

GOLF AUSTRALIA

RULES

NEWSLETTER

Autumn 2013



Setting Up Your Course

The editor asks Trevor Herden, Director – Championships, Golf Australia a few questions about setting up courses for various standards of competition.

Q: To the average club member, the condition and speed of the greens are of paramount concern. What should clubs be aiming at in this regard?

A: Over a number of years and a large number of events, I have learned about the benefits and obstacles of setting up golf courses.

As we know, each member of a club loves to play under similar conditions to what they perceive the best players in the world tackle. In fact, many tournament courses that we watch on TV are set up more fairly than those of a large number of Australian clubs.

For example, many club managers and superintendents are pushed by members who want their greens to run at a pace similar to say Augusta, on average between 12 - 13 feet on the Stimpmeter. For the most part, a lot of greens were never designed to be running at 12 or 13 feet - many championship hole locations as they are designed make it impossible to play proper golf to these locations when 12 feet or above is the speed. We have all seen greens that have significant movement in them, whether it is a swale to putt up and over or down and through, or indeed across. When combined with a sideways slope it does become extremely testing. When a green was designed it may have well been designed with special considerations being given to it, such as;

1. The elevation of the shot to the green.
2. Bunkering.
3. The strength and direction of the prevailing winds across the course.
4. The length of the shot for both the average or stronger players.

5. The average green speed that is manageable and acceptable for the degree of difficulty.
6. We know that if you have greens designed specifically with all of the above in mind, combined with a set of very challenging hole locations and a recommended green speed of 10.5 feet, by forcing the staff to increase the speed of the greens to 12 feet or beyond is likely to create a number of significant challenges to players and problems for the club. Today on some of our major courses there are a number of hole locations that are unusable, simply because when they were designed, they were designed with a significantly slower green speed in mind.

Normally a superintendent to achieve pace will allow the greens to dry out somewhat, adding yet another problem. Increasing the firmness of the green normally makes it more difficult to hold the greens with an average shot for the majority of the field; this then forces the majority of players to have to chip from around the greens. When a superintendent is forced to increase the speed and firmness and he realises that the proper playing of the game is compromised he is forced to select the easiest, flattest and safest hole locations. That normally means they are in the middle of flat areas of the greens. This also then means the club members end up not really playing a course the way it was designed to be played.

When greens are too firm and too fast for the design of the green it generally means that players are not capable of playing proper golf and unfair things can happen, such as putting balls into a hazard, rolling from a top tier to a bottom tier and then off the green or simply not being able to stop a ball within 2 metres of the hole on a basic putt. In these cases the major problem for the club is that the pace of play becomes very challenging for everyone and the game is not enjoyable. We watch professional players go about their business looking at putts trying their utmost to sink them or at least lag putts and get close. They are the best players in the world and we watch the Masters at Augusta with fast and firm greens but

Autumn 2013 In this edition



Setting Up Your Course

Trevor Herden provides some insight into setting up a course for a major tournament and for club events



The Tiger Woods Ruling

The R&A and USGA explain the Ruling made at the Masters



Water Filled & Damaged Bunkers

Scott Wagstaff, GA National Referee & Carbrook GC Manager provides some guidance on how to proceed



these greens were designed specifically to be played with firmness and speed; shorter holes have narrow greens, longer holes have longer and deeper greens.

Q: What other factors need to be taken into consideration for greens?

A: An interesting point for all is the set up of the Open Championship by The R&A. As you know, the Open is played in the UK on links courses, some more exposed to the elements than others. Some of these links courses have their greens lodged between large dunes and below the level of the fairways in many cases. Others have their greens exposed, level with the fairways or raised well above them, like St Andrews where the 11th and 12th come to mind. The desired green speed for the Open is set at around 10 feet due to the risk of high winds, etc. The risk for an event as large as the Open is that they simply cannot afford to miss their world TV deadlines. As we know, when the wind is howling around 80 kmh even with greens at 10 feet the wind will move a stationary ball which renders the course unplayable.

Q: What about the positioning of tee markers?

A: When setting up teeing grounds it is important that weather conditions be considered. I always try to ensure that the fairway bunkers are in play. If there are strong winds into players' faces, moving the tees forward should always be considered. By not moving the tee forward you probably take the fairway bunkers out of play for most players, which would then provide a less demanding tee shot. Where possible we should retain the strategy as the hole was designed, keeping the fairway bunkers in play. Many clubs choose to simply keep tee markers stuck at the back of teeing grounds on the plates, protecting yardages but by doing this they are taking away the real demands of the tee shot as it was designed.

I am often asked if I set up the course for the Women's Australian Open any differently than for the men's Australian Open and the answer is yes. We play at a length of around 6100 metres for the women; we also allow the greens to be a little more receptive (softer) as most women do not generate the same spin as the men. We do however play on greens with similar speeds - when possible and when there is no major winds forecast we seek to play on greens around 11-12 feet. TV deadlines are critical to our Opens also. If greens become too firm and fast and rounds

take longer than the maximum we would allow then we lose our coverage, with our marquee players standing on the 16th green instead of putting out on the 18th green. This is a bad scenario for sponsors, players and TV audiences.

Q: What about the intervals between groups? There seems to be a big difference between what is used for various events.

