




# THE REF

THE REFEREES' WEBSITE

## REFEREE ASSESSMENT REPORT 2015/16



### Match Details

FIXTURE	 Sunderland	1-3	Norwich City	
COMPETITION	Barclays Premier League			
DATE (KICK OFF TIME)	15/08/15 (15:00)			
VENUE	Stadium of Light, Sunderland			




### Appointed Officials

		MARK	BAND	
	REFEREE	FRIEND, Kevin	8.1	GOOD
	ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	WEST, Richard	8.0	GOOD
	ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	HOLMES, Adrian	7.9	SATISFACTORY
	4 <sup>TH</sup> OFFICIAL	ATKINSON, Martin	8.4	GOOD
	ASSESSOR	NICOLE		



## SECTION A – THE REFEREE

### 1 | IDENTIFICATION OF FOUL CHALLENGES

<b>ACCURACY</b> The referee's ability to accurately distinguish between fair and foul challenges.	
<b>CONSISTENCY</b> The referee's consistency in identification & penalising of foul challenges.	
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	<p>The referee managed to appropriately identify fouls, as exemplified in the 7th minute, when Norwich #6 (Bassong) slide tackled Sunderland #17 (Lens). The tackle was late, and a desperate attempt to get the ball away from Lens, thus making it a reckless tackle, that was given a caution accordingly. The referee was consistent as Sunderland #17 (Lens) committed a tackle in a similar manner in the 9th minute and was also cautioned for it. Lens committed another similar offence and was not cautioned, so the referee's consistency was definitely not perfect. Also, a few other fouls were missed or the advantage was wrongly given. An example of this was in the 88th minute when the advantage was not given to Sunderland. Nothing too major, although they were noticeable to those with experience. Luckily, Sunderland scored on the free kick, so the mistake was not a game changer. The referee did not call Norwich's holding offence in the 45+2 minute, however in his opinion it may have appeared that</p>

	Sunderland had the advantage. Throughout the game some holding offences were called and some were not, therefore consistency was a slight issue. The correct decision was made in the 60th minute when the referee let play continue rather than award a penalty kick to Sunderland, as the replay revealed there was actually no contact made from the Norwich defender when the Sunderland player went down in the penalty area.
--	--

## 2 | POSITIONING & MOVEMENT

<b>READING OF THE GAME</b> The referee's ability to see play developing & adjust positioning & movement accordingly.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>POSITIONAL AWARENESS</b> The referee's awareness of his surroundings, including position of the players & the ball.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	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 did not run/jog the entire game, in fact, he walked around the pitch for the majority. He was late to the play a few times and was often quite far, luckily not many major issues were affected due to his lack of movement. Also, the referee's positioning slightly improved as the game progressed.					

## 3 | MAN MANAGEMENT

<b>TECHNIQUES</b> The methods used by the referee to manage situations and cooperate with the players.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b> The success of the methods used by the referee to manage players & situations.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>COMMENTS</b> Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	I noticed that before a corner kick was taken in the 9th minute the referee took the time to warn players of their actions before the kick. This most likely prevented a foul that would have led to injury, thus it was an effective tactic of man management. Although, the referee spent a lot of time arguing with players rather than dismissing them. He also made physical contact with a player which is highly unprofessional.					

## 4 | DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

<b>ACCURACY</b> The accuracy of the referee's identification of cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>CONSISTENCY</b> The referee's consistency in identifying cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	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 was consistent in his sanctions, exemplified as mentioned before in the foul recognition section regarded two similar offences.					

## 5 | FITNESS

<b>OVERALL MARK</b>	SATISFACTORY	<b>8.1</b>	EXCELLENT	
<b>COMMENTS</b>	Although the referee was definitely capable of keeping up with play it seemed as though he was walking for most of the game, which caused him to be behind the play on a few occasions. Considering the level of the game this was not a large issue, however, there was definitely the risk of not having the best view of the play, and possibly missing a few fouls or other infringements.			

## 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	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b>	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>	GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>OVERALL MARK</b> An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	<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's knowledge of the laws of the game were evident, as even the 'lesser known' laws were enforced well, for example, the distance requirement for the opposing team on corner kicks (10th minute). The referee's signals were also well executed, but could have been slightly more crisp, rather than relaxed, since it would have been body language enforcing his authority. In the 57th minute there was an incident where it is questionable whether Sunderland's keeper handled the ball after being passed back to him from his own teammate. As a spectator it was difficult to discern what really happened, however if it had indeed been a pass back, then it was a crucial error made by the referee.					

## 7 | OVERALL MARK

CATEGORY	MARK	BAND
1	8.3	GOOD
2	7.9	SATISFACTORY
3	7.9	SATISFACTORY
4	8.2	GOOD
5	8.1	GOOD
6	7.9	SATISFACTORY
<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>8.1</b>	<b>GOOD</b>



## SECTION B – THE ASSISTANT REFEREES

### 1 | OFFSIDE ACCURACY

<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 1</b>	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b>	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 2</b>	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	<b>X</b>	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING

<b>COMMENTS</b>	The assistant referees' recognition of offside infringements was almost 100% accurate. AR2 correctly called multiple offsides, and it was evident that he had a thorough knowledge of when he needed to make those calls.
-----------------	---

## 2 | TEAMWORK & COMMUNICATION

<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 1</b>	<b>UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>POOR</b>	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>	<b>X</b> GOOD	<b>EXCELLENT</b>	<b>OUTSTANDING</b>
<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 2</b>	<b>UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>POOR</b>	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>	<b>X</b> GOOD	<b>EXCELLENT</b>	<b>OUTSTANDING</b>
<b>COMMENTS</b>	There were no obvious miscommunications between the referee and his assistants.					

## 3 | OVERALL MARKS

<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 1</b>	<b>UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>POOR</b>	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>	<b>8.0</b> GOOD	<b>EXCELLENT</b>	<b>OUTSTANDING</b>
<b>ASSISTANT REFEREE 2</b>	<b>UNACCEPTABLE</b>	<b>POOR</b>	<b>7.9</b> SATISFACTORY	<b>GOOD</b>	<b>EXCELLENT</b>	<b>OUTSTANDING</b>
<b>COMMENTS</b>	AR2 was not always in line with the second last defender, noticed as quickly as within the first two minutes of the match. He was behind play on multiple occasions. AR1 appeared to be consistently in the correct position. Note: AR1 was not visible in camera for majority of the game. Mark given according to what was seen.					



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

### 1 | CONTRIBUTION TO THE TEAM

<b>OVERALL MARK</b>	<b>POOR</b>	<b>SATISFACTORY</b>	<b>8.4</b> GOOD	
<b>COMMENTS</b>	The fourth official properly executed his responsibilities, regarding bench management etc.			