

## Officials Report

Event	Sport In Action Ullswater Triathlon	Date	11 July 2015
Official	Pete EDWARDS		

### 1. Competitors Information

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

Comments: Copious amount of relevant information was supplied well in advance of the event via the organiser's website. This supplied everything competitors needed to know beforehand. On the day of the event this was reinforced in the registration tent by copies of course maps and entry list. At the pre-race safety briefing more diagrams were pointed out especially in relation to the swim course which varied significantly from the website diagrams.

### 2. Registration Process

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

Comments: With almost 250 pre race entries to process, registration opened several hours prior to race brief and closed prior to this. All competitors were signed on and provided with a goody bag by a team of 3 staff were achieved the task in a cheerful and efficient manner. Virtually all competitors were signed on before transition opened 3 hours before race start.

### 3. Swim Organisation and Safety

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

Comments: Following problems the previous day with a smaller race the organisers had clearly learned from previous occurrences. As such 2 safety boats were deployed as well as 5 kayaks which was sufficient to maintain a good watch on the whole field and deal swiftly with a number of withdrawals during the swim phase. Each swimmer was presented to medical personnel immediately on their exit from the water to ensure their well-being or requirement for further treatment.

#### 4. Transition Area (including security)

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

Comments: Transition was set up adjacent to registration on a large grassed field. The usual tubular scaffolding racking approx. 1.5m high was set up in 4 rows. Transition was bounded by 1 meter high crowd control barriers with access in diagonally opposite corners. With considerably more entrants than the previous days race the racking was extened in length but was bare adequate to accommodate the numbers involved . Entry and exit was controlled by a marshal at each end who required matching race numbers to be shown by competitors to deposit and remove equipment.

#### 5. Design and Signage of Courses

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

Comments: The swim course was basically oblong in layout over 2 laps and clearly demarcated by floating orange buoys. Sufficient kayaks were in place to point swimmers in the right direction. The bike course covered 2 laps in the adjacent hilly countryside and was very well signed and marshalled in its entirety. It contained several right turns though this was unconnected to the only accidne t on the cycle course. The run course began around the perimeter of the grassed field before continuing along the lakeside on the first of 3 laps. The use of barrier tape and marshals meant signage could be kent to a minmimum

#### 6. Drafting Situation

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

Comments: Although there were no official motorcycle officials used, no adverse reports were passed back to me regarding any drafting on the cycle course.

#### 7. Marshals

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

Comments: Most of the marshals utilised were employed at the previous days and were drawn from the organising company, a local events company and local triathlon club and were very well briefed on their duties and approached their task with enthusiasm and commitment. They offered plenty of assistance and encouragement to competitors who were heard to offer appreciation on numerous occasions. All marshals were easily identifiable in corporate hi-viz.

**8. Overall Safety of Event**

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

A very comprehensive risk assessment t was prepared in advance and clearly lessons were learnt from the previous days swim problem. .A greater number of water craft were used on the this race which helped to minimise previous problems. Overall I was impressed by the focus on safety on this event and at no point did I feel that this was potentially compromised. In total, felt this was a very safe to participate In for all involved.

**9. Response from Competitors**

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

Comments: A number of competitors were heard to express their thanks for a quality event to myself, marshals and event organisers. The fact that some had travelled considerable distances to take part illustrates the regard this event is held in. This response rom competitors should be regarded as high praise and provide encouragement to organisers to strive to continue and improve on this race.

**10. Treatment of Officials and Marshals**

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

Comments: No reports were received of any deliberate abusive or unsporting language and behaviour from competitors. This contributed largely to the fact that noi official penalties were issued, rather competitors were issued with on the spot advice which they almost invariably accepted in the right spirit. A note of thanks needs to go to the event organisers for ensuring that all marshals and officials were sufficiently fed and watered on a very warm day.

**Further Comments:**

Please list any penalties, including details:

Number	Reason
NONE	

**Number of officials in attendance (including m/c officials): 2**

**Number of competitors in the event (including DSQ and DNF): 229**

**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	11/7/2015
--------	-----------	------	-----------

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