A: Normally a club will use 7 or 8 minute intervals between groupings to ensure as many players as possible can play on that day, stacking the field. The club committee will then try to enforce its own pace of play policy that will usually not work, simply because the major inhibitor is the course set up. There seems to be little flexibility with the policy irrespective of winds blowing at 25-35 kms for example. Times in most cases are unachievable especially on stroke rounds, with five hour rounds becoming more and more frequent. Golf Australia and the Tours work on 10 minute intervals which provide more time for the players, less jamming when a problem arises. When crossing over from an AM to PM we allow 3 hours between last off in the am and first off in the pm, again allowing the first groups to play into a gap behind the last of the crossing groups.

Q: Are there guidelines on the mowing heights for tournaments?

A: Greens heights range from around 2.2 mm to 3 mm depending on grasses, undulations and weather conditions. For example, greens with significant undulations in most cases need the greens to remain around 3 mm to avoid scalping of the high points of the undulations and may also assist in windy and exposed conditions to prevent balls moving.

Greens that are less exposed and undulating, and provided the turf quality is good, may be cut at 2.2 mm. This will increase the pace slightly and will generally provide a smoother surface to putt on. One must always be mindful not to increase the pace of the greens to such an extent that proper putting is compromised and the championship hole locations cannot be utilised as designed.

Teeing grounds are normally cut to fairway height or slightly lower, but normally around 10-12 mm.

Care must be also be taken when fairways are on clay - cutting fairways below 10 mm can lead to mud on the ball in damp conditions which in turn forces officials to introduce a "lift, clean and place" local rule which we try to avoid.



The steep undulating 7th green at The Lakes Golf Club

Dealing With Flooded & Damaged Bunkers

By Scott Wagstaff

(GA National Referee & General Manager, Carbrook Golf Club, QLD)

Flooded bunkers are a common problem in the wet months. In Queensland, especially in 2013 this has been an issue we have dealt with on almost a daily basis and it has been challenging. However it is good to have a clear plan and policy at your club so that everyone understands what you will do when you have had some rain over night, or prior to the competition round so that you can act quickly and ensure that you are acting within the Rules and you don't affect your course rating.

There have been some changes in the guidelines set down by Golf Australia in recent years and so it is timely that we revisit this issue. There are a couple of issues, firstly ensuring an appropriate temporary local rule is in place and secondly understanding the impact (if any) on your course rating.

Local Rule

Setting the local rule is important and you will need to be clear in how you define the affected bunkers. At our club we use a stake to define the affected bunkers and then add a temporary Local Rule stating "staked bunkers are deemed to be GUR and 'through the green'. The ball may be dropped without penalty at the nearest point of relief outside the bunker in accordance with the standard GUR relief procedure".

Alternatively the Committee may wish to list the specific bunkers on the Local Rules board. I find most people don't take too much notice of the board and that a stake is a better and more reliable indicator.

There are a few things however to remember when introducing your local rule:

- You cannot invoke or revoke the temporary Local Rule after a competition round has commenced, although you can do so from round to round in a multi-round event.
- A club cannot have a permanent Local Rule giving relief from flooded or damaged bunkers.

In the case that the Committee decides that a bunker is flooded or damaged to the point that it will need renovation to become playable again then the following applies:

- It may be declared to be GUR and doing so it automatically changes its status to "through the green".

In the case that a bunker is only subject to flooding and does not require renovation to become playable again then:

- It cannot be declared GUR and "through the green". However an exception applies if the course has 15 bunkers or less.
- Therefore you should know how many bunkers you have on your course.
- A Specimen Local Rule to be used when Renovation of Bunkers is NOT required is provided by Golf Australia as above and it is good practice to use it.

One suggestion if you are in charge of educating staff, committee and golfers on this rule is to publish your own policy and take the staff involved in this area (eg. Greens staff and Pro Shop staff) through the policy. You may also spend some time on course with them so they understand what a flooded bunker is and when it should be deemed "GUR". In my opinion people are usually too



quick to pull bunkers out of play and if the player can take a drop at the rear of the bunker then I will always keep the bunker in play. Mind you there is always the pending weather to consider and whether the flooding will worsen.

Remember that Rule 25-1b (ii) deals with this issue and in the absence of a local rule the player can still proceed under any circumstance regardless of the impact of flooding.

Impact on Course Rating

When clubs have bunkers filled with water or otherwise out of play, they should continue to process competitions through GOLF Link. The following table provides advice on when a club needs to contact its State/Territory Association, and when its course ratings may be affected.

No. Bunkers out of play	Period of Time	Contact State/Territory Association	Impact Club's Official Course Ratings
0-5	1 month or less	No	No
0-5	more than 1 month	Yes*	Possibly
6 or more	1-4 days	No	No
6 or more	5 days or more	Yes*	Possibly

For more information be sure to read the Golf Australia memo titled "GA Guidance for Committees: COURSE WITH BUNKERS FILLED WITH WATER OR OUT OF PLAY" which can be downloaded at: http://www.golf.org.au/site/_content/document/00010710-source.pdf

The Tiger Woods Ruling



THE R&A, USGA ISSUE STATEMENT ADDRESSING TIGER WOODS RULING AT THE 2013 MASTERS TOURNAMENT

St Andrews, Scotland and Far Hills, N.J., USA (1 May, 2013)

– The R&A and the United States Golf Association (USGA), golf's governing bodies, today released the following statement to provide guidance to players and Rules officials on the Rules decision involving Tiger Woods at the 2013 Masters Tournament.

