



**MATCH OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW
FORM 2 - 2018/19**

MATCH OFFICIAL:	FORSYTHE , Andrew	LEVEL:	8
SOCIETY:	Leicestershire	DATE:	19-01-2019
HOME:	Kidderminster Carolians 1 (25pts)	AWAY:	Old Laurentian (22pts)
GAME LEVEL:	7	COMPETITION:	London & SE Intermediate Cup
DEVELOPER:	KNIGHT, Mike		

GAME CONTEXT

PLAYING CONDITIONS:

It was cold, grey and overcast but the rain/sleet/snow held off for the duration of this match. The grass was wet but otherwise there was a perfect playing surface for this Midlands Division semi-final of the R.F.U. intermediate Cup.

GAME CHALLENGE:

DEVELOPER:	MATCH OFFICIAL:
<p><i>These clubs have identical playing records (both have lost only to Kenilworth, the league leaders, and to each other in the respective home league fixtures) and are 2nd and 3rd in M2WS. This encounter proved to be as close as their league records. The home team raced into an early lead (10-0 on 1/09), lost this lead by HT (10-15), trailed even further in Q3 (10-22 by 2/01), equalised soon after (22-22 on 2/06) and then kicked the winning points on 2/31 (25-22) [not forgetting a disallowed try for K. on 2/28 for a forward pass and then hitting the posts with another penalty kick on 2/38]. It was that kind of game! Three tries were scored at the beginning of H2 before either a scrum or a lineout had been called. The pace and continuity levels were both consistently high and skill levels were positive and constructive. This made for a high match challenge. Likewise, the degree of difficulty was also high but for positive reasons in that this competitive contest was cleanly fought at all times (but with just enough of a technical challenge at the breakdown to make it even more interesting). The match was a highly entertaining spectacle that had a large crowd absorbed all afternoon. Some of the defending and handling was not of the highest order but did not detract from the overall quality of the match. It was a match that was a credit to both teams and the referee.</i></p>	<p>I didn't really know the clubs, so could only go on previous form. It was likely to be lively as they are positioned 2 and 3 in their league and it is a cup semi-final, so there may be crowd participation.</p> <p>I needed to be on my game from the start and and maintain my work rate throughout.</p>

MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE

COMMUNICATION:

Whistle tone was clear, differentiated and consistent. Signalling, including repeat signals after stoppages, was competent for the most part (on occasions an even more definitive signalling action would emphasise the decision more strongly). Preventative verbal communication was consistent and effective for the most part. Such use established an evident rapport with the players and had frequent outcomes in dynamic situations e.g. as at the final contest on 2/40 when O.8 was put on-side at a Maul. As discussed, despite the success of verbal communication there was a need on occasions to make the decision without a further

discussion with either a player or a team captain i.e. make the decision, ensure that the play then continues in short order; punitive decisions have an element of preventative control in themselves without the need to explain each and every decision (see below, Game Management). Consistent identification of the offender at punitive awards also raises the level of control, giving precision to the whole process.

GAME MANAGEMENT:

Andrew managed this match effectively and contributed significantly to the quality of the playing pattern. His mental focus and concentration were maintained from start to finish in a contest that required such a high level of efficiency. It was a challenging encounter and Andrew met this challenge with aplomb. The awards count per quarter was as follows - 4, 4, 3 and 2. Yellow cards were shown to O.2 on 1/36 (loss of temper) and to K.15 on 2/18 (T3 offence initially, repeat offending afterwards as well!). This data reflects the positive nature of the contest and the constructive response of players to punitive measures and a high level of preventative control applied by the referee. The YC on 1/36 followed a clash of heads at the breakdown and a loss of temper between the players; formal communication with the team captains and then the YC to the main protagonist ensured that the situation was well managed. This incident apart there was no serious foul play and only very minor incidents of apparent temper. The second YC was a long time coming. Appealing by various players figured consistently in this match. On 1/27 downtime was used to talk to both team captains (K.7 and O.6) as to the need for player appealing to stop. On 2/09 formal communication with the K. captain at another downtime moment repeated this requirement and the use of a card was proffered (a legitimate escalation at that point). A process for raised control and the use of escalated sanctions had been evidently put in place. On 2/10 a discussion with K.7 as to further appealing should have seen the requisite follow-up applied rather than another discussion (as in Communication, instant punitive effect rather than yet another preventative discussion). On 2/12 a PK was given for appealing against K. (no card used, offender not identified). On 2/18 a T3 offence by K.15 was compounded by further appealing and this time the YC sanction was duly applied. This was correct in itself but should have been applied rather than discussed on 2/10. Draw your parameter strongly and then make use of any prime opportunity to emphasise the required level of control. Undoubtedly the use of preventative verbal communication had a marked effect on the punitive count and player discipline but on occasions the rapid completion of a decision would be more helpful to the playing pattern of the match. But this is fine-tuning. A low punitive count, minor use of cards, no serious foul play and little temper in a highly competitive match were all very positive outcomes of this performance by Andrew.

