

European Athletics MEETINGS



Technical Delegate's Report Form for European Athletics MEETINGS (Indoor/Race Walk/Cross Country)

(Please fill in so far applicable)

Name of Meeting: Reykjavik International Games

Venue: Laugardshöll, Reykjavik, Iceland

Date: 23 January 2016

Name of Technical Delegate: Mats Svensson

European Athletics relies very much on its Delegates at all European Athletics Meetings for comprehensive, objective reports, because the feedback from the Technical Delegate is most important for evaluating thoroughly and critically the organisation and carrying out of the Meeting.

The Report Form must be completed by the Technical Delegate, and returned (by mail or e-mail) within 10 days after the Meeting to:

EUROPEAN ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
Avenue Louis Ruchonnet 18
1003 Lausanne, Switzerland
Tel: +41 21 313 43 50
Fax: +41 21 313 43 51
E-Mail: competition@european-athletics.org

The report form shall be accompanied by:

- Athletes declaration form
- Notification Forms
- Doping Control Forms
- Any additional Information (e.g. pictures)
- (Program, 2xZero-test, Results, and 5 pictures)

Please note that the meeting specific items to be reported are summarised in Appendix 1 of this document!

Please check with the organiser that the full results (approved by the TD) are sent **immediately** after the competition to European Athletics Competition Department (competition@european-athletics.org), European Athletics Communication Manager (media@european-athletics.org) and European Athletics Statistician (mirko@tilastopaja.fi) in either of the following file formats (ascii, txt, Word, Excel, html) for publication on the European Athletics Website.

1. General Items

1.1 Please give the approximate number of spectators attending the Meeting.

	Capacity	Spectators
Seated	220	220
Standing	100	100
Total	320	320

Please enclose pictures taken of the stands to support your estimation!

1.2 Weather Conditions (not applicable for Indoor Permits)

Please give a brief description of the weather during the Meeting, and state whether the conditions affected the performance of the athletes:

1.3 Accommodation

The accommodation (hotel) for the athletes and officials was:

poor acceptable good very good excellent Hotel category stars

The meals for the athletes and officials were:

poor acceptable good very good excellent

Please describe any additional hospitality offered to the athletes, officials, VIP's and sponsors:

The VIPs were offered coffee, and a small buffet of cheese and soft drinks.

1.4 Transportation

The transportation for the athletes and officials was:

poor acceptable good very good excellent

1.5 Event Presentation (e.g. music, athletes presentation, announcers, etc.)

Was there an event presentation system in place?

Yes No

If yes, please give details:

Short presentation of each event was done, and the first place was honoured on the podium directly after each event. A very nice Video screen showed the competition and results.

2. Competition Information

Please comment on the general organisation and technical conduct of the meeting:

It was a nice and wellorganised event with spectators that liked the competition!

2.1 Please indicate the duration of the Meeting

	Full programme (all events)	Main programme (international events)
Start	13:15	13:15
End	15:00	15:00
Total duration	1 hrs 45 min	1 hrs 45 min

2.2 Timetable

Was there any timetable delay?

Yes No

If yes, mention and detail what were the reasons?

LJ Men 13:20 and LJ Women 14:10 in the timetable was too tight and was discussed before the games. The officials worked efficiently. Men stopped 14:10, women started 14:30 and stopped just before 15:00, so they managed be inside the total time frame.

Please give any suggestions which could be used to improve the timetable and the carrying out of the competitions

The LJ Men could have started as the very first event, 13:15, and if the games grow just a little bit, to two hours, there wouldn't be any problem.

2.3 Timing

Which timing company and system was used? Finish Lynx

How would you evaluate the ability and services of the timing company:

poor acceptable good very good excellent

2.4 Facilities at the Stadium/Venue

The athletes' changing rooms were:

poor acceptable good very good Excellent

Which warm-up facilities were available to the athletes, and were these facilities adequate?

An adequate area 40m x 4m was used, just outside the oval track in the first bend.

2.5 Training

Which training facilities were available to the athletes, and when were the athletes allowed to use these facilities?

Friday 08:00 – 20:00 in the arena where the competition will be held.

2.6 Medical

Please confirm the availability of the following medical services:

On-site emergency aid

Yes No

Emergency ambulance service to provide full hospitalisation

Yes No

On-site physiotherapy

Yes No

What additional medical facilities/services were available to the athletes?

The medical doctor were on site, but with ice possible to use in a near room.

3. Doping Control

3.1 Doping Control Area

Were there adequate - facilities Yes No
- personnel Yes No

Please give a brief description of the facilities used, and the general security at the control station:

One way in/out of the area. One toilette was used, with a possibility to use two.

Were all personnel in the control station authorised? Yes No

3.2 How many doping tests were conducted at the Meeting? 6

3.3 Please indicate your choice of events and placings selected for doping control

Event	Placing	Event	Placing
M 60m	1	W 400m	2
M 800m	2	W Pole vault	2
M Shot put	1		

Was doping control carried out on athletes who achieved a World or Area Record during the Meeting? Yes No

3.4 Please indicate the information stated below, concerning athletes undergoing doping control, after having achieved record performances.