During the second round, Tiger Woods played his third stroke from the fairway of the 15th hole to the putting green, where his ball struck the flagstick and deflected into the water hazard in front of the green. He elected to take stroke-and-distance relief under Rule 26-1a, incurring a one-stroke penalty (his fourth stroke on the hole). He then dropped and played a ball to the putting green (his fifth stroke), and holed his putt. After finishing his round, he signed and returned his score card, recording a score of 6 for the 15th hole.

Before Woods returned his score card, the Masters Tournament Committee had received an inquiry from a television viewer questioning whether Woods had dropped his ball in a wrong place. After reviewing the available video, but without talking with Woods, the Committee ruled that he had complied with Rule 26-1a and that no penalty had been incurred. The following morning, after additional questions had been raised about the incident in a Woods television interview, the Committee talked with Woods, reviewed the video with him and reversed its decision, ruling that he had incurred a two-stroke penalty for dropping in and playing from a wrong place in breach of Rules 26-1a and 20-7c.

This also meant that, in returning his score card the previous day, Woods had breached Rule 6-6d by returning a score (6) for the 15th hole that was lower than his actual score (8). The penalty for such a breach of Rule 6-6d is disqualification. Under Rule 33-7 ("Disqualification Penalty; Committee Discretion"), a Committee has discretion to waive that penalty in "exceptional individual cases." As discussed below, the Committee elected to invoke that discretion and waived Woods' penalty of disqualification.

Explanation of the Rulings

This situation raised two questions of interpretation under the Rules of Golf.

1. *The Ruling that Woods Dropped in and Played from a Wrong Place*

The first question was whether, after taking relief, Woods played his next stroke in accordance with the Rules. The Masters Tournament Committee ultimately answered no and imposed a two-stroke penalty because Woods did not drop and play a ball "as nearly as possible at the spot from which the original ball was last played," as required under Rule 26-1a. The Rules do not define "as nearly as possible" in terms of a specific measured distance, because the conditions unique to each situation can affect how near to the original spot it is possible to drop a ball and because dropping a ball is an imprecise act. But in this type of situation, in which that original spot was clearly identifiable as being just behind the back edge of the divot hole created by Woods' previous stroke and in which there were no other unusual circumstances, "as nearly as possible" means that the player must attempt to drop the ball on or next to (but not nearer the hole than) that spot. Woods did not do so. In his post-round media comments, he stated that he dropped the ball about two yards behind that divot hole. Although the precise distance away was not determined, he clearly dropped the ball a significant distance away from that spot and did not satisfy the "as nearly as possible" requirement in these circumstances. As a result, he was penalised two strokes for dropping in and playing from a wrong place.

2. *The Decision to Waive the Penalty of Disqualification*

The second question was whether the Committee was permitted to waive the penalty of disqualification that otherwise applied to Woods under Rule 6-6d, which provides that a competitor "is responsible for the correctness of the score recorded for each hole on his score card. If he returns a score for any hole lower than actually taken, he is disqualified." For nearly 60 years, the Rules have provided Committees with limited discretion to waive a disqualification penalty. Under Rule 33-7, "[a] penalty of disqualification may in exceptional individual cases be waived, modified or imposed if the Committee considers such action warranted."

Such discretion is not intended to protect a competitor from the consequences of his erroneous application of the Rules. The fact that Woods, when he returned his score card, was not aware that he had incurred a two-stroke penalty on the 15th hole was not a basis to waive disqualification under Rule 33-7. Moreover, contrary to what some have suggested, the decision of the Committee to waive the disqualification penalty for Woods was not and could not have been based on Decision 33-7/4.5, a 2011 Decision that permits waiver of disqualification where "the competitor could not reasonably have known or discovered the facts resulting in his breach of the Rules." That extremely narrow exception, which relates generally to use of high-definition or slow-motion video to identify facts not reasonably visible to the naked eye, was not applicable here and had no bearing on the Committee's decision. Woods was aware of the only relevant fact: the location of the spot from which he last played his ball. His two-stroke penalty resulted from an erroneous application of the Rules, which he was responsible for knowing and applying correctly. Viewing the incident solely from the standpoint of Woods' actions, there was no basis to waive the penalty of disqualification under Rule 6-6d.

However, the Masters Tournament Committee did not base its exercise of discretion under Rule 33-7 on any circumstances specific to Woods' knowledge, but rather on the consequences of the Committee's own actions. Before Woods had returned his score card for the second round, the Committee had received an inquiry from a television viewer questioning whether Woods, in taking relief under Rule 26-1a at the 15th hole, had dropped his ball sufficiently close to the spot from which he had played his original ball. The Committee promptly reviewed an available video and determined that Woods had dropped and played correctly under Rule 26-1a and therefore had not incurred a penalty. The Committee did not talk with Woods before making this ruling or inform him of the ruling. Woods therefore signed and returned his score card without knowledge of the Committee's ruling or the questions about his drop on the 15th hole. The following morning, after additional questions had been raised about the incident in a television interview, the Committee discussed the incident with Woods, reviewed the video with him and reversed its decision, ruling that Woods had dropped in and played from a wrong place.

