

FIBA POST GAME REPORT

NZL vs MEX GP751 2023 FIBA WC PHI-JPN-INA



Contents

Note about the data	3
Global Evaluation	
Quality and Consistency	4
Game Information	5
Calls Summary vs Referee	6
Calls vs Teams	
Calls vs Referee	8
Play Situations Break-down	9
Call Average vs Game	
Calls vs Zone and Position	11
IRS vs Game	12
Regular Call vs L2M & OT Accuracy	13



Note about the data

The purpose of this report is to share OFFICIATING DATA with our referees. The intellectual property contained herein is the sole property of the FIBA Refereeing Department and must not be publicized. It is provided strictly FOR YOUR PERSONAL INFORMATION. Thank you for not sharing this information outside of the referee team.

The data and statistics presented can be modified when reviewed by FIBA Refereeing Department. The latest version of the data will be used as a basis for individual and global assessments during a competition. It will also be used to detect any deviations. The data only pertains to the calls made by the referees, whether they are negative or positive, and doesn't reflect a global assessment. This report is only one part of all the variables used by FIBA Refereeing Department to help the referees to improve and grow.

Data is useful for FIBA Officiating because it provides a means to justify the quality of our calls. Numbers are not subjective. They are unquestionable fact that can be used as compelling arguments against complaints made by:

- Teams; Delegation members, Coaches, Players.
- Media
- Other estates

Global Evaluation

To obtain a final global assessment of referee performance during a game or competition, some non-tangible variables must be taken into consideration. Data is never an absolute within the context of an overall assessment, but it helps. The interpretation of the data is left to the discretion of the people responsible for the evaluation.

Most importantly, data can be used to:

- Improve referees' personal officiating skills.
- Create/adapt different training methods.
- Secure FIBA standard criteria.
- Know your level compared to FIBA standard



Quality & consistency

FIBA's Referee Department is continuously working to improve the coordination, quality, and consistency of our work. In order to attain this goal, the following people are key:





Game Information

		202	3 FIBA WC PHI-JPN	I-INA		
			GP - GP751			
✓ ★ ★	16:45 31/08/20	123			MALL OF ASIA	3
*	%	Total	Calls	Total	%	
New Zealand	N/A	24	Fouls	25	N/A	Mexico
	N/A	2	Violations	2	N/A	
NZL	N/A	9	00B	9	N/A	MEX
100	N/A	0	Fake	0	N/A	108
	N/A	0	DOG	1	N/A	
	N/A	35	Total	37	N/A	


Quarters	Quarter 1		Quar	ter 2	Quai	ter 3	Quai	ter 4	TOTAL		
Score	22	31	19	26	27	21	32	30	100	108	
Duration	00:1	7:50	00:2	2:38	00:2	23:43	00:4	2:31	01:4	6:42	
Fouls	3	4	5	6	4	8	12	7	24	25	
Violations	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	
00B	3	1	2	0	2	4	2	4	9	9	
Fake	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DOG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
530	<u> </u>	9	J	U	U	0	U	, and the second	-		


	REFEREEING STAFF	
KATO, Takaki (JPN)	GARCIA NIEVES, Daniel Alberto (VEN)	PRAKSCH, Péter (HUN)
Email real real	Company of the compan	The same of the sa
Referee Instructor	Stand-by Referee Instructor	Video Operator
UEDA, Atsuhiro (JPN)	N/A	MITJANA, Roger (ESP)





