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## Introduction

The event took place in Serbia from $15^{\text {th }}-29^{\text {th }}$ January 2012.
The preliminaries were played in the cities of Belgrade (A), Nis (B), Novi Sad (C) and Vrsac (D). The main round was played in Belgrade (1) and Novi Sad (2), the finals took place in Belgrade.

The organisation by the LOCs and the attendance of the audience was excellent.
There had been test tournaments in all the venues for the training of the logistics during the last year before the Championship. Additionally direct test matches were scheduled in all the venues shortly before the event to test the final set-up of the equipment, electronic gear, etc.
Regional setting of the host team (as usual) and of three more qualified teams (that had worked well at the Euro 2010) was done putting a crowd catcher to every location according to the regional position of the preliminary venues. Therefore the supporters of MKD, CRO and HUN made it almost a tournament on home soil for their teams as it was for SRB.

Of course there were some small deficiencies but most of them were covered by the LOCs and their volunteers pretty fast.
In terms of security tremendous effort was done by the organizers to avoid troubles and that worked very well in all the direct sport venues. Unfortunately some incidents still happened but there was no chance for the organizing bodies to prevent these kinds of stupid actions.

Some deficiencies are just inevitable due to the construction of the event as a whole. To give an example it is very difficult to achieve an absolute common line of the refereeing when you have four venues to cover and the accommodation of the officials is spread all over these venues and therefore you cannot have one common meeting for refs and officials altogether.

At the end of the day we can state that this event marked a cornerstone in terms of organisation and the echo by the media as well as the spectators was massive. Especially the matches in the Beogradska Arena were something to remember. For sure another step forward was done to maintain the good position of handball in the indoor sports programme.

In this spot let me add that the first ever Licensing Course of the EHF took place in the first week of the Championship. For the weekend it was joint with the regular Top Coaches seminar. Due to the outstanding efforts of the team of the local organization the branding and the presentation of these seminars was the best so far.

It was my pleasure to be part of such a successful event and I want to express my gratitude and congratulations to all the people who have been involved.

## Picked statistical data of interest

Table 1
Table of results of the European Championships with 16 teams in the final round

| Rank. | SWEDEN | SLOVENIA | Switzerland | NORWAY | AUSTRIA | SERBIA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2002 | 2004 | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 |  |
| 1 | SWE | GER | FRA | DEN | FRA | DEN |
| 2 | GER | SLO | ESP | CRO | CRO | SRB |
| 3 | DEN | DEN | DEN | FRA | ISL | CRO |
| 4 | ISL | CRO | CRO | GER | POL | ESP |
| 5 | RUS | RUS | GER | SWE | DEN | MKD |
| 6 | FRA | FRA | RUS | NOR | ESP | SLO |
| 7 | ESP | SWE | ISL | POL | NOR | GER |
| 8 | CZE | SCG | SLO | HUN | CZE | HUN |
| 9 | POR | HUN | SCG | ESP | AUT | POL |
| 10 | YUG | ESP | POL | SLO | GER | ISL |
| 11 | UKR | CZE | NOR | ISL | SLO | FRA |
| 12 | SLO | SUI | UKR | MNE | RUS | SWE |
| 13 | SUI | ISL | HUN | RUS | SRB | NOR |
| 14 | ISR | POR | SUI | CZE | HUN | CZE |
| 15 | POL | UKR | POR | BLR | SWE | RUS |
| 16 | CRO | POL | SVK | SVK | UKR | SVK |

Two teams are still very stable on top - DEN and CRO.
Behind the first two is a lot of movement as ESP continues to rise and SLO seems to have managed their turnaround.
POL and NOR on the other hand seem to be in a downswing.
ISL continues oscillating as HUN and CZE zigzag in the lower half of the table where RUS (another big disappointment) and SVK seem to have their position stabilized.

GER and SWE are still struggling in disputable performance and positions as newcomer MKD and even more host SRB took full advantage of the competition on home soil. Both of them will have to prove their ranking in upcoming events.

FRA is a very special case in this ECh because according to their play they obviously did not look for the final result their appearance had the character of a trainings camp.

Table 2 (Teams 1-12 only)
Game dynamics of the teams by scores ( 6 matches)

|  | Preliminaries | Main Round | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEN | $26-25(14-11)$ | $31-27(17-15)$ | $28-26(15-13)$ |
| SRB | $22-20(11-9)$ | $21-21(12-10)$ | $22-21(12-9)$ |
| CRO | $29-26(14-12)$ | $25-23(12-12)$ | $27-25(13-12)$ |
| ESP | $28-26(14-12)$ | $30-27(14-14)$ | $29-26(14-13)$ |
| MKD | $25-24(12-12.5)$ | $27-26(16-13)$ | $26-25(14-13)$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| SLO | $30-30(14-14)$ | $30-31(15-14)$ | $30-31(14.5-14)$ |
| GER | $26-25(14-14)$ | $26-27(13-16)$ | $26-26(13-15)$ |
| HUN | $27-26(14-15)$ | $25-28(12-13)$ | $26-27(13-14)$ |
| POL | $29-23(11-13)$ | $29-29(13-18)$ | $29-27(12-15.5)$ |
| ISL | $32-32(15-17)$ | $27-27(14-13)$ | $29.5-29.5(15-15)$ |
| FRA | $26-26(14-13)$ | $26-28(13-14)$ | $26-27(13.5-13)$ |
| SWE | $28-28(16-17)$ | $25-28(14-14)$ | $26-28(15-15)$ |

In this tournament most of the teams were capable of constant play all over the 60 minutes. This shows the positive effect of the new format including additional rest days compared with the EURO 2006 in SUI.
GER had a better second than first whereas SLO, FRA and SWE fell behind in the second half time of the matches.
The average score of all matches together came to a 27.5 - 25.5 (14-13) which shows two main facts: First of all the score is getting lower and lower since the Euro06 in SUI and second the decision is a result of a match-long domination in general.
The exception was the team POL who could equalize a lousy first half by excellent play in the second in several matches.

Compared with 2010 DEN, CRO and ESP had identical figures, meaning that these teams kept their level without change.
SLO improved clearly in terms of makes giving them a far better result in total as GER had the same problem like two years ago - good performance in defence could not give a top result because of ongoing weakness in the offense play.
The low ranking of POL came from too many makes compared with the other teams in the main round, that one of ISL of a setback in their offence play in the main round as well.
FRA was a very special case in this Euro 2012; they seemed to take the whole event not too serious so they fell back in their scores but even more in their defence play resulting in a clear increase in the makes.

All in all the figures became more close than before showing that the level of the teams has become more equal and although DEN, CRO and ESP were on top again all the competition has become more close than ever. Only 5 teams managed to have a positive goal balance when two years ago some 7 teams had achieved that.

Two more facts to underline this statement: DEN became the very first champion in history to start the main round with 0 points. And GER was very close to be eliminated in the preliminaries, came up with 4 points and were very close to the semi until the dying seconds of their last match.
Table 3
Team figures in goals, shots, makes, shots on target allowed, saves, suspensions

| Offence |  |  |  | Defence |  |  |  |  |  |  | Goalkeeper |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | shots | goals | $\%$ | shots allowed <br> on target | makes | saves | $\%$ | 2 min. <br> suspensions |  |  |  |
| DEN | 50 | 28 | 55 | 39 | 25 | 14 | 35 | 3 |  |  |  |
| SRB | 44 | 22 | 50 | 34 | 21 | 13 | 39 | 3 |  |  |  |
| CRO | 45 | 27 | 60 | 37 | 25 | 11.5 | 31 | 3 |  |  |  |
| ESP | 64 | 29 | 62 | 38 | 27 | 11 | 29 | 2 |  |  |  |
| MKD | 44 | 26 | 59 | 38 | 25 | 13 | 35 | 4 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SLO | 45 | 30 | 66 | 45 | 31 | 14 | 32 | 6 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GER | 49 | 26 | 53 | 38 | 26 | 12 | 32 | 5 |  |  |  |
| HUN | 47 | 26 | 55 | 39 | 27 | 12 | 31 | 4 |  |  |  |
| POL | 49 | 29 | 59 | 38 | 27 | 11 | 30 | 4 |  |  |  |
| ISL | 49 | 29.5 | 61 | 40 | 29.5 | 11 | 27 | 3 |  |  |  |
| FRA | 49 | 26 | 53 | 39 | 27 | 12 | 31 | 2 |  |  |  |
| SWE | 46 | 26 | 56 | 42 | 28 | 14 | 33 | 4 |  |  |  |

This table shows some changes if compared with that one of the Euro 2010.
First of all defense work has improved - the number of shots in total has decreased as has the number of the shots on target allowed by the defense.
And so has the score - SLO were the only team to shoot an average of 30 goals per match. And the margin of the figures has become closer.
The range of shots was from 44 to 50 only, shots allowed on target from 34 to 45 .
The range of the saves was from 11 to 14 only (2010: $10-16$ ) which is a signal for more discipline and determination in terms of shooting.

