

Law 5 - The Referee

REFEREE OBSERVATION REPORT

World Cup U20 Poland; Lublin, 29 May 2019, 20:30 CET; Match 26; Colombia – Tahiti 6 - 0 (4 - 0)

Referee: Daniel Siebert (GER)

Assistant Referee 1: Jan Seidel (GER)

Assistant Referee 2: Rafael Foltyn (GER)

Fourth Official: David Yareboinen (PNG)

Video Assistant Referee: Juan Martínez Munuera (ESP)

Assistant Video Assistant Referee: Ammar Al-Jeneibi (UAE)

Law 5 Blog Observer: RJC

Presentation of the match:

Very important game for the objectives of Colombia in moving to the next phase. For this they needed to win the game with a substantial margin if the Poland team win the other game of the group A.

Theoretically it would be an easy game for Colombia and for the refereeing team. The result of the first half (4-0) came to confirm. In the second half gradually increased the result. During the game, the Tahitian team made just one shot on goal.

The players played the game correctly, with few fouls. However it is important to mention some important incidents: Wrong yellow card (44'), two requests from penalty kick (53' and 61'), one missed card (65') and a red card by second yellow card (82').

Although with good climatic conditions there were few spectators to the stadium (about 30% of the capacity of the stadium).

Despite this I consider the normal degree of difficulty for the entire referee team.

Referee performance (Personality, LotG application, disciplinary control, physical condition, cooperation, VAR management):

Most of his decisions were accepted naturally. All parties concerned have respected it. He showed natural authority. There were few situations to test your personal characteristics.

He let the game flow and when there was opportunity he applied the law of advantage even though with little meaning to the game (18', 28').

He judged as well as # 4 TAH unintentional pass to his goalkeeper (4'). Watching for infractions near the penalty areas (40'). More and more safety is required in the marking of fouls in the front area of the goal. Many teams have experts in running these free as happened in this case (goal of #10 COL).

More work in the second time in the evaluation of difficult analysis incidents.

Penalty request by #18 TAH in his area of penalty enters a sliding tackle in the attempt to intercept the ball and this ball hits him on the arm that is resting on the ground (53'). Play on is a good decision because the arm is in a natural position, the ball is shot off very close and there is no deliberate movement of the player.

Penalty request by #20 TAH in his area of penalty shoot down the #10 COL (61'). Play on is a good decision because he first plays the ball and then inevitably comes into contact with the opponent.

Disciplinary did not perform as well. Started by talking to players making public warnings (21', 49'). He used disciplinary powers correctly most of the time (29', 46', 79', 82').

Yellow card barely shown to the #8 COL allegedly by deliberately throwing the ball with his arm (44'). In the replays of the tv it is notorious that the ball hits the belly and not the arm. Difficult to analyze. The referee has a player in front and, well, let the game follow. However, he must have been informed by the communication system and interrupted the game. He later warned the player. More attention and concentration are needed in these bids. In this case, the player was prevented from playing in the next game.

Don't booked #10 COL for reckless charge against goalkeeper (65'). Just considered direct free kick. He have two players in front and don't see the contact. Consequently, don't evaluated correctly the infraction.

Second yellow card showed the #11 TAH for preventing a promising attack. Right decision.

He played almost always in the midfield of the Tahitian team. The amount of players in a short space of land makes it difficult for the referee to move, which sometimes was on the pass line (30', 60', 76',90'). On the other hand the rhythm of the game did not allow to test their physical capacities. Expected level.

Good collaboration of the VAR.

Assistant Referee 1 performance (Please mention the minutes of important / crucial situations):

Some work and correct in the first half in the analysis of the offside. Good use of wait and see technique (4', 6', 27'). Just one flaw when he raised the flag signaling offside to #7 COL (13'). When your teammate passed the ball, he is in line with defensive line how we can see in tv. Then he hesitated a little bit to signalize offside. These bids are difficult to analyze because the attacker is very close. Second half was easy and calm. Overall had expected performance.

Assistant Referee 2 performance (Please mention the minutes of important / crucial situations):

Little work in the first half. After the break, he followed the COL attack and had more decisions to take.

Good use of wait and see technique (54') and good decisions onside (76').

Difficult decision by canceling a goal for COL (55') but was well taken following the VAR protocol. When the ball was passed the player was offside. When the ball was passed the player was out of play then don't raised the flag and just signalized offside after the game was interrupted for permit VAR analysis.

Overall had excellent performance.

Fourth Official performance:

Expected performance although I think it may have given the referee a wrong indication (44').