

FIBA POST GAME REPORT

CHN vs SSD GP425 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	7
Calls vs Referee	
Play Situations Break-down	9
Call Average vs Game	10
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

		2023	B FIBA WC PHI-JPN	I-INA		
÷.			GP · GP425			
10 H	16.00 28/08/20	023			ARANETA	
	%	Total	Calls	Total	%	
China	N/A	23	Fouls	20	N/A	South Sudan
	N/A	2	Violations	0	N/A	
CHN	N/A	9	00B	7	N/A	SSD
69	N/A	0	Fake	0	N/A	89
	N/A	0	DOG	0	N/A	
	N/A	34	Total	27	N/A	


Quarters	Quarter 1		Quar	ter 2	Quar	ter 3	Quar	ter 4	TOTAL		
Score	14	22	26	22	13	19	16	26	69	89	
Duration	00:17:29		00:2	3:39	00:2	3:55	00:2	7:15	01:32:18		
Fouls	3	5	6	3	9	4	5	8	23	20	
Violations	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	
00B	2	1	0	3	2	1	5	2	9	7	
Fake	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DOG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

	REFEREEING STAFF	
LOCATELLI, Guilherme (BRA)	BAKI, Kerem (TUR)	VULIC, Martin (CRO)
Referee Instructor	Stand-by Referee Instructor	Video Operator
JOSEPH, Albert John (AUS)	N/A	ARTES, Didac (ESP)





Calls Summary vs Referee

CALLS 12 (60%) 8 (40%) 12 (63%) 7 (37%) 10 (45%) 12 (55%) 34 (56%) 27 (44%) 0 COULS 20 (33%) 19 (31%) 22 (36%) 61 0	0 0 0 0 0
EOULS 20 (33%) 19 (31%) 22 (38%) 61 61 FOULS 7 (58%) 5 (42%) 8 (57%) 6 (43%) 8 (47%) 9 (53%) 23 (53%) 20 (47%) DEFENSIVE 6 (60%) 4 (40%) 7 (54%) 6 (43%) 8 (47%) 9 (53%) 23 (53%) 20 (47%) 0 DEFENSIVE 6 (60%) 4 (40%) 7 (54%) 6 (46%) 7 (44%) 9 (56%) 20 (51%) 19 (49%) 0 OFFENSIVE 10 (26%) 13 (33%) 16 (41%) 39 0 0 OFFENSIVE 1 (50%) 1 (100%) 0 1 (25%) 4 0 DOUBLE FOUL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 UNSPORTSMANULKE 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0
FOULS 12 (28%) 14 (33%) 17 (40%) 43 0 DEFENSIVE 6 (60%) 4 (40%) 7 (54%) 6 (46%) 7 (44%) 9 (56%) 20 (51%) 19 (49%) 0 0 10 (26%) 13 (33%) 16 (41%) 39 0 <t< td=""><td>0</td></t<>	0
12 (28%) 14 (33%) 17 (40%) 43 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 17 (40%) 43 6 6 6 6 7 17 (40%) 43 6 6 6 6 6 7 17 (40%) 9 9 0 1<	0
DEFENSIVE 10 (26%) 13 (33%) 16 (41%) 39 0 OFFENSIVE 1 (50%) 1 (50%) 1 (100%) 0 1 (100%) 0 3 (75%) 1 (25%) DOUBLE FOUL 0 <td< td=""><td>0</td></td<>	0
OFFENSIVE 11 (50%) 1 (100%) 0 1 (100%) 0 39 OFFENSIVE 1 (50%) 1 (100%) 0 1 (100%) 0 3 (75%) 1 (25%) DOUBLE FOUL 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 UNSPORTSMANULKE 0	0
OFFENSIVE 2 (50%) 1 (25%) 1 (25%) 4 DOUBLE FOUL 0	0
DOUBLE FOUL 0 <th< td=""><td></td></th<>	
DOUBLE FOUL 0 <th< td=""><td></td></th<>	
	0
	0
TECHNICAL 0 0 1 (50%) 1 (50%) 0 0 1 (50%) 0 0	0
	0
5 (63%) 3 (38%) 2 (67%) 1 (33%) 2 (40%) 3 (60%) 9 (56%) 7 (44%)	
OOB 5 (53%) 3 (38%) 2 (67%) 1 (33%) 2 (40%) 3 (50%) 7 (44%) 8 (50%) 3 (19%) 5 (31%) 16 0	0
STEP ON SIDE LINE	0
E (6294) 2 (2994) 2 (6794) 1 (2294) 2 (4094) 2 (6094) 0 (6694) 7 (4494)	
OTHER 8 (50%) 3 (19%) 5 (31%) 16	0
	0
TRAVELING 0 1 (100%) 0 1	0
OTHER 0 1 (100%) 0 1	0
	0
	0
	0
	0