To underline this here is a direct match of some figures in 2010 and 2012:

|  | 2012 <br> min. - max. | 2010 <br> min. - max. | 2012 <br> range | 2010 <br> range |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Goals | $131-180$ | $157-192$ | $22-30$ | $26-32$ |  |
| Makes | $125-184$ | $147-203$ | $21-31$ | $24.5-34$ |  |
| Saves | $11-14$ | $10-16$ |  |  |  |

And again the word stands that defence wins championships:

- DEN won the title with good defence and outstanding performance of their GK
- SRB won silver in spite of the weakest performance in offence play due to their defence work and GK play giving them the lowest figure in makes by far
- CRO won their next medal with the second best defence and a strong offence that equalized the surprisingly low performance of their GK
- ESP was denied the medal because of the inconstant play of their GK just like two years ago in spite of second best offence and good defence.

On the other hand it is still true that bad defense play will kill you:

- SLO had the most goals shot and a top saving of the GK - but most shots allowed and most suspensions called on them kept them from an even better final ranking
- ISL had a strong offence as usual but the defence below average and the weakest performance of all GK gave them a severe set-back compared to 2010
- FRA was a special case as already mentioned. Trials and experiments made them weak in all parameters due to a lot of ups and even more downs in their play.

An exception to all that was the team GER:
Like two years ago they had a good performance of the GK and an average defences play (although they suffered from the second most suspensions) but their weak offence play left them failing their target.

Compared with the Euro 2010 CRO, ESP and GER showed more or less an identical shape, SRB and SLO clearly improved as POL, ISL and FRA fell behind due to different reasons that will be discussed in the TEAM analysis chapter.

Table 4
1-1 situations with the goalkeeper (GK 1-1)

|  | shots total | shots 1-1 | $\%$ | L $>$ W | imbalanced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Preliminaries | 1831 | 1182 | 64.55 | $5(24)$ | $8(24)$ |
| Main Round | 1411 | 960 | 68.04 | $3(18)$ | $2(18)$ |
|  | 3242 | 2142 | 66 | $8(42)$ | $10(42)$ |

Following some discussions with expert friends and top coaches the 1-1 situations between GK and shooter are subject to closer monitoring in this paper.
The reason is that the question was raised about the percentage of 1-1 confrontations in the matches and the influence of these on the result of the game.
The figures show that the 1-1 situation occurs twice as often as the shot situation with a block or screen by the defense. This means that we have to think again about the content and the balance of the focal drills in the training of the GK.

Blocking does not seem of high importance in this tournament.
All the teams do have an average of 3 blocks per match. For me this is an indicator of very high shooting discipline of all the strikers. It seems that most of the blocks will occur if one team is forced to shoot due to the passive play warning given by the referees.

Two more facts are represented in this table:
First only in $20 \%$ of the games the losing team scored more goals from 1-1 situations than the winners.

Second in $25 \%$ of the games only an imbalanced performance of the GK occurred. The criteria for "imbalance" is a margin of 3 or more (e.g. GK winners 8 saves, GK losers 4 only).
Both these figures do drop sharply from the prelims to the main round as you can see.
The conclusion is that a key issue for a good defence performance is to deny 1-1 situations against your own GK as much as possible.
On the other hand it seems that creating 1-1 situations is a characteristic for a good offence performance.

Table 5
Balance of the matches (42 matches)

| AUT 2010 | Draw | $1-2$ | $3-5$ | $6-9$ | $>10$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PR | $6(2)$ | $7(8)$ | $7(9)$ | $3(5)$ | 1 |
| MR | $2(-)$ | $6(7)$ | $5(9)$ | $5(2)$ |  |
| Total | $8(2)$ | $13(15)$ | $12(18)$ | $8(7)$ | 1 |
| SRB 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PR | $4(4)$ | $8(8)$ | $9(10)$ | $2(2)$ | 1 |
| MR | $4(1)$ | $7(6)$ | $4(8)$ | $3(2)$ | $0(1)$ |
| Total | $8(5)$ | $15(14)$ | $13(18)$ | $5(4)$ | $1(1)$ |

This table proves clearly that the matches have become closer.
23 out of 42 are decided by up to 2 goals ( $=55 \%$ ).
Only 6 out of 42 show a higher difference than 5 goals in winner - loser margin.

## Some more findings:

- The scores from fastbreak have increased from 3.5 to 4.3 compared with 2010 as the total average.
- The teams allowed 4-8 shots from fastbreak. The best turnover play teams were ISL (3) and CRO (3.5). The weakest ESP (8) followed by HUN, SWE and FRA (7 each).
- Only 5 teams achieved a positive balance in the fastbreak play: ISL, POL, CRO, DEN and MKD.
- $\quad$ DEN (8.5) was by far the best team in terms of low figures in turnover. Second best were SRB and MKD (10) followed by CRO (11). SLO (15) and SWE (14) were at the bottom of this list. The fact of having all the medal winners among the best 4 proves the high importance of this item.
- $\quad$ There were 7.5 suspensions per match which is a clear decrease from the 9 two years ago. So defence work seems to have become cleaner, the best teams were FRA and ESP at an average of 2 suspensions only per match, the "bad boys" came from SLO (6) and GER (5).
- $\quad$ The tactics of the additional player was rarely used as all the teams had very effective systems in the play 5-6 at hand although most defence teams in the case of numerical superiority used to play $5-1$ or even $5+1$ immediately.
- On the other hand the 6-5 offence play of most of teams was very bad in the preliminaries and became better during the main round matches. Most probably an effect of a very limited period of tactical preparation for many teams resulting from having many players enlisted in the German Bundesliga and they had matches until the dying days of last year thus limiting the direct preparation to some 10 days only.
- $\quad 10$ direct red cards were presented at the matches in total which still raises the question of courage and consequence of the referees.
- And in fact the performance of the referees seemed somewhat inconsistent and a common line could only be seen in some of the important issues. The biggest problem still gives the "Progressive Punishment" and the clear separation between the penalty shot as "Restoring a clear scoring chance" and the punishment because of the character of the action denying the chance.
- $\quad$ But we have to give the referees one point - three top couples went out during the tournament because of injury and illness. Therefore the load became heavier on the shoulders of all the others than usual and there was little time for rest and recovery after some shaky appearance. Anyhow - all parties involved have to go on working for more consistency in the application of a common line.
- Once again like in the EURO 2010 the rule with 16 players on the score sheet did not make any sense. 13-14 players were sent in by the coaches on average with only a very few exceptions in case of bad performance.
In the main round and the finals the number of players sent in decreased even more.
So this is a clear indicator to return to a seed of 14 players on the score sheet only.


## General trends

The move towards a unification of offense systems has increased. One or two moves have been used by almost all the teams, moves that can be seen with the top teams in the Champions League as well.
Funny enough the success of teams like DEN, SLO and MKD seemed to be based on the fact that these teams still had specific moves at hand, different from all the other ones. The failure or setback of ISL and POL might be connected with their change in the offense set-play system.
Both teams went away from their very successful basic conception of the past and tried to succeed with new moves which were used by many other teams as well. I have to state that this caused a decrease in the efficiency of their offense set-play. And although these two teams had the best figures in terms of fastbreak-play still they ended in some disappointing $9^{\text {th }}$ and $10^{\text {th }}$ in the final ranking.

