

## Techniques E-blast 10.25.18

The recent VolleyCast reviewed the new fundamental mechanics for indicating the nature of the challenge (the “challengeable decision”). Note that there are only **five** signals used to indicate the category of the challengeable decision:

1. “IN” for decisions associated with line calls, pancakes, or ball-contacting-antenna faults, or any other in/out decision.
2. “TOUCH” for decisions associated with a touch by a defender prior to a ball going out, a decision regarding a ball hit into the tape that may or may not have been contacted by an opponent, the possibility of a team contacting the ball four times or a single player making two distinct attempts to play the ball.
3. “NET FAULT” for decisions associated with traditional net faults or a player contacting the antenna.
4. “FOOT FAULT” for decisions associated with a server’s foot position on the end line or hash mark.
5. “BACK-ROW ATTACKER” for decisions associated with a back-row attacker’s foot position at take-off if the ball is attacked while entirely higher than the top of the net.

Remember, the “challenge accepted” raised hand/fist is executed near the site of the request, with the arm on the side of the challenging team, and the challengeable decision signal is executed with the **same** arm, regardless of which team is being reviewed for the fault. A quick double whistle should accompany this signal.

After the video review, it is critical to have consistent, clear communication about the result.

- If the original decision is confirmed, the R2 simply turns toward the court, whistles once and repeats the original point signal to the R1. The R1 repeats that signal.
- If the original decision stands because the video does not provide indisputable evidence to reverse, the R2 whistles once and repeats the original point signal followed by the “inconclusive” signal. The R1 repeats the point signal.
- If the original decision is reversed, resulting in a replay, the R2 whistles once and shows the replay signal, which the R1 repeats. This typically occurs when the video review shows that play was stopped when a whistle was blown for a fault that did not occur (net fault, ball down on pancake, etc.).
- If the original decision is reversed resulting in the other team receiving the point, the R2 whistles once and signals the **new** fault (including the player number for a net fault if possible) and waits to mimic the R1’s new point signal. The R1 mimics the new fault signal and then awards the point. **NOTE:** The new fault signal is not necessarily one of the challengeable categories – the video might have shown 4-hits, or a double contact on two distinct attempts to play the ball. In those situations, the actual fault should be signaled.
- If the review of an “in/out/touch” changes the original call, the signal shown after the review should be the actual fault seen on the video, regardless of what was challenged. For example, if a coach challenges an original decision of “IN”, the correct challenge category signal used at the time of the challenge is “IN”, as described in #1 above. However, if the video review shows that the ball was actually OUT, but was TOUCHED by a defender, the R2 should turn toward the court, whistle once, signal TOUCH, and repeat the original point signal.