



REFEREE ASSESSMENT REPORT 2015/16



Match Details

FIXTURE	 Paris Saint Germain (FRA)	2-0	Malmö FF (SWE)	
COMPETITION	UEFA Champions League (Group Stage)			
DATE (KICK OFF TIME)	15/09/15 (19:45)			
VENUE	Parc de Princes, Paris			



Appointed Officials

		NAT	MARK	BAND
 REFEREE	KARASEV, Sergei	 RUS	8.2	GOOD
 ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	AVERIANOV, Anton	 RUS	8.4	GOOD
 ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	KALUGIN, Tikhon	 RUS	8.5	EXCELLENT
 ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT 1	LAPOCHKIN, Sergei	 RUS	8.4	GOOD
 ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT 2	IVANOV, Sergei	 RUS	8.4	GOOD
 4 TH OFFICIAL	DEMESHKO, Igor	 RUS	8.2	GOOD
 ASSESSOR	ADAM	 ENG		



SECTION A – THE REFEREE

1 | IDENTIFICATION OF FOUL CHALLENGES

ACCURACY The referee's ability to accurately distinguish between fair and foul challenges.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
CONSISTENCY The referee's consistency in identification & penalising of foul challenges.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
OVERALL MARK An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.4 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	Karasev's foul detection was strong throughout. He was accurate in his identification of fair and foul challenges and appeared very confident in his decisions. It was good to see the referee award a free kick when a player was fouled but remained on his feet on 13 minutes. Karasev correctly awarded a free kick on 23 minutes, and then gestured to the player after he protested. The referee didn't need to do this and gesturing can be quite risky, especially if the referee has misread a situation. Overall, however, Karasev had no problems with his foul detection and most of his decisions were accepted without many protests.					

2 | POSITIONING & MOVEMENT

READING OF THE GAME The referee's ability to see play developing & adjust positioning & movement accordingly.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
POSITIONAL AWARENESS The referee's awareness of his surroundings, including position of the players & the ball.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
OVERALL MARK An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	7.9 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	For large parts of the game, in particular the first half, Karasev was too central in his positioning and was often caught too far away from play. Notably, a few times when a corner kick was played short, Karasev remained positioned on the opposite side of the penalty area. Despite the fact he has the AAR to assist him, Karasev still could have perhaps logged closer to the play as he would have had a poor angle to judge an incident. Also, when the ball is passed amongst the defence (such as 10'), the referee remained near the half way line. Should a defensive mistake occur, with the referee required to make a big decision, he would be left very vulnerable. The referee was never in the way of play and never looked in danger of obstructing play, however, but should consider getting closer to the action on some occasions in order get a better viewing angle of proceedings.					

3 | MAN MANAGEMENT

TECHNIQUES The methods used by the referee to manage situations and cooperate with the players.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
EFFECTIVENESS The success of the methods used by the referee to manage players & situations.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
OVERALL MARK An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.1 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	In the first half, Karasev took a lenient approach and was willing to give the players a chance. It was not a particularly challenging game that required the use of cards, and Karasev identified this and kept his cards in his pocket for as long as possible. He chose to formally rebuke a player on 39 minutes for pulling him from behind during an attack, but by the letter of the law this should have been a caution. Karasev appeared to have the respect of the players and never had any difficulties in managing them and keeping control.					

4 | DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

ACCURACY The accuracy of the referee's identification of cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
CONSISTENCY The referee's consistency in identifying cautionable and dismissable offenses.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
OVERALL MARK An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.2 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	Karasev issued a total of 4 cautions, all of which were understandable. As stated above, Karasev took a lenient approach early on, only showing cautions when the game started to become more intense, which was a sensible approach. The first card did not come out until the 57 th minute, and although it was perhaps a harsh yellow, it was timed very well as the game was started to heat up and increase in pace.					

5 | FITNESS

OVERALL MARK	SATISFACTORY	8.4	EXCELLENT	
COMMENTS	Karasev clearly had a high level of fitness, and he had no problem keeping up with play, especially counter attacks. However, I don't think Karasev fully utilised his fitness capabilities, as he often chose to remain a large distance away from play rather than jogging with the ball.			

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

GAME MANAGEMENT The referee's overall management of the occasion and handling of the match.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
APPLICATION OF THE L.O.T.G The referee's knowledge and accurate implementation of the L.O.T.G throughout.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
OVERALL MARK An overall mark out of 10 in accordance with the guidelines for this category.	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.4	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS Brief comments by the assessor, applied to this category, with reference to specific incidents where appropriate.	The game was managed well, and Karasev was always calm and confident in his decision making. In particular, he played some outstanding advantages which helped to keep the game flowing (especially at 63', where he went back to caution). Overall, an impressive refereeing performance with small areas for improvement.					

7 | OVERALL MARK

CATEGORY	MARK	BAND
1	8.4	GOOD
2	7.9	SATISFACTORY
3	8.1	GOOD
4	8.2	GOOD
5	8.4	GOOD
6	8.4	GOOD
OVERALL 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.	8.2	GOOD



SECTION B – THE ASSISTANT REFEREES

1 | OFFSIDE ACCURACY

ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	X	OUTSTANDING
ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	X	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS	Malmo played a very high defensive line and this meant the assistants had to pay extra attention for potential offsides. Assistant 2 had several very tight offside calls to make (3', 7', 12', 17'...) and was correct in all but one, which occurred in the 23 rd minute, but the mistake was understandable as it was very tight and played at speed. Assistant 1 had a crucial offside decision to make in the 92 nd minute, which resulted in a disallowed PSG goal. It was a very tight decisions and replays were inconclusive so I will agree with the decision.					

2 | TEAMWORK & COMMUNICATION

ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	X GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS	Assistant 1 correctly flagged for a free kick on 5 minutes. The assistants & referee communicated well throughout.					

3 | OVERALL MARKS

ASSISTANT REFEREE 1	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.4 GOOD	EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
ASSISTANT REFEREE 2	UNACCEPTABLE	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	8.5 EXCELLENT	OUTSTANDING
COMMENTS	Both assistants had a busy night, but AR2 impressed the most with some very good offside decisions.					



SECTION C – THE ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT REFEREES

1 | TEAMWORK & ASSISTANCE FOR INCIDENTS IN AND AROUND THE PENALTY AREA

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT 1	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.4 GOOD	
ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT 2	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.4 GOOD	
COMMENTS	AAR1 may have had some input into the disallowed goal on 90+2 minutes as he could see that the player guilty of being in an offside position was interfering with play by obstructing the goalkeeper.			



SECTION D – THE 4TH OFFICIAL

1 | CONTRIBUTION TO THE TEAM

OVERALL MARK	POOR	SATISFACTORY	8.2 GOOD	
COMMENTS	The 4 th official decided to intervene on 39 minutes, telling a player to move the position of the ball ahead of a free kick, despite the referee not originally telling him to. This was unusual and perhaps undermined the referee, who belatedly signalled for the player to move the ball.			