## 1. Defence set-play

The picture is very much alike when looking at the defence set-play. The domination of the 6-0 system has returned but the there is a lot of variation in the character of the $6-0$ set-defence from team to team.
As a matter of fact the interpretation of 6-0 does not only differ from team to team but even within the same team according to the personal configuration.
That means that the coaches will bring in a certain player to one position in the $6-0$ with a specific task and therefore different moving lanes. In this case the whole character of the formation will change although you will not realize any difference in the basic set-up.

All the teams do have defence specialists and there will be an offense-defence switch of 1,2 or even 3 players (MKD).
In all of the teams one of the defence specialists will participate in the fastbreak and go for substitution only in case of set-play offense. The second one will go for immediate switch in most of the teams.

| Basic systems: | $6-0$ | $5-1$ | $3-2-1$ | $5+1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | DEN | CRO |  |  |
|  | ESP * | ESP * |  |  |
|  | GER | FRA |  |  |
|  | HUN | MKD |  |  |
|  | ISL |  |  |  |
|  | POL |  |  |  |
|  | SLO |  |  |  |
|  | SRB |  | CRO | POL (all main rounds) |
|  | SWE | ISL | SWE (vs DEN) |  |
|  | CRO |  |  | DEN (vs GER) |
|  |  | MKD | SLO | FRA |

This list represents the basic set-up only.
ESP played both systems $50 \%$ of the time approx. So it is not possible to say which one is the basic one and which is the variation. In this tournament the 6-0 though was much more effective than the 5-1.
It is very interesting to see that the opponents winning from GER in the main round succeeded by using 5-1 and 5+1 respectively.
POL was pretty successful with the $5+1$, turning two of their main round matches and closing up remarkably in the third.
As for FRA I do think that this was an experiment only to improve the 1-1 of the players under pressure.

In the case of transitions ISL and DEN will go back to 6-0, SLO also as CRO and MKD will turn to 5-1. Teams playing $5+1$ will stay in this set-up.

Only new or clearly changed set-ups will be presented now, for the basic set-up of FRA (5-1), CRO (5-1 \& 6-0), ESP (5-1) please refer to the analysis of Euro 2010.

The same holds good for the 6-0 defence of ISL and POL and the 3-2-1 defence of SLO and CRO.

### 1.1. Styles of $\mathbf{5 - 1}$



If the PM or the LB of the opponent team is in possession of the ball, the basic 5-1 set-up will be switched into a 3-3.
The LP will be doubled not to let him move towards ball side.
This is played on either side.
Sometimes, if the RB has made use of the dribbling already this set -up will be used on non-ball side in order to force the lefthander to risk an unprepared shot.


MKD played with a triple-switch D-O with \#9, \#13 and \#14 coming in for the defense. The basic system was a 5-1 with pretty aggressive backs on either side but sometimes it turned into a full scale 3-2-1.

The only change in this set-up was done if \#7 LAZAROV needed a break, then \#8 MITKOV came in as substitute.

## 1.2. $\mathbf{5}+\mathbf{1}$ system



POL used the $5+1$ against the left handed RB in all the games of the main round and managed to turn two of the matches.

What was surprising was the inconsistency in the set-up of the formation using many different players in the back position.

The man-to-man player was picked according to the character of play of the direct opponent to cover.

DEN had changed their system from 2010 as sometimes there is only one defense specialist playing now if \#2 MOGENSEN will be on court. If he is out, the second specialist \#3 CHRISTIANSEN will stand as BR.

The LP on IR will not go so deep but both backs go more deep than in previous competitions especially on non-ball side in order to fight diagonal passes.
MOGENSEN will go extremely deep from either position and therefore is used as a very specific tactical tool to fight the main striker of the opponent.

In the set-up of the team GER the LW will always play BL and the LB will be in the position OL.
The BL will therefore always go pretty deep as will the PM who defends in the position IR.

The main task of the defense specialist \#4 ROGGISCH is to cover the line and close the gaps. And this leads to the weak point: If ROGGISCH leaves the line there will be huge space for the opponent's LP.

SRB


SRB play a very flat 6-0 with tall inner block and moving sideways very well thus closing the gaps against breakthrough.

The LP will always be doubled up to give no way for pick \& roll or for passes.

Wing players move far inside leaving wing shots to the GK in the first place.

HUN system is very similar but less effective.

## 2. Offense set-play

The dominating concept is the outnumbering of the defence in close quarters. In achieving this, almost all teams use group tactical means and 2-2 or 3-2 solutions.
The core characteristic of the offence play is that it is focused upon decision making and continuation play. The sequence is:

Initiating move - decision making - termination/continuation - decision making - termination
For the initiating move all the teams take some kind of a crossing with or without ball. This gives the offence player a clear advantage in terms of speed and direction of the move. Therefore in many cases he will be able to pass by the direct defender and force the approach of a second one thus giving a man advantage situation in the continuation.

Beside this statement that is taken from the Euro 2010 analysis and which is still valid in the offenses set-play a strange unification has taken place - two moves have been used vs a 6-0 defence by many teams in identical way one even without any serious attempt for scoring.

The only teams aiming for direct chances from the first move by using some extensions were DEN, CRO and SWE.

The second one was dedicated to create scoring chances anyway.


## Play versus a 6-0 defence set-up

DEN


SWE


CRO


Double cross with \#4 BALIC starting in the Position LB.
After first crossing PM and RB the lefthander starts a long run bringing BALIC to the PM position after the second cross.

From here he will aim for the LP moving inside or continue with a diagonal pass to the on moving PM for breakthrough.
Continuation to RW if necessary.

MKD


Double cross with inside move of the LP.
The PM will start the first crossing with the LB; LB will continue the long move for a crossing with the RB.
The LP will move inside simultaneously.
After this the RB will sweep inside for the shot or the pass to the LP.

ISL


Nice move by \#4 PALMARSSON from the PM position.
After the pass to the LB he will fake an empty crossing with the RB but stop halfway.

The LB deploys an explosive inside-outside switch and passes on to the LW.
The LW will go for an extreme angle and launch the pass for a jump combination with the PM who had followed the outside move of the LW only.

## FRA



With the explosive move of the LB the PM does a parallel move and receives the ball in full move.
Now the PM pushes towards the BR and passes on to the LP.
The RB will come with an inside sweep in any case for support.

If the pass PM-LP is not possible he will receive the ball in order to fire a fast shot through the gap in the centre.


Tailor-made move vs GER 6-0.
As the LP takes position with the BL the LW in this position cannot go deep as usually.

PM starts crossing with the ball with LB; after that the LB passes on to the tall lefthander who pushes in an inside move.
This brings a forward move of \#4 for the block or the tackle thus giving huge rooms for an inside move of the LP that cannot be prevented.


PM starts crossing with the ball with \#4 BALIC in the position LB.
The LP will simultaneously sweep inside as will the RB with short delay.

According to the reaction of the defense there are two options for the pass - forward moving defense leaves the LP uncovered; flat defense gives way for the shot of the tall lefthander.

PM starts flat crossing with the ball with the RB who aims for a shot over the screen of the LP.

If IR tackles, RB will pass on to the LB who will shoot through the gap or, if BR comes for the tackle will pass on to the LP on a short outside move

SWE
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This was the most effective move of the team SWE and their most versatile.

PM will go for far outside to cross with the RB and deploy a double screen for the shot.
Besides the shot \#5 ANDERSSON has three options for a diagonal pass.

The easy solution to the LB, the direct pass to the LW (frequent solution in 6-5) and the pass back to the RW because OL will move inside to cover the PM on 6 m .

## Transitions versus a 6-0 set-up Wing sweeps

ESP


With the pass PM - LB the LW sweeps inside for the BL.

The LB starts the parallel thrust continued by the PM but the RB will start a countermove simultaneously that will give the chance either for a shot through the gap between BL and IL or even for a breakthrough.

## FRA



The well known move of FRA in the set-up with \#2 FERNANDEZ as RB.

The LW rushes in and \#8 NARCISSE pushes at the IL as the RB moves inside and fires a fast jump shot after the pass. If this does not work he will continue with breakthrough towards throwing arm side - final solution pass to RW.

Sometimes the PM will pass the ball back to the LB surprisingly for a 2-2 on the left side.


