





# THEREF

THE REFEREES' WEBSITE

## REFEREE ASSESSMENT REPORT 2015/16



### Match Details

FIXTURE	 Norwich City	1-3	Crystal Palace	
COMPETITION	Barclays Premier League			
DATE (KICK OFF TIME)	08/08/15 (15:00)			
VENUE	Carrow Road, Norwich			



### Appointed Officials

		MARK	BAND	
	REFEREE	HOOPER, Simon	7.4	POOR
	ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	GARRATT, Andrew	8.4	GOOD
	ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	HALLIDAY, Andrew	8.3	GOOD
	4 <sup>TH</sup> OFFICIAL	SWARBRICK, Neil	8.4	GOOD
	ASSESSOR	EDWARD		



## SECTION A – THE REFEREE

### 1 | IDENTIFICATION OF FOUL CHALLENGES

<b>ACCURACY</b> The referee's ability to accurately distinguish between fair and foul challenges.	UNACCEPTABLE	X POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>CONSISTENCY</b> The referee's consistency in identification & penalising of foul challenges.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	X SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	7.4 POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee's foul detection was satisfactory in most of the match. His line was very lenient since his intention was to let both teams present their technical abilities. He allowed much of physical play (09', 17', 29', and 88'). Another positive point would be his usage of the advantage rule in the few occasions that this was needed (41', 89'). However there are some clear fouls that were missed (01', 85') as well as 2 major decisions that unfortunately weren't assessed correctly. The first one is the disallowed goal for Norwich at min. 74' when #Jerome (NOR) raised his foot inside the penalty area to play the ball and scored. Joel Ward (CRP) was near the NOR attacker and also tried to play the ball. The referee signalled an attacker foul for high-foot. However replay shows that no infraction took place. The second scenes happened at 90+1'. After a high ball inside CRP penalty area, Bassong tried to get the ball but Wickham barged into his back. A clear foul in which the referee was very close. 2 <sup>nd</sup> major error.					

## 2 | POSITIONING & MOVEMENT

<b>READING OF THE GAME</b> The referee's ability to see play developing & adjust positioning & movement accordingly.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>POSITIONAL AWARENESS</b> The referee's awareness of his surroundings, including position of the players & the ball.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.3</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee overall presented a good positioning. He was close to play and managed not to intervene with it. However he should be better positioned in set-pieces (corner-kicks and free-kicks).					

## 3 | MAN MANAGEMENT

<b>TECHNIQUES</b> The methods used by the referee to manage situations and cooperate with the players.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b> The success of the methods used by the referee to manage players & situations.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>7.9</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee tried to be friendly with the players and used a quite passive approach. He used mostly small talk or small gestures of "calm down" in order to control the player. However this technique wasn't always successful since in some cases, players either didn't respect the referee or completely disregard his decisions (riot at min. 07', 27', 58', 67'). Personality and man management is definitely an area which the referee should review his approach. Being passing and not communicating properly with players can lead to a number of problems.					

## 4 | DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

<b>ACCURACY</b> The accuracy of the referee's identification of cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>CONSISTENCY</b> The referee's consistency in identifying cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.2</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee issued only 1 caution for a reckless tackle. The card came out at min. 23' to Tetley who tackled in a real reckless manner on Square. However the referee failed to caution Murray for a really nasty tackle to Dorrans. The CRP defender used his studs in extend but luckily the contact with his opponent was only minimal. That's the distinction from the RC. According to this assessor, it was a clear case of reckless challenge which was missed. Murray also did a couple of equally strong fouls (45', 71') but the referee chose only to verbally warn him. We can argue that both fouls weren't as mandatory cautions as the first one. No other major incidents on this area.					

## 5 | FITNESS

<b>OVERALL MARK</b>	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.4</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	
<b>COMMENTS</b>	Good fitness in general. The referee was close to play at most instances and didn't appear tired in any moment of the match. He was able to use sprints and/or backwards movement in order to keep up with pace.			

## 6 | OVERALL GAME MANAGEMENT & APPLICATION OF THE L.O.T.G

<b>GAME MANAGEMENT</b> The referee's overall management of the occasion and handling of the match.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	<b>X</b> SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>APPLICATION OF THE L.O.T.G</b> The referee's knowledge and accurate implementation of the L.O.T.G throughout.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	<b>X</b> SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	<b>7.4</b> POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The referee tried to handle the match by allowing both teams to present their abilities and intervene when it was necessary. In most of the match, this approach worked well and the referee would have achieved a better mark if he had used his personality more to control the players. However the referee produced 2 clear mistakes in the Application of the LOTG. The scenes at min. 75' and 90+1' weren't correctly assessed and created unnecessary tension with the players and the crowd. More attendance and awareness needed especially in scenes that occur inside the penalty area.					

## 7 | OVERALL MARK

CATEGORY	MARK	BAND
1	7.4	POOR
2	8.3	GOOD
3	7.9	SATISFACTORY
4	8.2	GOOD
5	8.4	GOOD
6	7.4	POOR
<b>OVERALL</b> Add the above marks together and divide by 6. Round up or down to the first decimal place. In instances where the referee has made 1 or more major errors, this mark is limited to 7.9.	<b>7.4</b> (due to 2 major errors)	<b>POOR</b>



## SECTION B – THE ASSISTANT REFEREES

### 1 | OFFSIDE ACCURACY

<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 1</b>	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 2</b>	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b>	AR2 was slightly more challenged than his colleague, having to assess 5 offside cases. He didn't experience any problems in general with 1 exception (min. 78') where attacker was level with the 2 <sup>nd</sup> last defender. AR1 wasn't so challenged but he correctly let his flag down at CRP 3-1 where the scorer is clearly onside despite contrary movements.					

## 2 | TEAMWORK & COMMUNICATION

ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS	Good co-operation with the referee in general. Both AR's seemed to talk a lot to the referee. AR2 may have been involved at min. 75' decision but we can't be sure of that. AR1 should be more careful at min. 25' since, according to this assessor, the free-kick went the wrong way.					

## 3 | OVERALL MARKS

ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.4</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.3</b> GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS	Good performance by both AR's. AR2 made a small mistake (min. 78') but all his other decisions were correct. AR1 could have been more careful at min. 25' since the foul occurred far away from him and he signalled it wrong unfortunately.					



## SECTION C – THE 4<sup>TH</sup> OFFICIAL

### 1 | CONTRIBUTION TO THE TEAM

OVERALL MARK	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.4</b> GOOD
COMMENTS	The Fourth Official executed correctly his technical duties. Substitutions and additional time were displayed properly and on time. He had mostly small talk with both coaches when it was required. A valuable team-member.		