CORE VALUES:

Despite the intensity of the contest this match played in very good spirit and demonstrated the principles of good sportsmanship at all times. It was also very enjoyable to watch! The players achieved satisfaction from this contest and so did the crowd (post match comment from both 'camps' was both positive and appreciative). It was a Cup match in the best of traditions. Andrew was organised and motivated, altogether a credit to his Society.

Proper concern for player safety was also demonstrated e.g. on 2/12 a PK Advantage for O. was stopped and returned due to a player being down with a head injury.

TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE:

BREAKDOWN:

The breakdown was the strongest technical challenge in this match (as is usual in the modern game). Overall the contest was well managed and both teams gained rapid possession from these components which contributed to the high level of continuity in the match. Preventative communication was used consistently and achieved good outcomes ("Hands out Green" on 1/07 followed by an immediate response with a PK when player response was not forthcoming; likewise after the award on 1/13 when "You need to take another step" was offered to K.7). The flashpoint on 1/36 along with the YC was certainly an example of effective management. The use of materiality as to ball possession was also applied intelligently e.g. a 'lazy run' by O.8 on 2/16 which did not disrupt possession. There were some areas for future development. Positioning needs to show more variation. Positioning was mostly at the rear on the attacking line (it was adjacent and never became a detached chariot position). More short range mobility was required from such positioning i.e. 'sweep the rear' rather than remaining static (and, as discussed, make use of your sightlines and angle of running to view play should a team switch play to the narrow side as happened frequently in this match). More positional variation in using any 45 location would inevitably put you closer to the contact point so that you raise your control profile (visibly in the mindset of the players, audibly in ensuring that any verbal communication is apparent). Given the use of an in-field 45 make sure that your stance remains open and that head movement affords scanning opportunities across the whole field. Given varied positioning and short range mobility then respond in kind to technical issues, a referee response to the context of the game and blow more immediately if necessary i.e. get amongst them and use a quick whistle! To highlight: on 1/18 your stance was turned square at

a rear position; on 2/01 your in-field 45 positioning was turned square and missed midfield offside by).12 but which was not critical to the subsequent score by another O. player; on 2/19 you maintained a rear position at a pick-and-drive attack by O. rather than moving to an in-goal position ("Short" would also have been a more precise call than "No, no"); on 2/29 multi-phased play saw rear positioning held three times rather than any mobile switch to view all aspects of the contest; on 2/38 a 360 pirouette at an in-field 45 position was entertaining but not totally effective!; on 2/33 positioning was turned square and at a mid point to the contact area i.e. not a 45 position but in 'no-mans-land'. And to reiterate, given that much of the appealing came at breakdown contests, draw the parameters earlier and respond more quickly to escalate sanctions. Again these are fine-tuning points given that much of the contest was constructive and contributed to an exciting playing pattern.

SCRUM:

The engagement procedure was followed consistently to ensure a safe and fair contest. For the most part the contest was evenly balanced and neither team gained any marked superiority at this component; what minor drives were created were well managed and controlled effectively. The punitive count was low (PK x 1), the number of resets was low (two at player-request), the number of collapses and 'wheels' was non-existent (all very good outcomes to have achieved in this match). The proactive switch to the far side on 1/37 was an intelligent response when the replacement for the YC on 1/36 set up an unstable wrestling match with his opposite number after the engagement (O.3, as numbered, but a replacement). The preventative words at the engagement on 2/37 ("It's getting scrappy") was a timely reminder even at that late stage of the match (and was another indicator that mental focus was being maintained). In terms of good practice more use of far side positioning would have been appropriate in this match i.e. using short range mobility (as with rear positioning at the Ruck component and variation of positioning at the Lineout). Such positioning will depend on the context of each match but should be used to an extent for preventative purposes (though not material in this match). Far side positioning was used 2 from 33 (a single reset per quarter until 4 resets in Q4); small use of the far side as a preventative strategy would have been appropriate and certainly in Q4 when the resets rose in number (even though one of these at 2/27 was when the referee blocked the half-back channel on the narrow side!). But, overall, this was a constructive and technically sound aspect of the playing pattern.

LINEOUT & MAUL:

Lineout: this was another component that provided both teams with quality possession and the opportunities to establish free-running attacks and close quarter support play. The number of offences was low (FK x 1) and the throwing was accurate ('not 5' x 2, retake on 2/35). The gap was set early and maintained [this despite O.6 persistently complaining about blocking ("Not yet material" offered in Q2), another discussion that could have been foreshortened]. I agreed with you, I did not see it as a problem, end of discussion! Again, in terms of good practice rather than materiality, short range mobility in making more use of rear positioning would have been appropriate in this match (2 from 13, firstly on 2/26). Even allowing for the context of this match and the use of throws to the front of the line some additional use of rear positioning was needed i.e. raises your physical control profile, inputs on the mindset of players, no part of play is a 'no-go' area. Maul: these contests were limited in number (the ball was moved away from Lineout possession on most occasions) but all remained upright and technically precise (PKs x 0). Again, preventative verbal communication was used consistently and effectively e.g. on 2/27 "He's fine, his binding stayed on" at a driving Maul by O. curtailed any offending and materially ensured the continuation of a constructive contest; on 2/40, as mentioned above, a similar outcome was achieved with O.8 though again short range mobility to get closer or around the contact point would have been better practice rather than following on at a rear position (the wise words were successful when the maul slowed rather than when in full movement). The discussion with the O. captain (O.6) on 2/27 when awarding a scrummage to K. was an instance when informal communication proved more than useful at a double-Maul situation ("It was called once"). It was another well managed component that added to the quality of the contest.