In deciding to waive the disqualification penalty, the Committee recognised that had it talked to Woods – before he returned his score card – about his drop on the 15th hole and about the Committee's ruling, the Committee likely would have corrected that ruling and concluded that Woods had dropped in and played from a wrong place. In that case, he would have returned a correct score of 8 for the 15th hole and the issue of disqualification would not have arisen.

The Decisions on the Rules of Golf authorise a Committee to correct an incorrect decision before the competition has closed, and they establish that where a Committee incorrectly advises a competitor, before he returns his score card, that he has incurred no penalty, and then subsequently corrects its mistake, it is appropriate for the Committee to waive the disqualification penalty. See Decision 34-3/1. The Woods situation differed from the situation in Decision 34-3/1, and in other Decisions that protect a competitor from disqualification where the competitor has relied on erroneous information from a referee or the Committee, in that Woods was not informed of the Committee's initial ruling and therefore did not rely on the Committee's advice in returning his score card. This situation therefore raised a question not expressly addressed in the existing Decisions under Rules 33-7 and 34-3 and that reflected two competing considerations. On the one hand, the Decisions provide that the player's responsibility for his own score is not excused by his ignorance or misapplication of the Rules. On the other hand, the Decisions provide that a Committee may correct an erroneous decision and may take its error into account in determining whether it is appropriate to waive the penalty of disqualification. In effect, based on all of the facts discussed above, in this case both the competitor and the Committee reached an incorrect decision before the score card was returned.

The Masters Tournament Committee concluded that its actions taken prior to Woods' returning his score card created an exceptional individual case that unfairly led to the potential for disqualification. In hindsight, the Committee determined that its initial ruling was incorrect, as well as that it had erred in resolving this question without first seeking information from Woods and in failing to inform Woods of the ruling. Given the unusual combination of facts – as well as the fact that nothing in the existing Rules or Decisions specifically addressed such circumstances of simultaneous competitor error and Committee error – the Committee reasonably exercised its discretion under Rule 33-7 to waive the penalty of disqualification under Rule 6-6d, while still penalising Woods two strokes under Rules 26-1a and 20-7c for playing from a wrong place.

Scope of Committee Discretion to Waive a Penalty of Disqualification for Failure to Return Correct Score

Since this ruling at the 2013 Masters Tournament, The R&A and the USGA have received various enquiries about the scope of a Committee's discretion to waive a penalty of disqualification where the player has failed to return a correct score card. The Woods ruling was based on exceptional facts, as required by Rule 33-7, and should not be viewed as a general precedent for relaxing or ignoring a competitor's essential obligation under the Rules to return a correct score card. Further, although a Committee should do its best to alert competitors to potential Rules issues that may come to its attention, it has no general obligation to do so; and the fact that a Committee may be aware of such a potential issue before the competitor returns his score card should not, in and of itself, be a basis for waiving a penalty of disqualification under Rule 6-6d. Only a rare set of facts, akin to the exceptional facts at the 2013 Masters Tournament as summarised in the previous paragraphs, would justify a Committee's use of its discretion to waive a penalty of disqualification for returning an incorrect score card.

Future Review

The R&A and the USGA continuously work to monitor and assess the Rules of Golf in practice, to observe and incorporate the lessons of experience, and, as appropriate, to clarify and revise the Rules and Decisions to ensure that the Rules operate in the best interests of the game and that their appropriate interpretation and application are understood and consistently followed. In recent years, The R&A and the USGA have been assessing the Rules that relate to score cards and disqualification. As part of this ongoing assessment, and in keeping with this regular practice, the Rules of Golf Committees of The R&A and the USGA will review the exceptional situation that occurred at the 2013 Masters Tournament, assess the potential implications for other types of situations, and determine whether any adjustment to the Rules and/or the Decisions is appropriate.

About The R&A

R&A Rules Ltd is the rules-making company of The R&A. Based in St Andrews, The R&A organises The Open Championship, major amateur events and international matches. Together with the United States Golf Association, The R&A governs the game worldwide, jointly administering the Rules of Golf, Rules of Amateur Status, Equipment Standards and World Amateur Golf Rankings. The R&A's working jurisdiction is global, excluding the United States and Mexico.

The R&A is committed to working for golf and supports the growth of the game internationally and the development and management of sustainable golf facilities. The R&A operates with the consent of 149 organisations from the amateur and professional game and on behalf of over thirty million golfers in 135 countries.

For more information about The R&A visit www.RandA.org.

About the USGA

The USGA conducts the U.S. Open, U.S. Women's Open and U.S. Senior Open, as well as 10 national amateur championships, two state team championships and international matches. Together with The R&A, the USGA governs the game worldwide, jointly administering the Rules of Golf, Rules of Amateur Status, Equipment Standards and World Amateur Golf Rankings. The USGA's working jurisdiction comprises the United States, its territories and Mexico.

The USGA is a global leader in the development and support of sustainable golf course management practices. It serves as a primary steward for the game's history and funds an ongoing "For the Good of the Game" charitable giving program. Additionally, the USGA's Course Rating and Handicap systems are used on six continents in more than 50 countries.

For more information about the USGA, visit www.usga.org.