The RW sweeps inside with the ball and passes on to the PM who - in a countermove - goes for crossing with the RB.

Shot of the RB from the centre or pass to the PM who simultaneously has moved into the open space behind IR and IL.

ISL


This move in the new set-up of the offense did not work too well.

The main reason is that \#7 ATLASON just aimed for the shot or passed on the ball to the RB.

With \#4 PALMARSSON in the centre it was much more effective since this player went for shot, breakthrough or pass to either of the two players at the line.

MKD


Very simple but extremely effective.
After the rush of the RW the PM will just pass the ball to the RB in the inside move.

Due to the quality of \#7 LAZAROV and \#5 STOILOV in the 2-2 play they scored a lot in this situation.

If the IL comes assisting, LAZAROV will launch a diagonal pass to the LB and they will have a clear man advantage situation on the left side.

SLO


This is the main offense conception of this team. They played it very fast and effectively.

After a fast rush in of the LW the LB \#13
SPILER will start an explosive move towards throwing arm side.
If neither breakthrough nor pass to the LP is possible he will pass on to the PM who will continue with the parallel thrust and pass on to the RB.
This one will have two passing options beside the direct breakthrough chance.

SRB


A combination of rush in of the LW and a crossing without the ball PM - LB.

The LB will pass on to the PM who will aim for breakthrough or find the LP for a short bounced pass.

If there is no chance for neither of that he will pass on to the LB in the centre and they will aim to use the man-advantage situation on the right side.

## Backcourt transitions to 4-2

FRA


This very nice move is an extension of the old "Swiss turntable" of the late 70s and 80s.

The PM will meet the upcoming LP and hand over the ball. The LP will continue his move and pass on to the RB who waits for the ball.

Only with the ball the RB will move inside thus giving both the LP and the PM the chance for a crossing move near the line.
After that he will shoot over the PM or pass to the LP.


Played versus GER with three righthanders in the backrow.
\#2 MOGENSEN passes to the PM and moves to the line. The PM goes for a crossing move with the ball towards the LB.

From this move he will launch a short bounced pass to MOGENSEN or complete the crossing with \#24 HANSEN who will shoot from the centre.

CRO


Played versus the extremely deep 5-1 of ESP.
With the pass LW - LB the LP starts a long run to the other side.
The RB moves inside in a counter move and receives the diagonal pass.

From his inside move he can easily play a diagonal pas to either of the wings, more effective to the RW.


The PM will meet the upcoming LP and hand over the ball. After that he will move on for the position of LB.
The LB in the meanwhile has moved to the centre and receives the ball from the LP. LB and LP continue their move as the RB too starts an outside move.

From this the LB launches a surprising counter-diagonal pass back to the PM who now starts for breakthrough.
If OR comes rushing he will pass on to the LW.

## Transitions versus a 5-1 defence set-up Wing sweep

ESP vs FRA


LW starts an inside move after passing the ball to the LB.

Suddenly he will return and deploy a block on the point thus giving the PM free way towards throwing arm side.

PM has two passing options - LP or RW - or can try for breakthrough.

This is the only sample taken since it is the only new one. All the other transitions with wing sweeps can be seen in the Euro 2010 analysis.

## Backcourt transitions

## DEN vs ESP



Righthander will rush in diagonally from the position RB. LB will move inside receiving the ball in full speed and thus forcing the point to tackle.

PM runs fast in semicircular move and receives diagonal pass on 9 m .
Breakthrough or continuation to RW.
All backcourt players have to run fast and well coordinated.

## DEN vs ESP



Different set-up but leading to identical initiating moves.

The main striker is in PM position now and the PM in LB position.

Therefore a completely different solution is taken with shot from 6 m .

DEN vs MKD


Since the centre of the defense of MKD will stay flat even though the point has moved away \#24 HANSEN will aim for a straight shot through the gap opened by the LP.

The big advantage of the team DEN was it to have four backcourt players at hand who could play all three positions in the backcourt.
Therefore they could pick a variety of solutions from identical moves always adjusting themselves to the situation and/or the reaction of the defence.

## Situations of numerical imbalance

Play 5-6
As mentioned before the game 5-6 was pretty effective in general. In the following we will discuss a concept used by several teams.
In a set-up without LP the move will start by sending in both wing players who will do some crossing move between 6 m and 9 m and after that they will continue heading back to their regular position.
Most of the teams did this without the ball but here the version of team GER is shown who do that move with the ball.


The LW will start an inside move with the ball and play a diagonal pass to the RW on his inside move.
There will be a first crossing with the ball of the two wing players and after that the RW will launch another diagonal pass to the LB.

The LW will follow the pass flight to the centre and with the RW continuing the inside move a 3-2 situation can be created for the LB.

Another move that was used by several teams (e.g. ESP, FRA and SLO) is shown here in the version of team SLO.

SLO


The PM passes the ball to the RB and moves to the line.
The RB starts an inside move thus pulling the defence and launches a diagonal pass to the LB who had started a fast inside move.

With the reception of the ball the LB switches direction in an explosive outside move and aims for breakthrough against throwing arm side.
If the OR should move in for tackling he will pass on to the LW.

## Play 6-5

After a very weak start in the preliminaries the man-advantage play improved a lot in the main round. Generally speaking two main concepts could be monitored

- crossing in the backcourt to pull the defence followed by a diagonal pass to a wing player and
- transition of the PM to the line and finishing from a 4-2 set-up.

For each one of the two concepts some examples will be given according to the specific solutions of the teams tailor-made for the skills of the respective players.

## CRO vs FRA



After crossing of PM and RB with the ball the RB passes the ball on to the LB on his inside move.

Thus the OR is forced to screen down the LP and the LB will launch a diagonal pass to the LW in the corner.

SWE


PM goes for a crossing with the ball with RB \#5 ANDERSSON; both wings in the corner.

First solution - shot over the LP
Second solution - pass to RW
Third solution - pass to LW.

SLO


With a pass-repass action of PM and RB the LW rushes inside.

With the LW in position at the line PM and RB start a give \& go move thus forcing the OL to go for the RB.
\#23 ZORMAN now launches the diagonal pass to the RW in the corner.

## DEN



In the version of DEN PM and LB deploy a very wide crossing with the ball.

The RB will do an outside move thus forcing the OL of the defending team to move in.

The LB will launch a diagonal pass to the RW in the corner.

MKD


PM passes to LB and moves on to the line.
LB moves inside with the ball.
If the defence stays flat he will pass on to the RB in an inside swing for the shot or the pass to the LP.

If the defence goes deep against the RB he will launch the diagonal pass to the RW.

HUN


Almost identical play by the team HUN.
The only difference is that in case of going deep of the defence the LB will play the pass to the LW.

POL


For several years now POL use to play a flip-flop version of the move.

The problem is that the RB has to decide between 4 different options very fast.

If the lefthander in this position happens to be out of shape a lot of mistakes will occur.

## FRA



In the version of FRA the RB will not move inside but will start an outside move.

They have played it in this way for years with a righthander in this position thus giving an excellent chance for the continuation to the RW.

And now they stay with the move even with a lefthander in the position RB.

ISL


This move is the most simple and depends on \#4 PALMARSSON and his abilities as a playmaker.

The problem of this move is that in case the two players at the line are not effective enough the defence will have a chance to create very narrow angles for the wings.