Name	Nation	Record (World,Area,National)	Performance
Hafþís Sigurðardóttir	ISL	National	6,54m in W Long jump

3.5 Name and position of the LOC nominated person, responsible for the doping control:

Birgir Sverrisson, Project Manager at the Iceland Anti Doping.

3.6 To which laboratory were the samples sent? Norwegian Doping Control Laboratory, Oslo, Norway

3.7 Which type of sampling material was used?

BEREG-KIT-94 VERSAPAK other

3.8 By whom, and how, was the transportation of the samples to the testing laboratory supervised? UPS

3.9 Were the „IAAF Anti-Doping Regulations and Guidelines“ adhered to?

Yes No

3.10 Were the athletes co-operative?

Yes No

3.11 Do you have any suggestions which might improve the control procedure?

No, all worked well.

4. Athletes

Had the organiser experienced any difficulties concerning invitation of athletes and confirmation of entries?

Yes No

If YES, please give details: Athletes contacted the organisers themselves, and was very well invited.

5. European Athletics Logo & Advertising

Was the European Athletics Permit logo on all printed/promotional materials (programme, results, flyers, website, etc.)

Yes No

6. Advertising

6.1 Was there any advertising of tobacco or alcohol (more than 20% alcohol) products at the venue?

Yes No

6.2 Was there any advertising of a political nature?

Yes No

If your answer is YES to either of the above questions please give details below:

Please report and **only** give details of any **non-compliance** to the relevant IAAF Regulations (stadium or non stadium events) concerning advertising and displays. For further details we refer to point 7 of the guidelines for technical delegates.

Please enclose pictures about the above mentioned non-compliances!

7. Athletes Clothing

7.1 Did all clothing worn by athletes in the competition area conform with the IAAF Regulations?

Yes No

If NO, please give details _____

7.2 Did you notice any new form of advertising (tattoos, hair cuts)? Yes No

If YES, please give details: _____

8. Bibs

8.1 Did the Competition Bibs conform with the IAAF Regulations? Yes No

If NO, please give details

8.2 Where there any cases of Bibs having been cut, folded or removed, and which action was taken?

No.

8.3 Which sponsor's name(s) appeared on the Bibs?

Men	Valitor
Women	Valitor

9. Television

9.1 Which Network was the host broadcaster? _____ RUV _____

9.2 Duration of live coverage min

Transmission(s) after the competition (e.g. highlights, news) min

At the 19:30 sports of today.

9.3 Please give details of all television coverage of the Meeting, by the Host Broadcaster, and, if known, networks outside the country.

Not known.

10. General Comments

Please evaluate the overall cooperation and communiacion of the meeting organiser

Before the meeting

Good Sufficient Poor

On site

Good Sufficient Poor

Indoor Meetings

Please give details and participation statistics about the events held during the Meeting

	Track events	Field events	Total number of events	Number of	
				countries (Total / EUR)	athletes (Total / EUR)
Men	4	2	6	3/2	49/47
Women	4	4	8	3/3	52/52
Total	8	6	14	5/4	101/99

Please describe the technical facilities and services

Full Electronic timing (mandatory) Yes No

Manufacturer (brand) and age of track Mondo 2005, soon time for a new surface.

Number of lanes straight oval

Did all equipment / implements comply with the IAAF specifications, in force at the time of the Meeting? Yes No

If NO, please give details: The plasticene indicators boards were not with the, on top, erased wooden area 10 mm into the board, but were changed to be.

Please give details of records broken during the Meeting

	Name	Nation	Event	Performance
World				
Area				
National	Hafþís Sigurðardóttir	Iceland	W Long jump	6,54m

Please give your overall impression of the organisation and technical conduct of the Meeting. Mention any individuals from the organising committee who played a prominent role. Please make any suggestions, which you feel would improve the standard of the Meeting. Please also note that all non-compliances shall be supported with photos (as relevant).

It was a nice and well organised event with spectators that liked the competition!

The organisers took good care of the invited athletes, and a warm hospitality was given to me. Around the competition itself, Einar Vilhjálmsson and Árni Þorsteinsson worked hard with a most positive attitude, and in the competition Guðlaug Baldvinsdóttir, Meeting director, and Þorsteinn Þorsteinsson did a good job.

The technical part could be upgraded in two ways:

1) The responsibility, to check that things are done and items are delivered.

It seemed that persons trusted a little bit too much in each other in different parts of the organisation, the athletic part and the management managing the hall. Cones to be placed on white line at the oval track were not there, only too small ones, and there was not enough of them (see pic).

2) The equipment in the hall, the landing area in Shot put was not good (see pic), the automatic Mondo uprights didn't work, had only worked 2-3 times in the beginning when they were delivered and the surface in some parts could be looked on. But as we all know, it all comes down to money and especially the landing area in Shot put is very expensive.

Use additional sheets if necessary.

Signature of the Technical Delegate Mats Svensson

Date and place 25 January 2016, Mölndal, Sweden