Rules Quiz

By Brian Nesbitt

(Victorian State Level Referee)

Answers can be found on back page

Club Level — True or False

1. A ball which oscillates on the spot is deemed to have moved.
2. Stakes or lines used to define the margin of or identify a water hazard must be yellow.
3. A provisional ball is a ball played under Rule 27-2 for a ball that may be lost anywhere or may be out of bounds.
4. The margin of a water hazard extends only downwards.
5. A ball is outside the teeing ground when part of it lies outside the teeing ground.
6. The margin of a bunker extends vertically downwards, but not upwards.
7. A hole made by a dog is not an abnormal ground condition unless marked or declared as ground under repair.
8. Frost is not casual water.
9. If a ball is lifted because it is interfering with play it may not be cleaned unless it is on the putting green.
10. A player may declare his ball lost at any time.

Now for a hole with Dawn and Briony. Please count the strokes and any penalties involved in each paragraph and check your score for the hole at the end.

1. Briony nervously teed her ball up, set to compete in the Monthly Medal; she declared to her playing partners that she was playing a #4, which she proceeded to knock out of bounds with her first stroke. She then discovered that she had played from outside the teeing ground. She teed up another ball, again a #4, this time within the teeing ground, and skied her drive, but was relieved nonetheless — she was off the first tee.
2. Briony's ball came to rest in an area of Ground Under Repair on the fairway. When she reached her ball she discovered that it was plugged. She decided to drop the ball, not nearer the hole, within the ground under repair and it sat up beautifully. Briony elected to play the ball as it lay, without taking relief from the GUR. She hooked her ball and it appeared to come to rest in a water hazard.

3. Briony elected to take stroke and distance relief from the water hazard, and just after she played her next stroke, this time with a #2, Briony's partner Dawn found Briony's original ball in the rough adjacent to the water hazard. Dawn advised Briony to continue play with the #2, the ball in play.
4. Briony's ball came to rest in a rabbit scraping, from which she took relief within 1 club length, not nearer the hole, before chipping to 60 cm from the hole.
5. Briony surveyed her putt and noticed an embedded acorn on her line of putt. The acorn was not solidly embedded, so Briony removed the acorn with her hand. Briony then repaired the depression in which the acorn lay and then sank her putt.

This next Section may need the use of the Decisions Book and is aimed at State Level Referees.

1. A player's ball strikes a rock and bounces farther away from the hole than the spot from which the stroke was played. The player deemed the ball unplayable. May the player invoke the stroke-and-distance option of Rule 28 and play the ball from nearer the hole than where it came to rest?
2. A player's ball comes to rest on a small, grass-covered island within the confines of a bunker. The player deemed the ball unplayable and elected to drop it under Rule 28b. He went to drop it outside the bunker and his opponent immediately objected, insisting the ball should be dropped within the bunker, and you are called for a decision.
3. A player removes a post defining out of bounds on his line of play. He realises he has made a mistake and replaces it before playing his next stroke. His opponent claims the hole and you are called.
4. A player's ball lies in casual water within a bunker. The player elects to play the ball as it lies and touches the casual water with his club prior to making the stroke. The player's club does not touch the sand in the bunker except in making the stroke. His opponent immediately lodges a claim and you are called.
5. The first players out in Pennant arrived at the first green to find that the green had not been swept of dew. The first player to putt swept his line of dew and, as he was about to putt, his opponent claimed the hole. The player argued that the dew was casual water, and you are called.

Rules on Tour

By Tom Duguid

(Editor, GA National Referee & part-time PGA Tour Referee)

As a Rules Official at a professional tournament or a major amateur championship there are days when you don't have any rules queries at all! Most of your time is spent watching and timing groups go through your zone, with the occasional visit to the rough or trees to help search for a wayward ball.

Players appreciate officials helping in searching and it softens the blow a little when you then have to advise that the five minutes have elapsed. Whether on the scene or at a distance, officials should get into the habit of checking your watch (a stop watch is preferable) or mobile (on silent!) every time a search commences, remembering that the clock starts when the player or their caddie enters the area likely to contain the ball – not when spectators or officials start looking. Inevitably, no one else has got an accurate sense of the time elapsed.

At the Talisker Masters at Kingston Heath last November, I had to assist with a few interesting incidents.

On Day 1, Stuart Appleby's ball was up tight behind an advertising sign near the 17th green – a relatively simple Temporary Immovable Obstruction (TIO) relief situation. Stuart knew that he had to drop "more than one, less than two club lengths" to the side of the sign. As he would have a delicate chip to the flag, he eyed a spot where he wanted to drop and asked his caddie for his shortest club, one that would get him to his preferred dropping position. Having measured the first club length with the wedge, he then had a mind change and proceeded to measure the second club length with his driver. At this point I intervened, explaining that although he could measure with any club, both club lengths had to be measured with the same club (see Decision 20/1). He chose then to re-measure the second length with his wedge, dropped correctly and chipped onto the green.

Unfortunately, a TV commentator misconstrued my explanation and incorrectly stated on air that I had advised Stuart that he had to measure with the club that he was likely to use in playing the next stroke. No doubt a number of rules enthusiasts were jumping up and down in their lounge about my apparent error!