Calls Summary vs Referee

Types/Referees	C	C		И	U	12	TO	TAL	CHAMPIONSHIP	FIBA
24112	8 (47%)	9 (53%)	13 (45%)	16 (55%)	14 (54%)	12 (46%)	35 (49%)	37 (51%)		
CALLS	17 (2	24%)	29 (4	40%)	26 (36%)	7	2	0	0
FOLLO	5 (45%)	6 (55%)	8 (40%)	12 (60%)	11 (61%)	7 (39%)	24 (49%)	25 (51%)	_	
FOULS	11 (2	22%)	20 (4	41%)	18 (37%)	4	9	0	0
DEFENSIVE	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	7 (44%)	9 (56%)	10 (63%)	6 (38%)	22 (52%)	20 (48%)	0	0
DEFENSIVE	10 (2	24%)	16 (38%)	16 (38%)	4	2		U
OFFENSIVE	0	1 (100%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (29%)	5 (71%)	0	0
OFFENSIVE	1 (14%)		4 (5	7%)	2 (2	9%)		7		•
DOUBLE FOUL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOODLETOOL	(1	0	1	0	()		· ·
UNSPORTSMANLIKE	0	1 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0
ONO OTTOWANTERE	1 (10	10%)	1	0	l	0	'	1	•	•
TECHNICAL	1 (100%)	0	0	2 (100%)	0	0	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	0	0
TEOTINICAE	1 (3			7%)		0	;	3		•
DISQUALIFYING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DIOGOALII TIIVO)		0		0)	•	•
00B	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	3 (38%)	5 (63%)	9 (50%)	9 (50%)	0	0
	5 (2			8%)		4%)		8	•	•
STEP ON SIDE LINE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTEL ON OIDE LINE	(0		0)		•
OTHER	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	3 (38%)	5 (63%)	9 (50%)	9 (50%)	0	0
OTHER	5 (2			8%)		4%)		8		
VIOLATIONS	0	0	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0	0	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0	0
VIOLITICATO	(•	00%)		0		4		
TRAVELING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(0		0)		
OTHER	0	0	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0	0	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	0	0
	(•	00%)		0		4		
Fake	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	(<u> </u>		0		0)		
DOG	0 1 (100%)		0 0		0	0	0	1 (100%)	0	0
	1 (100%)			0		0	. (====()	4 (3004)		
IRS	0	1 (100%)	0	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	0
	1 (5		0		1 (50%)		2			
HCC	0 0				1 (100%) 0		1 (100%) 0		0	0
	0		0		1 (10	00%)		1		














Calls vs Team

Dofo	Teams			NZL	- 100			MEX · 108						
Hers	Assessment	CCM	ICCM	INCO	L2M C	L2M I	L2M?	CCM	ICCM	INCO	L2M C	L2M I	L2M?	
CC	KATO, Takaki (JPN)	8	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	9	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	
U1	GARCIA NIEVES, Daniel Alberto (VEN)	13	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	16	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	
U2	PRAKSCH, Péter (HUN)	14	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	
	TOTAL	35 (48,6%)								37 (5	1,4%)			
	ССМ			35 (4	8,6%)			37 (51,4%)						
	ICCM			N	/A			N/A						
	INCO			N	/A					N	/A			
	L2M C			3 (4	,2%)					4 (5	,6%)			
	L2M I	N/A							N/A					
	L2M ?	N/A							N/A					

Ref	0		TOTALS																		
S	Assessment	CCM	ICCM	INCO	L2M C	L2M I	L2M ?	CCM	ICCM	INCO	L2M C	L2M I	L2M ?	CCM	ICCM	INCO	L2M C	L2M I	L2M?		
CC	KATO, Takaki (JPN)	8	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	9	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	17	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	CHAMP.	FIBA
U1	GARCIA NIEVES, Daniel Alberto (VEN)	13	8 N/A N/A 1 N/A N/A 16 N/A N/A 2 N/A N/A 29 N/A N/A 3 N/A N/A											AVG	AVG						
U2	PRAKSCH, Péter (HUN)	14	4 N/A N/A 2 N/A N/A 12 N/A N/A 1 N/A N/A 26 N/A N/A 3 N/A N/A																		
	TOTAL									72 (1	00%)										
	ССМ									72 (1	00%)										
	ICCM									N	Ά										
	INCO									N	Ά										
	L2M C		7 (9,7%)																		
	L2M I		N/A																		
	L2M ?		N/A																		