## The Top teams 12-1

## SWE - Sweden <br> After 6 Games

Coach: Lindgren ola
Time outs: 11 Avg. Time outs: 1.8

| No | Name | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M} \\ & \mathrm{P} \end{aligned}$ | Total |  |  | All Goals / Shots |  |  |  |  |  |  | Punishments |  |  |  | Offence |  |  | Defence |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Goals | Shots | \% | 7 mP | 7 mk | 6 mC | Wing | BT | FB | 9 m | YC | RC | 2M | $2+2$ | AS | R7 | TO/TF | ST | BS | P7 |  |
| 1 | ANDERSSON Matias | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 46:34 |
| 4 | LUNDSTROM Horrik | 6 | 25 | 33 | 76 | 0.1 | 0 | 1/1 | 14/19 | 0/1 | 9/9 | 1/2 |  |  | 4 |  | 3 | 3 | $3 / 2$ | 3 |  | 1 | 5041107 |
| 5 | ANDERSSON Kim | 6 | 23 | 40 | 57 |  |  | $1 / 1$ |  | 3/4 | $1 / 1$ | 18134 | 3 |  | 4 |  | 16 | 2 | 10/3 |  | 1 | 2 | 5:17:37 |
| 7 | JERNEMYR Magnus | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0/1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 7 | 6 | 240-50 |
| 10 | EKPERG Niclas | 6 | 33 | 51 | 65 | 9115 | 60 | 4/4 | 14/24 |  | 616 | $0 / 2$ | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | $2 / 1$ | 4 |  | 1 | 5.25-53 |
| 11 | DODER Dalbor | 6 | 9 | 21 | 43 |  |  | $3 / 4$ |  | 4/4 | $0 / 1$ | 2/12 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 6/3 |  |  |  | 125-51 |
| 12 | PALICXA Andreas | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 203.56 |
| 13 | STENBACKEN Jonathan | 6 | 2 | 7 | 29 |  |  | 1/1 |  | 0/1 | 0/1 | 1/4 | 2 |  | 4 |  | 2 |  | 9/2 |  | 2 | 3 | 231107 |
| 15 | LARHOLM Jonas | 5 | 15 | 31 | 48 |  |  | $3 / 5$ |  | 1/2 | 2/2 | $9 / 22$ | 1 |  | 2 |  | 6 |  | 9/5 |  | 2 | 2 | 221-54 |
| 18 | KARLSSON Tobias | 6 | 3 | 3 | 100 |  |  | 3/3 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 3 |  | 1 |  | 11 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 3:13:14 |
| 19 | JAKOESSON Johan | 6 | 7 | 15 | 47 |  |  | 1/1 | 1/2 | 0/1 |  | 5111 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 4/1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1,00:42 |
| 22 | SJOSTRAND Johan | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3,08344 |
| 24 | PETERSEN Fredik | 6 | 1 | 4 | 25 | $1 / 2$ | 50 |  |  |  | 0/2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16:24 |
| 25 | EKOAHL du RIETZ Km | 6 | 26 | 50 | 52 |  |  | 2/4 | 1/1 | 4/6 |  | 19/39 |  |  | 4 |  | 4 | 6 | 6/9 |  | 1 | 1 | 3,42:37 |
| 27 | BARUD Niclas | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6344 |
| 35 | NIL SSON Andreas | 6 | 13 | 20 | 65 |  |  | 13/20 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 2/4 |  |  |  | 2:14:46 |
|  | Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Totals |  | 157 | 276 | 57 | 10.18 | 66 | $32 / 44$ | $30 / 46$ | 12/19 | 18/23 | 551120 | 20 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 44 | 18 | 52132 | 13 | 19 | 24 | 6.00:00 |


| No | Name | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M} \\ & \mathbf{P} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Total |  |  | Alll Saves / Shots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Saves | Shots | \% | 7 mP | 7 mf | 6 mC | Wing | BT | FB | 9 m | 9m\% | NS | NS\% |
| 1 | ANDERSSON Mattis | 4 | 10 | 29 | 34 | 013 | 0 | 1/2 | $3 / 7$ | 1/2 | $0 / 3$ | 5112 | 42 | 5111 | 45 |
| 12 | PALICKA Andreas | 6 | 29 | 94 | 31 | 219 | 22 | 6/13 | 6/24 | 2/5 | 6/17 | 10126 | 33 | $12 / 42$ | 29 |
| 22 | SJOSTRAND Johan | 5 | 45 | 129 | 35 | 4/11 | 36 | 6/17 | $7 / 23$ | 2/9 | 2/20 | 25149 | 51 | 14/49 | 29 |
| Totals |  |  | 84 | 252 | 33 | 623 | 26 | 11/32 | 15/84 | 5/16 | 7/40 | 40137 | 46 | $31 / 104$ | 30 |

Attacks

| Team | All |  | Player Majority |  | Player Minority |  | Position Attacks |  | FB |  | Ind. FB |  | Team FB |  | To | TO\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | G/Att. | \% | G/Att. | \% | G/Aft | \% | G/Att. | \% | G/Aft. | \% | G/Aft. | \% | G/Att | \% |  |  |
| SWE | 157/339 | 46 | $2 \mathrm{z} / 42$ | 67 | $17 / 42$ | 40 | 1393313 | 44 | 18/26 | 69 | $9 / 11$ | 82 | $9 / 15$ | 60 | 84 | 25 |

## Defence set-up



The well-known Swedish 6-0 defence although the two backs will go more deep than in the historic version. Especially on non-ball side they will go deep anticipating diagonal passes.

IL and IR are the two specialists who will switch with the PM and the LP respectively; the LW will stay most of the playing time.

RW will stay as well there will be substitution only if \#5 ANDERSSON should need some break.

## Offence set-up



## Offence moves



For the offence set-up \#7 will switch with the PM and \#18 with the LP.

The wings will play on most of the time as will the RB. Substitutions are done on the other positions mainly.

The biggest problem of the team was that most of the danger came from the RB only and if he was isolated then the offence play collapsed almost totally.

This was the most effective move of the team SWE and their most versatile.

PM will go for far outside to cross with the RB and deploy a double screen for the shot. Besides the shot \#5 ANDERSSON has three options for a diagonal pass.

The easy solution to the LB, the direct pass to the LW (frequent solution in 6-5) and the pass back to the RW because OL will move inside to cover the PM on 6 m .

From the well known basic move of the crossing without the ball \#5 ANDERSSON will fire a diagonal pass to the PM now in the position of the LB. From his break between OR and BR he will launch the pass for the LW.

The pass was played behind the back in many cases.

SWE play this move on either side but mostly as shown.

## Play 5-6



With the usual crossing PM - RB the LW will rush inside for the centre offering the shot over him for the RB.

If this does not lead to a clear chance the RB will pass on to the LB and the LW will follow this pass.

From the straight push the LB will find the LW for the pass.

Play 6-5


PM goes for a crossing with the ball with RB \#5 ANDERSSON; both wings in the corner.

First solution - shot over the LP
Second solution - pass to RW
Third solution - pass to LW.


PM passes to RB and moves on to the line.
RB moves on in an inside switch thus aiming for the shot over the PM.

If this seems not to be possible he will pass on to the LB who comes running in an inside move for a very fast one-step jump shot.

The final rank was a result of allowing too many shots on target in the first place. The main reason for that was that most of the load in offense was put on the RB and if he was isolated by the defence the game turned to be too risky thus offering too many shots from fastbreak because of turnovers. This deficiency could not be compensated by good goalkeeper play and not by quite a good percentage in the offence play.