Mount Broughton Golf Club

On Day 2 I was driving over the hill on the 10th hole (normally the club's 1st) when I saw Terry Price, Leigh McKechnie and their caddies walking back from the green towards the crest of the fairway hill. Puzzled, I approached to offer assistance and they sheepishly advised that they had hit each other's ball from the fairway and noticed the errors when at the green. As the group following had already teed off, Terry asked me to warn them of the situation. It happened to be the marquee group of Adam Scott, Graeme McDowell and Oliver Goss. Graeme was relieved when hearing the news as he thought I was coming back to reprimand his group for hitting up on the group ahead!

On Day 3 I was called to help Brad Lamb in the sandy rough off the 1st fairway. His drive had finished under a golf cart driven by a volunteer, who, in an attempt to clear the area, drove over the ball, pushing it into the sand. This was witnessed at close range by a marshal who was able to describe the ball's original lie. This made it easy for Brad to lift his ball from the depression and place it very adjacent, on a similar lie under Rule 20-3b.

Later, near the 1st green I had to assist a young amateur whose ball was sitting on the ground but amongst a tangle of TV cables. I asked him to mark his ball in case it moved and then remove the cables. Unfortunately after marking the ball he immediately picked it up. After querying this illegal action, I determined that he had misinterpreted my instructions and he replaced the ball without penalty (see Decision 34-3/3.5).

Day 4 was a normal "Search and Rescue" day.

Later that month I assisted at the NSW PGA Championship at the attractive and challenging Mt Broughton GC in the Southern Highlands near Moss Vale. A relatively new, privately owned course, its Manager and President is Frank Williams, formerly the manager of Greg Norman and previous co-owner of the Australian Masters tournament.

Although the fairways were very wide, the rough was thick and long – over a metre high in parts. Any ball in this chaff was virtually always lost or unplayable!

I was called to an interesting incident in a bunker one day. Two balls were in the bunker but the track made by one of the balls in the sand was weird – it ran down the face into the flat area where it took a 90 degrees left turn for about 20cms to where the ball was at rest. As the second ball's point of impact was not visible, the available evidence was that the second ball had landed on the first ball, moving it. It was easy for the player to replace his ball on the original spot at the apex of the track.

Murray Cropley, a GA National Referee, relates several TIO situations he dealt with over summer –

1. On the 5th hole at Kingston Heath for the Talisker Masters (this is the normal 2nd hole), Kevin Smith's ball was in the rough with a gum tree about 3 metres in front of his ball but between his ball and the hole, which was about 50 metres away. About 10 metres in front of the tree, in a direct line with the hole, was an advertising sign. He asked me if he was entitled to TIO relief. Given that he could reasonably easily bend the ball around the tree to either strike the sign or pass over it and could thus have his ball finish on a direct line to the hole, I said that he was, since the sign met the two

required criteria of (i) being in a direct line between his ball and the hole and (ii), being on his line of play.

2. On the 8th hole at The Lakes in the Emirates Australian Open, Richard Green's ball lay behind an advertising sign near the green. This sign was one for which it was permissible to drop either side (as per the tournament's local rules), but the fairway side gave a potentially very sandy lie and, while the other side gave a better lie, taking the appropriate relief meant dropping behind another sign which was nearer to the green. But the relevant relief option for this second sign was behind a tree, so Richard elected to take relief from the first sign but not the second, and indeed played his shot over the second one and onto the green.

3. On the 12th hole at The Lakes in the Emirates Australian Open, a player's ball was in an unplayable lie under a bush some 5 metres or so off the fairway. His best option was dropping within 2 club-lengths to the left of the bush but this was behind an advertising sign near the green. (Indeed, his ball was in the unplayable lie because it had hit the sign and bounced back — had it not hit the sign it probably would have been lost.) This sign was another one where it was permissible to drop either side in taking relief, so the player elected to take an unplayable lie, drop the ball behind the sign, and then take relief from the sign. This in fact allowed him to drop almost on the fairway, and gave him a relatively easy pitch onto the green.

David Greenhill, Golf Victoria's Chief Operating Officer, describes a situation with Brett Rumford and the perils of water hazards.

On the par 5 14th hole at The Lakes, in the first round of the Emirates Australian Open, Brett Rumford's drive finished inside the margin of the left hand side lateral water hazard; not in the water, but on the edge of the bank in the dense kikuyu grass. Rumford looked at the stroke for a minute or so and contemplated playing a rescue club from the hanging lie to the green some 180 metres away. However, a sufficiently balanced stance was not possible for such a long shot and he opted against it. He went back to his bag outside the hazard and swapped the rescue club for a wedge. (As an aside, my vision of being involved with a Rule 26-2 ruling — the water hazard rule of regression — which I have only ever seen once in a major tournament in 22 years of working in golf, coincidentally given by the late, great Ron Budge at The Lakes at the 1992 Australian Open to Lucas Parsons on the old 13th, therefore evaporated before my eyes.)

Rumford's problems continued, given the lie of his ball and his difficulty in getting a stance to pitch it back onto the fairway. While this was going on, as the walking rules official with the group, I was standing around 25 metres away with a clear, elevated view. I hadn't been requested, nor was I needed, to provide any rules advice up to this point. However, while Rumford was standing behind the ball within the hazard margin, thinking about what to do and holding his wedge in his left hand, it looked like he momentarily (1 or 2 seconds at the most) touched the grass (and potentially the ground) with the club. Straightaway, he looked up and stated, 'I've just touched the grass with the club, is that a penalty? I was so into the shot, I didn't think what I was doing with my wedge.'

