

Officials Report

Event	Hartside Duathlon	Date	13 October 2013
Official	Pete Edwards		

1. Competitors Information

Excellent		Good	x	Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	--	------	---	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments: Plenty of information provided for competitors in advance via the event website. A verbal briefing was provided by the event organiser which was clear and comprehensive especially in respect of a cycle route change caused by adverse weather conditions. Better quality written information around the registration area would have raised this section to an excellent standard.

2. Registration Process

Excellent		Good	x	Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	--	------	---	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments: Well organised with plenty of personel on hand from early in the morning to ensure all competitors were entered into the event in plenty of time.

3. Swim Organisation and Safety

Excellent		Good		Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	--	------	--	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments:N/A

4. Transition Area (including security)

Excellent	x	Good		Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	---	------	--	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments: Very good quality racking set up on a grassed area in the centre of the village. Racking was clearly numbered with plenty of space for all bikes and kit plus extra spaces for any overspill entries. The transition area was demarcated with orange plastic fencing supported by metal pickets which provided an adequate barrier to unauthorised entry. Egress with bikes and kit after the race was controlled by easily identified marshals who provided firm but polite security checks.

5. Design and Signage of Courses

Excellent		Good	X	Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	--	------	---	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments: Both run courses were identical and were clearly signed and marshalled resulting in none of the competitors going off-route. Due to adverse weather at altitude on the original bike course this had to be redesigned at less than 24 hours notice. This resulted in a slightly shorter bike course though competitors reported it was still challenging. All cyclists returned safely which tends to suggest the course was well signed and marshalled. My only concern about the cycle course arose from the last minute change of route. Continued under Further Comments

6. Drafting Situation

Excellent		Good		Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	--	------	--	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments: Unable to comment though there were no adverse reports from competitors or marshals.

7. Marshals

Excellent		Good	X	Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	--	------	---	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments: All marshals appeared to be very well briefed about their roles and responsibilities. All acted in a confident and courteous manner in their contact with officials and marshals. All of the marshals I spoke to were very friendly and contributed much to the success of this event.

8. Overall Safety of Event

Excellent		Good	X	Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	--	------	---	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments: No issues other than as outlined below.

9. Response from Competitors

Excellent		Good	X	Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	--	------	---	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments: No adverse comment were reported to me by any competitors, those I spoke to seemed very happy with the event overall.

10. Treatment of Officials and Marshals

Excellent		Good	x	Adequate		Poor		Very Poor	
-----------	--	------	---	----------	--	------	--	-----------	--

Comments: No Negative comments at all in this respect , I was afforded the best of courtesy and respect by all involved in this event especially competitors even when offered “words of advice”.

Further Comments:

This required cyclists to pass a line of parked vehicles outside a small church whilst dealing with moving traffic travelling in both directions. This left very little room to pass safely and at one point a cyclist lost control though it seems this may have been due to mechanical failure. Had the transition area and Bike Out been turned by 180 degrees the cyclists could have joined the same road beyond the parked vehicles and the avoided the congestion caused by the same vehicles.

Please list any penalties, including details:

Number	Reason
None	

Number of officials in attendance (including m/c officials): 1

Number of competitors in the event (including DSQ and DNF): 85

Distance travelled to officiate the event: 210 miles return

To make further comments, please use a separate sheet and attach to the report.

Signed	P. EDWARDS	Date	13/10/2013
--------	------------	------	------------

Copies to Triathlon England HQ, the appropriate Regional Official's Coordinator and the Event Organiser (within seven days of the event).

Report Checklist

This checklist is designed to act as a template to provide you with guidance when completing your race report. The use of this list is not mandatory but you may find it helpful to refer to.

Competitor Information		
Was the competitors information accessible before the event?	Yes	No
Were there maps provided on the information board for:		
• Transition	Yes	No
• Swim Course	Yes	No
• Cycle Course	Yes	No
• Run Course	Yes	No
Was the course explained to competitors?	Yes	No
Was the briefing content appropriate?	Yes	No

Registration		
Was there any delay processing competitors?	Yes	No
Were course maps displayed for competitor information?	Yes	No
Were course maps good quality and accurate?	Yes	No
Did registration open and close at the advertised times?	Yes	No

Swim Course		
Were there any impediments to competitor flow?	Yes	No
Were all swim buoys visible to competitors at all times?	Yes	No
Was there sufficient water safety craft and personnel?	Yes	No
Were wetsuits permitted? Add water temperature to Yes/No column	Yes	No
Did the race start at the advertised time?	Yes	No
Did the race have multiple waves?	Yes	No
• If yes, did all waves start at the advertised time?	Yes	No

Transition		
Did transition open and close at the advertised times?	Yes	No
Were competitors bikes and helmets checked before entering transition?	Yes	No
Was transition secure?	Yes	No
Did the design/size present a fair transition for all competitors?	Yes	No
Were the entry and exit points visible through signage?	Yes	No
Were marshal present to direct competitors and secure the area?	Yes	No
Were there cycle racks for all competitors?	Yes	No
Was each competitor allocated a numbered rack position?	Yes	No
Were there any impediments to the competitor flow?	Yes	No
Was a secure baggage area provided for competitors?	Yes	No
Was a change area provided for competitors?	Yes	No

Design and Signage of Courses		
Were there any impediments to the competitors flow?	Yes	No
Was there sufficient signage on the course?	Yes	No
Was the Traffic Management Plan appropriate for the course?	Yes	No
Were there sufficient marshals/police on the course?	Yes	No
Were there any unsafe areas on the course?	Yes	No
Was there a sweep/emergency vehicle on the course?	Yes	No
Was there sufficient crowd control, where needed?	Yes	No
Was the cycle course shared with the run course?	Yes	No

Drafting		
Were motorcycle officials present?	Yes	No
Was the feedback from competitors regarding drafting positive?	Yes	No

Marshals		
Were the marshals knowledgeable and effective?	Yes	No
Were the marshals effectively deployed?	Yes	No
Were there enough marshals for the size of the event?	Yes	No

Overall Safety of Event		
Was the safety of competitors maintained throughout?	Yes	No
Were there any elements of the courses/transition/the event area that gave cause for concern or are there any examples of good practice?	Yes	No
Was the safety of the spectators maintained throughout?	Yes	No

Response from Competitors		
Was the response from competitors positive?	Yes	No
Were there any common areas of praise or concern from competitors?	Yes	No

Treatment of Officials and Marshals		
How did the event organiser treat the race officials and volunteers?	Yes	No