## FRA－France <br> After 6 Games

Coach：ONES TA Claude
Time outs： 9 Avg．Time outs： 1.5

| No | Name | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | All Coala／Shota |  |  |  |  |  |  | Purna hmenta |  |  |  | OMance |  |  | Deslanta |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Cads | Shata | 5 | 7 mP | Fras | AmC | Wing | ET | F8 | 9 m | YC | Rc | 2M | 2＊2 | AS |  | TOVTF | ST | BS | P7 |  |
| 2 | FERNANDE2 Jínćme | 6 | 21 | 42 | 50 | 45 | 80 | $0 \times 1$ | 2品 | 2／2 | 22 | 11／28 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 11 | 4 | $6 / 4$ | 1 |  |  | 32651 |
| 3 | ONARTDidiar | 6 | 1 | 1 | 100 |  |  | V11 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 5 | 23626 |
| 4 | BARACHETXavir | 6 | 20 | 37 | 54 |  |  | $2 / 4$ | 34 | $2 / 2$ | $6{ }^{6}$ | 720 | 4 |  | 2 |  | 13 | 2 | 4／7 | 4 |  | 1 | 35037 |
| 5 | OILLE Oullaume | 6 | 1 | 6 | 17 |  |  | $0 \times 1$ | 1／1 |  |  | $0 / 4$ |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 1.2230 |
| 6 | OILE Bartrand | 6 | 16 | 22 | 73 |  |  | 11／13 | 18 |  | 45 | 011 | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | 5 | 3／6 | 1 |  | 2 | 33156 |
| 8 | NAROSSE Dinid | 6 | 16 | 32 | 41 |  |  | $0 \times 1$ |  | 66 | 2月 | $8 / 28$ | 1 |  | 1 |  | 10 |  | 4／3 | 2 |  |  | 3：1620 |
| 9 | JCLICuliauma | 6 | 13 | 困 | 72 | 12\％6 | 75 |  | 1／1 |  | 0n |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1／1 |  |  |  | 1.0523 |
| 11 | HCNRUBIA Samud | 4 | 4 | 5 | 80 | 1ก | 100 |  | 29 |  | 1／n |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1．1625 |
| 12 | MARABCUE Dacuda | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1328 |
| 13 | KARHBATIC Nikcla | 6 | 9 | 34 | 28 |  |  |  | 0.9 | $0 \times 3$ | 24 | 724 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 11 | 2 | 7／6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.1356 |
| 16 | OWE YER Thierry | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54632 |
| 18 | ACCAMERAY Wilam | 6 | 13 | 22 | 뇌 |  |  | 1／2 | 12 |  | 22 | 9\％ 9 |  |  | 1 |  | 4 | 1 | 11 |  |  |  | 12058 |
| 19 | ABNLO LU | 6 | 18 | 22 | 9 |  |  | V11 | $6 / 14$ | V1 | 4.6 | 6\％10 | 3 |  |  |  | 5 | 2 | 7／4 | 2 |  | 2 | 5.0320 |
| 20 | SCPHANDO Cadric | 3 | 4 | 5 | 80 |  |  | 2／3 | 22 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 5 | 1／2 | 2 |  | 2 | 1.1156 |
| 21 | OUROOU Michasl | 2 | 4 | 5 | 80 | 22 | 900 |  | 0 n |  | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0856 |
| 25 | OETREZ Onégaina | 6 | 4 | 4 | 100 |  |  | $3 / 3$ | 1／7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 2126 |
| 27 | BiNOO Amiad | 6 | 12 | 2 | 63 |  |  |  | 6n3 |  | 55 | V1 | 2 |  | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1／1 | 1 |  | 3 | 33300 |
| Team |  |  | 156 | 291 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tolab |  |  |  | 54 | 2024 | 79 | $21 / 30$ | 2452 | 1114 | 3099 | $49 \times 13$ | 21 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 69 | 24 | 37137 | 19 | 3 | 17 | 6.00 .00 |


| N | Name |  | Total |  |  | All Smin／Shota |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No |  | P | 3ives | Sida | 5 | 7 mP | InEx | BmC | Wing | ET | F8 | 9 m | 9m\％ | NS | NS\％ |
| 12 | KARABCUE Dacuda | 6 | 3 | 11 | 27 | 02 | 0 | $0 \times 1$ | 19 |  | 02 | 2／3 | 67 | 114 | 25 |
| 16 | OME YER Thisury | 6 | 69 | 224 | 31 | 2／14 | 14 | 12／34 | 1241 | $5 / 34$ | 939 | 2962 | 47 | 29／109 | 27 |
| Tolas |  |  | 72 | 235 | 31 | 2月6 | 13 | 12／3 | 1344 | $5 / 34$ | 9 A 1 | 3143 | 48 | 30／113 | 27 |

## Attacks

| Team | All |  | Payer Majortiy |  | Player Minarity |  | Panition Amacla |  | FB |  | Ind．FP |  | TamFE |  | T0 | T0\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ORAEA． | 8 | O／PEL | \％ | COA晨． | 8 | OVARE． | \％ | Orame | \％ | O／RAR． | \％ | O／REL | \％ |  |  |
| FRA | 194／390 | 47 | $2014{ }^{1}$ | 63 | 810 | 32 | 228278 | 48 | 3054 | 56 | 11／12 | 02 | 20／42 | 45 | 74 | 22 |

## Defence set－up



The basic set－up was the well－known 5－1 with the specialist in the position BC．

But the style of the play was different－it had more test character than anything else：The point moved out to $12-15 \mathrm{~m}$ ，sometimes \＃8 NARCISSE played man－to－man pressing even． Therefore \＃3 DINART was forced to leave the line and go to 9 m or even deeper．

All in all this was not the regular defence play of team FRA of the past．

## Offence set-up



In the offence play a lot of variations could be monitored thus giving the impression of testing as well.

The defence specialist will switch with the LP most of the time as usual.

But in one match there was a $\mathrm{D} / \mathrm{O}$ switch \#3/\#18 with \#20 staying on the field.
In another match there was an additional D/O switch \#5/\#4

## Offence moves



The well known move of FRA in the set-up with \#2 FERNANDEZ as RB.

The LW rushes in and \#8 NARCISSE pushes at the IL as the RB moves inside and fires a fast jump shot after the pass. If this does not work he will continue with breakthrough towards throwing arm side - final solution pass to RW.

Sometimes the PM will pass the ball back to the LB surprisingly for a 2-2 on the left side.

Another well-known move from the identical set-up.

RB moves to the line with the ball flight. LB aims for the shot from and inside switch.

If the situation does not give a clear chance he will fire a diagonal pass to the PM on the outside move offering a variety of continuations.


With the explosive move of the LB the PM does a parallel move and receives the ball in full move.
Now the PM pushes towards the BR and passes on to the LP.
The RB will come with an inside sweep in any case for support.

If the pass PM-LP is not possible he will receive the ball in order to fire a fast shot through the gap in the centre.

This very nice move is an extension of the old "Swiss turntable" of the late 70s and 80s.

The PM will meet the upcoming LP and hand over the ball. The LP will continue his move and pass on to the RB who waits for the ball.

Only with the ball the RB will move inside thus giving both the LP and the PM the chance for a crossing move near the line.
After that he will shoot over the PM or pass to the LP.

## Play 6-5



In the version of FRA the RB will not move inside but will start an outside move.

They have played it in this way for years with a righthander in this position thus giving an excellent chance for the continuation to the RW.

And now they stay with the move even with a lefthander in the position RB.

It was somewhat strange to watch to games of FRA in this tournament. Their appearance gave the impression that they took it as a test tournament in the first place. A lot of experiments seemed to take place in defence especially. And compared with the figures of the EURO 2010 their performance in the turnover play was disastrous affecting the goalkeeper play as well. I do think that we will see a totally different performance later this year in the OG.