My response was that it depended on whether he thought he had not just touched the grass but had grounded the club, where the

weight of the club had been supported by the grass, thus incurring a two stroke penalty for a breach of Rule 13-2. Even though I was close by and had a good view, I couldn't be certain as to whether he had grounded the club. The grass was thick and the situation had happened so quickly.

I felt that Rumford would really be the only person to know as he was holding the club and aware of its weight in his hand when it came into contact with the grass. To save time (and given a potential penalty wasn't going to make any difference to playing the ball), I suggested that he play the ball and I'd call in a rover to involve in the discussion given the situation and potentially severe penalty. He finally managed to get a stance and pitched back up onto the fairway, before playing a long iron onto the green with his third stroke.

Roving referee David Parkin from the One Asia Tour was nearby and immediately came across. After I'd briefed him as to what had happened (with Rumford present and in agreement with the summary), Parkin advised us to continue play while he double-checked the wording to Decision 13-4/8 and thought about the

situation as described to him. We also played the par 3 15th hole before Parkin rejoined us on the 16th fairway and agreed that it was really Rumford's call as to whether he had broken the rule. He concurred that I certainly couldn't say categorically that he had grounded the club. To help conclude the matter, we moved to some similar length grass in the rough at the 16th where Rumford demonstrated to both of us how he felt he had held the wedge in his left hand when it had come into contact with the grass. Parkin and I agreed that it was unlikely the club was grounded (as per the decision) and he wouldn't be penalised. Given his honesty throughout this situation (not to mention his distinguished and long playing career), we had little doubt that if Rumford had really touched the ground, he'd have called a penalty on himself.

This incident illustrates that rules situations can literally take place in the blink of an eye, aren't always preventable and, in a lot of cases, it's really only the player that knows whether they've broken a rule. Our job as referees is to work through the process and provide the player with the technical detail to assist in reaching an outcome. I'm still also waiting to be involved in a Rule 26-2 situation!

Anchoring

The R&A and The USGA announce final approval of Rule 14-1B that prohibits use of anchored strokes.

Governing Bodies Issue Report Explaining Their Decision Following Comment Process New Rule to Take Effect on 1 January 2016, Allowing for Transitional Period Belly-Length and Long Putters Remain as Conforming Clubs.

The R&A and the United States Golf Association (USGA), golf's governing bodies, today announced the adoption of Rule 14-1b of the Rules of Golf that prohibits anchoring the club in making a stroke. The new Rule will take effect on 1 January 2016 in accordance with the regular four-year cycle for changes to the Rules of Golf.

Rule 14-1b, which was proposed on 28 November 2012, has now been given final approval by The R&A and the USGA following an extensive review by both organisations. The decision to adopt the new Rule came after a comprehensive process in which comments and suggestions from across the golf community were collected and thoroughly considered.

The R&A and the USGA have prepared a detailed report to explain the reasons for the decision to adopt Rule 14-1b. The report explains the principles on which the Rules of Golf are founded, why freely swinging the entire club is the essence of the traditional method of stroke, and why anchoring is a substantially different form of stroke that may alter and diminish the fundamental challenges of the game. It points out that the Rule will still allow the use of belly-length and long putters and that a wide variety of types of strokes remain for players to use. The report concludes that the new Rule should not adversely affect participation in the game, that it is not too late or unfair to require players to comply with it and that it will remove concerns about any potential advantage that anchoring provides. It also makes clear that one set of Rules is essential to the future health of the game. The report, entitled Explanation of Decision to Adopt Rule 14-1b of the Rules of Golf, can be found at www.RandA.org/anchoring or at www.usga.org/anchoring.

Peter Dawson, Chief Executive of The R&A said: "We took a great deal of time to consider this issue and received a variety of contributions from individuals and organisations at all levels of the



game. The report published today gives a comprehensive account of the reasons for taking the decision to adopt the new Rule and addresses the concerns that have been raised. We recognise this has been a divisive issue but after thorough consideration we remain convinced that this is the right decision for golf."

"Having considered all of the input that we received, both before and after the proposed Rule was announced, our best judgment is that Rule 14-1b is necessary to preserve one of the important traditions and challenges of the game – that the player freely swing the entire club," said USGA President Glen D. Nager. "The new Rule upholds the essential nature of the traditional method of stroke and eliminates the possible advantage that anchoring provides, ensuring that players of all skill levels face the same challenge inherent in the game of golf."

The current Rule 14-1 of the Rules of Golf will be re-numbered as Rule 14-1a, and new Rule 14-1b will be established as follows:

14-1b Anchoring the Club

In making a stroke, the player must not anchor the club, either "directly" or by use of an "anchor point."

Note 1: The club is anchored "directly" when the player intentionally holds the club or a gripping hand in contact with any part of his body, except that the player may hold the club or a gripping hand against a hand or forearm.

Note 2: An "anchor point" exists when the player intentionally holds a forearm in contact with any part of his body to establish a gripping hand as a stable point around which the other hand may swing the club.

Rule 14-1b will not alter current equipment rules and allows for the continued use of all conforming golf clubs, including belly-length and long putters, provided such clubs are not anchored during a stroke. The new Rule narrowly targets only a few types of strokes, while preserving a golfer's ability to play a wide variety of strokes in his or her individual style.