Calls vs Referee

Quarters		Quai	ter 1			Quar	ter 2			Quai	ter 3				Quai	ter 4			TO	·O1
3 Referees	į	j"	1	ים		5'	1	D'	į	5"	1	0'	į	5"	1	0'	Las	t 2'	2	HL.
KATO, Takaki	1 50%	1 50%	0	1 100%	0	1 100%	2 100%	0	1 33%	2 67%	2 100%	0	0	3 100%	2 67%	1 33%	0	1 100%	8 47%	9 53%
(JPN)	12	2 !%	6	I %	6	1 %		2 !%	1 3	3 8%		2 2%	1	3 8%		3 8%	6	1 %	1 24	7 !%
GARCIA NIEVES,	2 67%	1 33%	1 33%	2 67%	0	1 100%	4 80%	1 20%	2 50%	2 50%	0	4 100%	3 60%	2 40%	1 25%	3 75%	1 33%	2 67%	13 45%	16 55%
Daniel Alberto (VEN)	•	3 1%		3 1%	3	1	1 '	5 '%	14	4 %	14	4 1%		5 '%		4 %		3	2 40	9 %
PRAKSCH, Péter	1 50%	1 50%	1 100%	0	0	0	2 40%	3 60%	1 50%	1 50%	1 25%	3 75%	3 75%	1 25%	5 63%	3 38%	2 67%	1 33%	14 54%	12 46%
(HUN)	8	_	4	I %		0	! 19	5 1%	8	2 %	15	4 5%	15	4 i%		B ∣%		3 !%	2 36	6 %
TOTOL	4 57%	3 43%	2 40%	3 60%	0	2 100%	8 67%	4 33%	4 44%	5 56%	3 30%	7 70%	6 50%	6 50%	8 53%	7 47%	3 43%	4 57%	35 49%	37 51%
TOTAL	10	7		5 %		2	_	2		9		0 !%	_	2		5 %	10	7)%	7	2







Play Situations Break-down

		Play Situa	tions Table					
Concepts	KATO, Tal	kaki (JPN)		EVES, Daniel to (VEN)	PRAKSCH, I	Péter (HUN)	Tol	tals
	NZL	MEX	NZL	MEX	NZL	MEX	NZL	MEX
Continuous Movement/Drive to basket	0	1	0	1	3	2	3	4
Continuous Movement/Moving Shot	0	1	0	2	2	1	2	4
Shot	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturing	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Dunk, Tap or Alley oop	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Landing	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Penetration	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
Perimeter play	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	2
Fast break	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Transition	3	1	0	0	1	0	4	1
Rebound	1	1	3	1	2	0	6	2
Post Play	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	3
Key area action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Screen Action	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
Double Team	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Help Defense	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2
Stopping the Clock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dead Ball	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	2
Free Throws	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Throw-in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Toss	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals	5	6	8	12	11	7	24	25





Call Average vs Game



Calls vs Zone and Position

Pos/Zones	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4	Zone 5	Zone 6	Zone 7	Zone 8	Zone 9	Zone 10	Zone 11	Zone 12	TOTAL	CHAMP.	FIBA
C1	5 (45%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (45%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11	0.0	0.0
C3	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	2 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3	0.0	0.0
m	5 (63%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	1 (13%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8	0.0	0.0
Т3	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6	0.0	0.0
L4	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10	0.0	0.0
L5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
L6	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	16 (55%)	11 (38%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	29	0.0	0.0
Ct	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	3	0.0	0.0
Τt	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2	0.0	0.0
Lt.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	10	3	3	3	33	12	2	2	0	3	1	0	72	0.0	0.0
CHAMP.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
FIBA	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		







IRS vs Game

IRS SITUATIONS TOPICS		(F	is .	INI	rial .	FOOTAGE			DURATION	PROTOCOL	
SITUATIONS	TUPIGS	REF	HCC	CCM	ICCM	INCO	CCM	ICCM	AVG	CCM	ICCM
	IRS vs COMPETITION										
	8" Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
F00	Basket or not	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
EOQ (5)	Foul or Not	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
(0)	00B Shooter	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	Shot Clock Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	Goaltending / Basket	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
L2M	00B	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
(4)	Shot Clock Violation & Basket	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	Foul away from the shooter	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	2/3 Points Basket	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	Act of Violence / Fight	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	Free throw shooter	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	Game Clock Adjust	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
A NIV TIME	Shot Clock Adjust	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
ANY TIME (11)	PF to UF	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
,,	UF to PF	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	PF to DQF	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	UF to DQF	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	DQF to UF	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	DQF to PF	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
	IRS vs GAME										



Regular Call vs L2M & OT Accuracy