## ISL - Iceland <br> After 6 Games

Coach: OUOMUNOSSON Gudmundur T.
Time outs: 7 Avg. Time outs: 1.2

| No | Name | $\begin{array}{l\|} M \\ P \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | Al Coala / Sheta |  |  |  |  |  |  | Punalmeners |  |  |  | OUlinion |  |  | Dedanco |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Coads | 3ras | \% | 7 mP | Fras | 6 mc | Wing | 87 | F8 | 9m | YC | ac | 3 M | 2+2 | 4 S | \% 7 | TOVTF | ST | BS | P7 |  |
| 1 | CUSTAVSSOKN日jownipia | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 n |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 5.14.49 |
| 2 | SVANARSSON Wgir | 6 | 9 | 11 | 82 |  |  | V1 |  | V1 | 70 |  | 4 |  | 4 |  | 3 | 1 | 12 |  | 7 | 2 | 2.0507 |
| 3 |  | 6 | 6 | 11 | 5 |  |  | 5/10 | 1/1\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 6 | 11 |  |  |  | 3954 |
| 4 | Palmunsscon Amm | 6 | 22 | 42 | 45 |  |  | 11 | 18 | 35 | 0 n | 1722 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 22 | 2 | $7 / 2$ | 1 |  | 4 | 40822 |
| 5 | IMCIMANDAPRON Mginnindr | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 3 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 48.45 |
| 8 |  | 6 | 13 | 23 | 43 |  |  |  | 29 | 33 | 68 | $2 / 15$ | 4 |  | 1 |  | 10 | 3 | $2 / 2$ | 5 | 2 | 4 | 420.04 |
| 7 | ATLASCN Ar nír | 6 | 21 | 39 | 9 |  |  | 3/4 | 0 n | 88 | 0 n | 12/23 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 2 | 3 | 00/4 |  | 1 | 3 | 4.4240 |
| a | OLAFSSOON Thưir | 6 | 18 | 23 | 76 | 44 | 100 | V1 | 7/11 |  | 6 8 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 13 | 1 |  |  | 40433 |
| 9 |  | 6 | 41 | 63 | 63 | \% 5 20 | 75 | $3 / 4$ | 1120 | 33 | 7/11 | 25 |  |  |  |  | 9 |  | 3/3 | 1 |  | 4 | 80000 |
| 12 | EOVARSSCN Aron Ralh | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 16.11 |
| 13 | ORET ARSSCN Odiur | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | OUOMUOSSONOUu itaj | 6 | 1 | 1 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1 / 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1337 |
| 15 | PETERSSON Alaxandar | 6 | 13 | 23 | 57 |  |  | $0 \times 1$ | 1/1 | 33 | 2A | 7\%4 |  |  | 2 |  | 6 | 1 | 4/3 | 1 |  | 5 | 22521 |
| 18 | CuCLLUNDS9ON Hisidur Levy | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29.00 |
| 17 | IhwCESSON S warre | 6 | 3 | 3 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  | 33 |  | 5 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 8 | 2 | 23331 |
| 18 | OUNWARSSCN Rowert | 6 | 18 | 22 | 82 |  |  | 13/18 | 5.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 7 | $2 / 8$ |  |  | 1 | 20944 |
| 12 | KARASCN RLnar | 3 | 9 | 5 | 60 |  |  |  | 0 n | $\sqrt{12}$ | 1/n | 711 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | $3 / 1$ | 2 |  | 1 | 1.18.52 |
| 21 |  | 6 | 3 | 4 | 75 |  |  | 11 |  |  | 0 n | $2 / 2$ |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 2930 |
| Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 177 | 292 | 61 | 204 | 79 | $28 \times 2$ | 23\&47 | 20.23 | 2948 | 50/113 | ข | 0 | 20 | 0 | 22 | 24 | $33 / 30$ | 16 | 12 | 30 | 6.0000 |


| No | Name | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{P} \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | All Smuen / Shota |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 3ives | Thata | \% | 7 mP | Imal | 1 mic | Wirg | ET | FPR | 9m | 9mf | NS | NS\% |
| 1 |  | 6 | 59 | 20 | 23 | 824 | 33 | 10/27 | 1046 | V20 | 3 n 9 | 2775 | 36 | 2102 | 23 |
| 12 | EOVARSSCON Aron Raf | 3 | 3 | 10 | 30 | 0 n | 0 | 03 | 02 |  |  | 34 | 75 | 05 | 0 |
| 16 | CLCMANDASONHaidir Levy | 3 | 4 | 24 | 17 | 19 | 33 | 04 | 02 | 044 | $0 \cdot 1$ | 3/10 | 30 | $0 / 10$ | 0 |
| Tolala |  |  | 68 | 244 | 27 | 228 | 32 | 10/34 | 1050 | 123 | 320 | 3320 | 37 | 21007 | 20 |

## Attacks

| Team | All |  | Payer Majorty |  | Player Minarity |  | Panifon Retacka |  | F8 |  | Ind. Fer |  | TeamFB |  | T0 | T0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | O/fen. | 8 | ONPL. | \% | OWa星 | \% | Oifer | \% | Oifer | \% | O/Rer | \% | Oikel | \% |  |  |
| $\underline{E L}$ | 177/228 | 54 | 23/32 | 72 | 15/27 | 56 | 545/277 | 52 | $\underline{251}$ | 83 | 45 | 80 | 29/4* | 61 | 83 | 19 |

## Defence set-up



The regular 6-0 with aggressive backs on either side, BR even more than BL.
The two specialists in the centre going for double switch D/O: \#17/\#4 (or \#7) and \#2/\#18 (or \#3). Brackets mean $2^{\text {nd }}$ halftime vs ESP only.
\#17 will go for the switch immediately, \#2 will go for the fastbreak and switch later.

Due to the inevitable substitution of \#15
PETTERSSON by \#6 HALLGRIMSSON this was not as effective as usual.

## Offence set-up



Very few substitutions as usual.
After the retreat of \#15 the set-up was fixed in fact and the only sub was on the line from then on.

In the $2^{\text {nd }}$ halftime vs HUN LB and PM switched positions and this set-up seemed to be more efficient.
\#9 SIGURDSSON was never substituted.

## Offence moves



This traditional move was rarely used in this tournament.
The reason might be that both top lefthanders had been eliminated by injury.
ISL has been playing this move for almost 25 years now creating full pressure on the defence from all positions (see EURO 2010).

In this tournament the crossing PM - RB was not efficient; most probably because they did not have the specific skills yet to make it real dangerous.

Because of that the concept had been altered to this move with continuous parallel thrust in the backrow.

In this set-up it was not too successful but whenever \#4 and \#7 switched positions it became quite efficient due to the individual skills of \#4 PALMARSSON.


Rush-in of the RW against ball flight.
RB moves to the open space thus giving room for an aggressive outside move of the PM from which he launches his pass to the LP or the LW.
If the PM was not tackled by the BL he would fire a fast ground shot through the gap.

ISL


Nice move by \#4 PALMARSSON from the PM position.
After the pass to the LB he will fake an empty crossing with the RB but stop halfway.

The LB deploys an explosive inside-outside switch and passes on to the LW.
The LW will go for an extreme angle and launch the pass for a jump combination with the PM who had followed the outside move of the LW only.

## Play 5-6



From their regular basic concept the LB after the sweep of the LW will launch a surprising diagonal pass to the jumping RW.

Play 6-5


This move is the most simple and depends on \#4 PALMARSSON and his abilities as a playmaker.

The problem of this move is that in case the two players at the line are not effective enough the defence will have a chance to create very narrow angles for the wings.

In the regular set-up this concept is pretty strong and with all players in good health and shape it will be a smash again in near future.

There are many reasons for the disappointing appearance of ISL in this EURO 2012.

- Both top lefthanders were out due to injuries
- Because of that the traditional basic moves both in defence and offence could not be used
- The performance of the goalkeepers was disastrous
- Finally the set-up in offence with \#7 ATLASON as PM did not work. In the few moments when he switched position with \#4 PALMARSSON there was more flow in the game and even the self confidence of the players seemed to improve.

These deficiencies could not be compensated by the good things like being still the team playing the best fastbreak balance because of an outstanding turnover-play. And they had the third best shot percentage of all the teams.

With the two lefthanders coming back to the team and an ongoing integration of the two youngsters \#3 KRISTIANSSON and \#19 KARASON the team ISL will be a strong performer again in near future.