The 1 January 2016 timetable for implementation also provides an extended period in which golfers may, if necessary, adapt their method of stroke to the requirements of the new Rule.

David Rickman, Executive Director of Rules and Equipment Standards at The R&A, said:

"This Rule change addresses the future and not the past. Everyone who has used an anchored stroke in the past, or who does so between now and 1 January 2016, will have played entirely within the Rules and their achievements will in no way be diminished."

"The discussion around the Rule has been very helpful, and we appreciate that so many different perspectives were offered," said USGA Executive Director Mike Davis. "We know that not everyone will agree with the new Rule, but it is our hope that all golfers will accept that this decision is reasoned and motivated by our best judgment in defining the sport and serving the best interests of the game."

For more information about the adopted Rule, including a demonstration video, photos, infographics, and a Guidance Document for Players and Officials, visit www.RandA.org/anchoring and www.usga.org/anchoring.

For a full transcript from the R&A press conference announcing the final approval of Rule 14-1B, visit <http://ow.ly/lgtSq>

Rule 6: The Player - Score Cards

By Brian Hill

(Golf Services Manager, Golf Victoria)

Often Rules Referees are asked to officiate at Club events in the role of score card checker or to give rulings on issues relating to score card errors.

Rules 6-2, 6-6, 33-5 and 34-1b tend to be the areas that players and committees either get wrong or inadvertently make a mistake.

Players, for a multitude of reasons, occasionally record incorrect handicaps or forget to record their handicap somewhere on the score card. Committees will often incorrectly disqualify players who have not recorded their handicap in the allocated box even though the player has clearly written their handicap under the gross score.

Recently a club sought clarification after a player had returned a score card with no scores recorded in the 'player' column but had one set of scores written in the 'marker' column. All other facets of the card were correct including the marker and player signatures. How would you have ruled?

I suggested that the club should first confirm that the scores are actually the player's scores and not the marker's. Decision 6-6d/4 was as close a decision as I could find and suggested that the player's score be accepted. The question was also forwarded to GA and their response came back as:

"It is our view that the score card should be accepted without penalty. That said, in a situation such as this, the Committee should check with the player to make sure the listed scores were indeed correct. We would also suggest that the player and marker be counselled to avoid such a practice in future – such an act clearly consumes far more of the committee's time than is reasonable."

Earlier this year a player reported that he had handed his score card to a committee member who was checking score cards and, after looking at the card, the committee member commented to the player that he was disqualified as he had not signed his card.

The player had not moved away from the committee member, who refused to return the card to the player to sign, quoting Rule 6-6c. This example highlights the necessity for clubs to publicise to the members a designated scoring area as per Decision 6-6c/1.

The PGA has a very clear definition on its hard card: "A player's score card has been returned to the committee when the player has exited the defined scoring area with both feet."



At the 2013 Victorian Open a player, after shooting a great round, got caught up in the moment and forgot to sign his card before leaving the scorers' hut, and was subsequently disqualified. The result simply shows that mistakes can happen to anyone at any time and, ultimately, it is the player's responsibility to check their score card.

Score card checkers should try to get the player to stay in the scoring area whilst they check that the score card has the correct name on it, all 18 hole boxes are filled, both marker and player have signed the card, and that the total score tallies with what the player thinks they scored. If the totals differ then you need both player and marker to review the card until all doubtful issues are settled. If this is a net event then you also must check that the card has the player's handicap on it.

Committees are responsible for providing players with a score card with their name and the current date on it. Score addition and the application of Stableford points or win/loss Par results are also the committee's responsibility.

Whilst Club events are not State Opens they are just as important to most competitors.



know.play.love.golf

Rules Quiz Answers

Answers to Club Level True or False

1. False. See Definition.
2. True. Definition Note 1.
3. False. Definition.
4. False. Definition.
5. False. Definition.
6. True. Definition.
7. True. Definition. A dog is not a "burrowing animal".
8. True. Definition.
9. True. Rule 22-2.
10. False. Definition, and see also Decision 27/16.

A Hole with Dawn and Briony: Answer

1. One stroke, 2 penalty strokes: Decision 11-4b/6.
2. One stroke, no penalty strokes: Decision 25-2/4.
3. One stroke, one penalty stroke: Decision 26/6 and Definition of Advice.
4. One stroke, no penalty strokes: Rule 25-1b.
5. One stroke, 2 penalty strokes: Decision 16-1a/7.

Five strokes and five penalty strokes = Total 10 strokes.

Decisions Book Answers

1. Decision 28/8. Yes, the player may play from nearer the hole.
2. Decision 28/9. As grass covered ground is not part of the bunker, the player may drop behind the bunker.
3. Decision 13-2/25. The player was in breach of Rule 13-2 the moment he moved the post and there was nothing he could do to avoid the penalty. The replacement of the post before the next stroke was irrelevant. Penalty: Loss of hole.
4. Decision 13-4/7. The player incurs no penalty as he did not touch the ground in the bunker with his club prior to making his stroke — see Rule 13-4b.
5. Decision 16-1a/3. Rule 16-1a prohibits touching the line of putt except in the removal of loose impediments, repair of ball marks, etc. Dew and frost are not loose impediments — see Definition of "Loose Impediments". Accordingly, such action would be in breach of Rule 16-1a, and the player loses the hole.