross court drive)....in which case a **Stroke** is awarded to the striker.
- Interference which **prevented the swing** (which is obvious as the non-striker has moved directly into the swing preventing it, or there is an obvious effect on the flight of the ball into the tin or out).....**Stroke**

PSA Update #9 – Sep'18 (Drew/Gingell)

4. Opening the door:

A brief reminder that players are to refrain from opening the door unless they request permission from the referee due to communication difficulties. We understand that awarding a conduct point is a severe penalty for opening the door, but it is significantly reducing discussions between players and referees which is an area that has been highlighted for improvement within the game.

The main points to remember are:

- A conduct point awarded immediately is a severe reprimand but does prevent players from opening the door and does reduce discussions.
- If there is difficulty for the player or referee to communicate, then a player may request or be invited by the referee to open the door.
- If the referee sees the player going to open the door, then they should intervene and ask the player not to do so.

PSA Update #9 – Sep'18 (Drew/Gingell)

PSA Initiative – Diving and stopping the rally after a dive

After much deliberation, it has been decided that going forward, the PSA will adopt the following **only** for PSA events:

- Any player who chooses to dive loses the right to stop the rally and ask for a let as they have altered the condition of the court and therefore accepted the playing surface.
- The striker must either stop immediately (before the next shot) and ask for a let or play the ball. Once played, the rally must continue as the conditions are deemed to have been accepted by both players.
- If the diving player hits a winning return, then a no let can still be awarded, even if the striker stops for safety.
- The referee has the right to intervene and stop play at any time should the conditions be deemed as unsafe.

Important: The process surrounding diving, described above, is a PSA initiative that will be reviewed by PSA on an ongoing basis, and is not part of the WSF process or included in the rules.

PSA Rule Initiatives - White Ball

- When using a white ball, either player may request a new ball at the end of the third game.
- The new ball must be requested as a player leaves the court at the end of the third game and cannot be requested when returning to court for the start of the fourth game.

Lee Drew – PSA Update #5, 2015

- WSF Rule – Either player can request at beginning of 3rd Game.

PSA Rule Initiatives – 30/60 Second calls

- The Referee announcements of 30 & 60 seconds that play will resume or match start, is in addition to the WSF 15 seconds. Once time is up, Lee & Lee require the Referee to get the match started again, basically immediately, i.e. no 10 ball whack around on any court or ball colour.

PSA Anti-Corruption – Player, Support Staff & Match Official

3. Use Of Communication Devices On-Site

3.1.1. No use of any Mobile Device, which includes, without limitation, mobile phone, tablet, wireless headphones, laptop on-site at a Tournament venue during a Match*

Guidance note: 3.1.1 refers to matches where the Player, Match Official and/or Support Staff is directly involved in the Match e.g. the Match Official is, in any capacity, officiating the Match or the Player is competing in the Match.

For the purpose of clause 3.1.1 and avoidance of doubt, a Match is deemed to have begun once a player has been introduced onto court and ends once the Match score is completed.

3.1.2. Smartwatches or similar devices are permitted to be worn by Players during a match purely for medical or fitness tracking purposes, provided that the phone or other device to which it connects is turned off and the smartwatch is unable to receive or send any communications or data.

WSF Referee processes to become WSO

In February it was announced that development of the website has started. Since then, the website providers have been undertaking a detailed analysis of the requirements and have started to build a design that will meet WSO requirements.

Referee Migration to WSO

WSO covers five levels (1-5) of formal qualification:

Level 1	Entry qualification level to referee, supervise, and officiate at a club event/state/province or county leagues
Level 2	Qualification level for selection to referee or supervise at junior competitions
Level 3	Qualification level for referees to officiate at both junior and senior matches at National Level.
Level 4	Qualification level for referees to officiate up to both junior and senior matches at National and International competitions
Level 5	Highest level of referees who officiate at National and International competitions

The migration process is key to establishing the officiating levels, standardising on competency levels and establishing an officiating baseline.

These key principles have been adopted for this migration process for currently applicable referees:

1. *All existing WSF referees will be allocated as WSO Level 4.*
2. *All existing Regional referees are provisionally allocated to WSO Level 3*
3. *Existing National referees are provisionally allocated to WSO Level 2*

To progress, all referees will need to complete the required accreditation requirements (modular course work, online tests) at the appropriate level and have any pre-existing assessments and activity records validated. Upon completion, following signoff by the respective National Federation (for Level 2) or WSO (for Level 3) the above levels will be offered.

Having completed the required accreditation requirements, existing WSF referees at level 4 will initially remain at that level. Level 5 are only allocated on the evidence available within the WSO framework.

The 2019-2020 season will act as a transitional period.

The competency of referees at levels 3, 4 and 5 will be assessed and validated. During this transitional period, allocation of referees to Tournaments will follow the same principles as exist at present.