

## 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.

| <b>Competitor Information</b>                                |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 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 |

| <b>Registration</b>                                      |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 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 |

| <b>Swim Course</b>  |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 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 |

| <b>Transition</b>  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 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 |

| <b>Design and Signage of Courses</b>                        |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 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 |

| <b>Drafting</b>  |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| Were motorcycle officials present?                             | Yes | No |
| Was the feedback from competitors regarding drafting positive? | Yes | No |

| <b>Marshals</b>                                       |     |    |
|---|-----|----|
| 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 |

| <b>Overall Safety of Event</b>   |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| 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 |

| <b>Response from Competitors</b>                                   |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| Was the response from competitors positive?                        | Yes | No |
| Were there any common areas of praise or concern from competitors? | Yes | No |

| <b>Treatment of Officials and Marshals</b>                           |     |    |
|--|-----|----|
| How did the event organiser treat the race officials and volunteers? | Yes | No |