Total Violations vs Ref





Total IRS vs Ref






Calls vs Team

Defe	Teams			CHN	- 69			SSD · 89							
Kers	Assessment	CCM	ICCM	INCO	L2M C	L2M I	L2M ?	CCM	ICCM	INCO	L2M C	L2M I	L2M ?		
CC	LOCATELLI, Guilherme (BRA)	12	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	8	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A		
U1	BAKI, Kerem (TUR)	12	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	7	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A		
U2	VULIC, Martin (CRO)	10	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A		
	TOTAL			34 (5	5,7%)		27 (44,3%)								
	ССМ			34 (5	5,7%)			27 (44,3%)							
	ICCM			N	/A			N/A							
	INCO			N	/A					N	/A				
	L2M C			4 (6	,6%)						D				
	L2M I	N/A							N/A						
	L2M ?	N/A							N/A						


Ref	Receptor									TOT	als										
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	LOCATELLI, Guilherme (BRA)	12	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	8	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	20	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	CHAMP.	FIBA
U1	BAKI, Kerem (TUR)	12	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	7	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	19	N/A	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	AVG	AVG
U2	VULIC, Martin (CRO)	10	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	12	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	22	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A		
	TOTAL									61 (1	00%)										
	CCM	61 (100%)																			
	ICCM									N,	/A										
	INCO									N,	/A										
	L2M C									4 (6,	,6%)										
	L2M I									N,	/A										
	L2M ?									N,	/A										






Calls vs Referee

Quarters		Qua	ter 1			Quar	ter 2			Quar	ter 3				Qua	rtør 4				701
3 Referees		5'	1	0"		5"	1	D"		5"	1)'	Ę	9	1	0"	Las	t 2'	TO	
LOCATELLI, Gullherme	1 50%	1 50%	0	2 100%	0	1 100%	2 67%	1 33%	4 100%	0	1 100%	0	2 50%	2 50%	2 67%	1 33%	1 100%	0	12 60%	8 40%
Gullherme (BRA)		2)%		2)%	5	1 %		3 i%		4 1%	5	 %		1 1%		3 5%	5' 5'	I %		0 8%
BAKI, Kerem (TVR)	0	1 100%	1 50%	1 50%	1 100%	0	1 100%	0	2 67%	1 33%	2 100%	0	3 50%	3 50%	2 67%	1 33%	2 100%	0	12 63%	7 37%
(TVR)	1 5%			2 1 11% 5%		1 %	1 5%		3 16%		2 11%		32			3 6%	11	2 %	-	9 %
VULIC, Martin (CRO)	2 100%	0	1 50%	1 50%	0	2 100%	2 50%	2 50%	1 25%	3 75%	2 67%	1 33%	1 33%	2 67%	1 50%	1 50%	1 100%	0	10 45%	12 55%
(CRO)		2 %		2 %	9	2 %	-	1 %		4 8%	: 14	-	; 14	3 !%		2 %	5	I %		2 i%
TOTOL	3 60%	2 40%	2 33%	4 67%	1 25%	3 75%	5 63%	3 38%	7 64%	4 36%	5 83%	1 17%	6 46%	7 54%	5 63%	3 38%	4 100%	0	34 56%	27 44%
TOTAL		5 %		6)%	7	4 %		3 %	1 18	1 8%	6 10		1 21	3 %		8 3%	2 7'		6	1







Play Situations Break-down

		Play Situations Table									
Concepts		, Gullherme RA)	BAKI, Kei	rem (TUR)	VULIC, Ma	artin (CRO)	Tol	tals			
	CHN	SSD	CHN	SSD	CHN	SSD	CHN	SSD			
Continuous Movement/Drive to basket	2	0	2	1	1	0	5	1			
Continuous Movement/Moving Shot	0	1	2	1	1	3	3	5			
Shot	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1			
Manufacturing	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3			
Dunk, Tap or Alley oop	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0			
Landing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Penetration	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1			
Perimeter play	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1			
Fast break	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Transition	1	0	2	0	0	1	3	1			
Rebound	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	2			
Post Play	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	1			
Key area action	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1			
Screen Action	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	1			
Double Team	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Help Defense	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Stopping the Clock	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Dead Ball	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1			
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	7	5	8	6	7	8	22	19			




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	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4	0.0	0.0
63	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	8 (73%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11	0.0	0.0
Π	4 (57%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	7	0.0	0.0
T3	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3	0.0	0.0
L4	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	4 (33%)	6 (50%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	12	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 (6%)	9 (53%)	7 (41%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	17	0.0	0.0
Ct	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	1 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5	0.0	0.0
R	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
u	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	2	0.0	0.0
TOTAL	5	2	1	8	27	11	0	1	1	2	3	0	61	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	TOPICS	ii ii	S	INIT	TIAL	FOOTAGE	FIN	ial	DURATION PROTO		'OCOL
SITUATIONS	IUPIGS	REF	HCC	GCM	ICCM	INCO	CCM	ICCM	AVG	CCM	ICCM
	IRS vs COMPETITION										
	8" Violation	0	0	0	0	0	0"	0	0	0	0
500	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
	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

