



Technical Officials Event Report

Event Name: Ullswater triathlon	Date: 10/07/2016
Chief Technical Official: Peter Edwards	
Assistant Officials: John Tuer Luke Brown	

1. COMPETITOR INFORMATION

Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The event information was presented via a website. This was clear, informative and easily accessed via the simplest of search terms. Location details and local facilities were covered by way of hyperlink. These can be susceptible to changes but as long as the organisers monitor the site regularly for dead links this is a good way of providing accurate and up to date relevant information. This information was supplemented with very detailed athletes pack emailed out in the lead up to the race. The briefing was clear, well attended and appropriate emphasising some last minute changes to the course.									

2. REGISTRATION PROCESS

Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Registration took place in a large marquee. A wide registration desk, adequately staffed and clearly marked for the different events was used to accommodate the athletes as they arrived. Pre planning and packing of athlete packs was noted the night before and this led to a smooth registration process with no excessive queuing noted. All relevant material was displayed including permits and course maps. Although there was an explanatory poster showing drafting rules this did not reflect the 2016 rule changes.									

3. SWIM ORGANISATION AND SAFETY

Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: The swim was a clearly defined open water swim marshalled with canoeists and a RIB. There were more than sufficient safety craft available. Appropriately chosen coloured swim hats were effective against grey and choppy water. The organiser's use of mats and carpet to protect athlete's feet on the run to transition was noted and clearly appreciated as the alternative would have been sharp painful gravel.									

4. TRANSITION AREA

Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Transition was well defined and contained adequate space for all competitors. The entry and exit points provided a fair environment for all and these were clearly marked and led to little confusion if any. Bike out required a run of 250m to a fairly busy road where the mount point was well staffed and managed to protect athletes in a vulnerable part of the race. The only issue noted was that the coned area leading to the mount point stopped 50m before the mount line and was marked with a sponsors sign on each side. This was, on at least one occasion, confused with the mount line by an athlete (although it is acknowledged the briefing did cover this point in great detail). To the organisers credit they are already seeking ways to improve the bike out element of the course and take advantage of improvements at the venue which they discussed with race officials.									

5. DESIGN AND SIGNAGE OF COURSES

Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Clear appropriately coloured and sized signs were consistently used throughout and there was very little confusion noted. No athletes are believed to have got lost or missed their way on the bike route.									

6. DRAFTING

Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: No drafting was noted or reported despite a horrendously wet and windy day. No motorcycle marshals were deployed and the organiser may wish to consider this for future day because of the dual safety/enforcement role they perform; particularly in days of inclement weather in areas where mobile phone signal may be limited.									

7. MARSHALS

Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Ample marshals were deployed and well commented on by the competitors. Food and refreshments were provided by the organisers which was appreciated. Effective and professional security staff were engaged in transition security. It was clear they were all well briefed and understood their role fully.									

8. OVERALL SAFETY OF EVENT

Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: Safety is clearly at the forefront of the organiser's consideration and they have invested heavily in this with a high profile and well-resourced medical support was present. Marshalls were clearly briefed. An effectively deployed support vehicle was also noted to be on call.									

9. RESPONSE FROM COMPETITORS

Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments: All competitors spoken to expressed their enjoyment of the day and in particular the challenge the event presented in demanding conditions being singled out alongside the effective organisation.									

10. TREATMENT OF OFFICIALS AND MARSHALS

Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------	-------------------------------------	------	--------------------------	----------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------	-----------	--------------------------

Comments: It was clear that the organisers value the contribution made from all of their staff whether paid or voluntary. The cheerful effort put in in awful conditions was a clear acknowledgement of the organiser’s ethos towards them. The organisers were very supportive of the officials and sought out and valued their input on all elements of the event and in the planning of its future.

ANY FURTHER COMMENTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE

Comments: This is an excellent event clearly constructed with the competitor in mind. The organisers have a very good ethos and provide all that can be expected and more.

PLEASE LIST ALL PENALTIES GIVEN:

Competitor Number	Reason for Penalty (include as much information as possible, including location of infringement)	Detail of Penalty Given
	none	

Total Number of Competitors at Event (including DSQ and DNF): 220

Total Number of Officials in Attendance: 3

Distance Travelled to Officiate at Event:200 (return)

Signed: John Tuer	Date: 10/7/16
-------------------	---------------