SPACE:

There was plenty of space on offer in this match! The three tries at the start of H2 came from what American Football calls 'Kick returns' but which in this case resulted from poor kicks out of defence compounded by poor covering across the field. (but was exciting to watch for the neutral observer). Otherwise both teams played in a positive manner at all components and offending was minimal. Having detailed positioning and scanning at the Breakdown above it is also true to say that both teams did not encroach in any organised manner at the tackle and Ruck components. Space was there and was taken by both teams to play a constructive form of rugby. Quickly taken penalty kicks were also well managed though, again, neither team sought to disrupt this particular ploy (1/07, 1/16). The application of Advantage was applied consistently and intelligently. Though no direct scores came from Advantage long plays on 1/25 and 2/30 produced scoring opportunities before returns were ordered. On other occasions the

use of Advantage contributed significantly to the level of continuity e.g. on 2/00 a knock-on at the restart by K. was played, called "over" and play continued so that a score came on 2/01 (and then 2/04 and then 2/06).

OVERALL SUMMARY

MATCH OFFICIALS COMMENTS:

I am completely happy with Mike's comments on this and really pleased with the game. The contest was good and fair and I believe I contributed greatly to this. Mike detailed all of the fine-tuning points and am happy to start implementing these, with my coach's input. Thanks again to Mike for watching me.

This was always going to be a high-intensity (and hopefully a crowd pleasing) game - and it was never short on action. Both teams were really appreciative of the efforts made in providing a platform for free-flowing competitive rugby.

I loved this game and it's great that I provided a contribution. I am really pleased with my performance having only been promoted to Level 7 at Christmas.

DEVELOPERS COMMENTS:

This was a high quality Level 7 contest (I would expect at least one of these teams to achieve promotion this season). Andrew's performance matched the challenge of the match, an intense contest of unremitting pace. It was a performance that certainly justified his current grading (Level 7) and warranted further appointments to matches of this quality. On its own this performance also demonstrated the potential to officiate at the next level given further appointments of this kind. It was a good sporting occasion where the efforts of the two teams were complemented by the efforts of the official. It was good to be there!

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

KEY FOR DECISION MAKING TIMELINE EVENTS:

PK - Penalty Kick Conceded

FK - Free Kick Conceded

RC - Red Card Conceded

YC - Yellow Card Conceded

Optional Information which may be recorded in timeline:

ND - Non-Decision

E - Error

DECISION MAKING TIMELINE

FIRST HALF:

QUARTER 1:

TIME	HOME	AWAY	DESCRIPTION & DISCUSSION
01	PK	-	Open: crossing offence by O. (O.12)
03	-	-	Score: K. try (5-0)
07	PK	-	Ruck: handling offence by O. (no number)
09	-	-	Score: K. try (10-0)
13	-	-	Score: PK goal by O. (10-3)
13	-	PK	Ruck: participant offside by K. (K.7)
16	-	PK	Ruck: offence by K., no signal, award taken quickly (no number)

QUARTER 2:

TIME	HOME	AWAY	DESCRIPTION & DISCUSSION
25	-	PK	Ruck: non-participant offside by K. (K.9)
29	-	-	Score: O. goal (10-10)
31	-	PK	Tackle: T1 offence by K. (K.15)
33	-	-	Score) O. try (10-15)
35	PK	-	Tackle: T2 offence by O. (O.7)
36	-	-	YC: shown to O.2 (loss of temper at Ruck situation)
36	PK	-	Ruck: loss of temper by O. (O.2)

SECOND HALF:

QUARTER 3:

TIME	HOME	AWAY	DESCRIPTION & DISCUSSION
01	-	-	Score: O. goal (10-22)
04	-	-	Score: K. goal (17-22)
06	-	-	Score: K. try (22-22)
12	-	PK	Open: appealing offence by K. (no number)
15	-	FK	Lineout: early lift by K. (no number)

18	-	PK	Tackle: T3 offence by K. (K.15)
18	-	-	YC: shown to K.15 for appealing the Tackle decision/repeat offending (K.15)

QUARTER 4:			
TIME	HOME	AWAY	DESCRIPTION & DISCUSSION
30	PK	-	Scrum: non-participant offside by O. (O.9)
31	-	-	Score: PK goal by K. (25-22)
38	PK	-	Ruck: scatter rucking by O. (O.13)

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION					
MATCH STATISTICS SUMMARY					
ITEM	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	TOTAL
PENALTY KICKS	4	4	2	2	12
FREE KICKS	0	0	1	0	1
YELLOW CARDS	0	0	0	0	0
RED CARDS	0	0	0	0	0
SCRUMS AWARDED	9	7	6	11	33
SCRUM RESETS	1	1	1	4	7
LINEOUTS	1	6	3	3	13