## POL－Poland <br> After 6 Games

Coach：WENTA Bogdian
Time outs： 7 Avg．Time outs： 1.2

| No | Name | $\begin{array}{c\|} \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | Al Coala／Shota |  |  |  |  |  |  | Punblimerts |  |  |  |  |  |  | Dedanom |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Conde | 3nda | 8 | 7 mP | Intor | 6mC | Wing | ET | Fer | 9n | YC | ac | 2M | 2＋2 | AS | 同 | TOVTF | ST | 85 | P7 |  |
| 2 | －nszra Bartianiad | 6 | 15 | 30 | 50 |  |  | 48 | 0 n | 35 | 48 | $4 / 2$ | 1 |  | 1 |  | 4 |  | 7／6 | 4 | 2 |  | 32128 |
| ， | Luewswo Kirysutof | 6 | 10 | 30 | 33 |  |  | 013 |  | 14 | 0 M | 922 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 11 | 2 | 9／2 | 4 |  | 1 | 15023 |
| 4 | 1OUCHCZYMSK1 Paryk | 6 | 16 | 28 | 62 |  |  | 11 | 411 |  | 11／14 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1／2 |  |  | 4 | 4．18．44 |
| 6 | TKACZMK Orasjur | 6 | 12 | 22 | $\theta^{6}$ | 29 | 67 | 38 |  | 231 | 55 | 712 |  |  | 2 |  | 9 |  | 3／2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2.38 .52 |
| ， | Brel ECKIKard | 6 | 13 | 30 | 43 |  |  | 11 | 12 |  | 1／1／ | 10，23 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 1／1 | 2 | 3 |  | 1．42．19 |
| 11 | WISNEWSK0 Adam | 6 | 12 | 17 | 71 |  |  | 231 | $6 \cdot 7$ |  | 45 | $0 / 2$ |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  | 2．52．49 |
| 12 | WICHARY Marcin | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3．16．11 |
| 13 <br> 15 | JuRECKIBartosi | 6 | 20 | 24 | 83 |  |  | $14 / 38$ | 0n |  | 68 |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 6 | 4 | 3／3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2.5554 |
| 15 | JURECKIMEhal | 6 | 21 | 38 | 59 |  |  | 45 | 1／1\％ | $2 / 2$ | 45 | 10.23 | 2 |  | 5 |  | 23 | 1. | 11／1 | 5 | 10 | 3 | 42336 |
| 16 <br> 19 | Wrszominskopior | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 2．43．49 |
| 12 | TLUCZYTSKITamasa | 6 | 15 | 24 | 63 | 7／12 | 58 | $0 / 1$ | 68 |  | 29 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1／1 |  |  | 3 | 3．10：17 |
| 20 | JuRKEWCZMamiuc | 6 | 12 | 因 | 67 |  |  | 34 |  | 33 | 35 | 38 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 14 | 2 | 3／2 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 32704 |
| 23 | SMPRZAK Kami | 6 | 9 | 11 | 22 |  |  | 810 | 1／1／ |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 1／3 |  |  | 1 | 58.32 |
| 29 | KWIATKOWSK2zigniaw | 6 | 3 | 3 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  | 39 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1：14：10 |
| 41 | ZAREMBA Matius | 6 | 1 | 6 | 17 |  |  |  | 0 n |  |  | 15 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 1.1536 |
| 43 | ORZECHONSKO Robart | 6 | 7 | 11 | 64 |  |  |  | 29 |  | 58 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1／1 |  |  |  | 1.41 .16 |
| Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tolata |  | 173 | 205 | 9 | 9 n 5 | 60 | 40530 | 2198 | 1117 | 4383 | 44＊08 | 17 | 0 | 24 | 0 | 9 | 菅 | $44 / 2$ | 32 | 33 | ง | 6.0000 |


| No | Name | $\begin{array}{\|c} \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | All Smia／Shota |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 3ives | Tuda | \％ | 7 mP | Trat | 6 mC | Wirg | ETI | F8 | 9m | 9mm | NS | NS\％ |
| 12 | WICHARYMarcin | 6 | 41 | 124 | 33 | 38 | 38 | 423 | 1197 | 04 | 10 | 2242 | 52 | 1506 | 23 |
| 16 | Wrszompsropiof | 6 | 27 | 104 | 24 | 20 | 22 | $3 / 23$ | 4n8 | 39 | $0 \mathrm{n4}$ | 15／31 | 48 | 1050 | 20 |
| Tolata |  |  | 68 | 228 | 30 | 5／17 | 29 | 7147 | \％ 5 ¢5 | 3／3 | 123 | 3773 | 51 | 25＇115 | 22 |

## Attacks

| Team | All |  | Phayer Majorty |  | Player Mincrity |  | Panition Aetacka |  | FB |  | Hd．FP |  | TsamFE |  | то | T0\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OiREL | 8 | CiPat． | \％ | OWa崖 | 8 | O／RAL | \％ | Oifet | 8 | OiARE． | \％ | O／Res． | \％ |  |  |
| PCL | 173／336 | 51 | 29／42 | 57 | 16／38 | 44 | 125268 | 47 | 43888 | 71 | 70 | 78 | 41／99 | 63 | 69 | 21 |

## Defence set－up



The orthodox 6－0 system without a defence specialist did not work too well．

The biggest problems occurred on the BR position leading to frequent changes and in the BL position where \＃2 JASZKA tried to go very deep as \＃6 TKACZYK remained defensively oriented．This seemed to give troubles in the coordination－surprisingly since the players do know each other for quite some time．

Because of the troubles with the 6－0 in the main round matches they changed into a $5+1$ and were pretty successful with that set－up．


POL used the 5+1 against the left handed RB in all the games of the main round and managed to turn two of the matches.

What was still surprising was the inconsistency in the set-up of the formation using many different players in the back position.

The man-to-man player was picked according to the character of play of the direct opponent to cover.

## Offence set-up



This set-up is well-known for some years now. The problem in this event however was that \#13 Bartos JURECKI was not in good shape and that the lefthanders in RB were fully out of shape. Therefore the deficiencies of the wings in the set-play that had been compensated all throughout the last years came fully into effect now.

## Offence moves



Turning away from their basic system with a transition to 4-2 (see Euro 2010) they now played a combination of "turntable" and "empty crossing" to the left.

The weak point seemed to be that because of an all inside move there was heavy traffic in the very centre and since this move does not create any man advantage the strikers have to be in top shape to succeed in this configuration.

Remark: This is the 5-6 move; for the regular move add the RW in the corner!!


## Play 6-5



PM goes for crossing with the RB with the ball. RB moves on for the shot over the LP from the very centre.

If the IR should go deep for the tackle continuation follows to the LB on a short inside move.
LB shoots through the gap of passes on to the demarking LP.

This was their most efficient move.

Wing sweep of the LW against ball flight. In case of aggressive wing pressing after inside sweep of the LW the RB will move inside with the ball forcing the IL to move.

After that follows parallel thrust of the PM against throwing arm side and a bounced pass to the LP who has a lot of space now to finish.

For several years now POL use to play this version of the move to the line by the PM.

The problem is that the RB has to decide between 4 different options very fast.

In the past this worked quite well because the lefthanders used to be in good shape and were quite experienced.

But if the lefthander in this position happens to be out of shape a lot of mistakes will occur.

Because of that Bogdan WENTA decided to try a very specific set-up in man-advantage.

Play 7-5


## After his pass the extra player has to leave the court immediately!!

In the set-up the position LB will be doubled and the RB is the extra player.

The PM plays the pass to the extra player on RB and goes for the line.

The first LB comes running inside and receives the ball from the passive RB. He has three options now - shot or pass to either of the players at the line.

If the BC goes deep in order to prevent this pass the RB has two more options:

- Pass to the LP (risky)
- Diagonal pass to the second LB \#8.

LB ( BIELECKY) will shoot or pass on to LW.

All in all POL remained below expectations. There are several reasons for that:

- SZMAL could not be substituted by the other goalkeepers
- M. LIJEKSKI was out and his brother was out of shape
- B. JURECKI was not in the shape of the past
- The changed offence team move did not work

With all that the deficiencies of the wing players in terms of solid execution in the set play that had been covered or compensated by the performance of the other players became a serious blow to the team efficiency now.

But all this is not enough to explain the disastrous start of POL in every match. In these moments it seemed that there were severe personal tensions between several players and they did not play as a team.

On the other hand together with ISL they were the best fastbreak team and they managed to turn around matches that had been lost already with their 5+1 defence and an incredible fighting spirit in the second half.

So at the end of the day we do state very mixed impressions of this team and we have to look forward what direction they will go in the future.

## HUN - Hungary <br> After 6 Games

Coach: MOCSA Laja
Time outs: 10 Avg. Time outs: 1.7

| No | Name | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M} \\ & \mathrm{P} \end{aligned}$ | Total |  |  | All Coala / Shota |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pumbinmerts |  |  |  | OUnmoe |  |  | Dedanos |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Conis | Thata | \% | 7 mP | Ima | 6 maC | Wirg | ET | F8 | 9m | YC | ac | 3 M | 2+2 | AS | 同 | TOVTF | ST | Ess | P7 |  |
| 3 | ILYESFananc | 6 | 16 | 22 | 50 |  |  | V1 | 25 | $\sqrt{1}$ | 39 | 922 | 5 | 1 | 10 |  | 8 | 3 | 7/4 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 42838 |
| 4 | S2OLLOES Sodedia | 5 | 2 | 3 | 87 |  |  | 22 |  |  | 0 n |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 41.10 |
| 5 | Csisziar oubar | 6 | 43 | 68 | 63 | 16/17 | 88 | 14 | 20 | W10 | 39 | 15/32 |  |  | 1 |  | 15 | 3 | 8/9 |  |  | 1 | 345:15 |
| 6 | MOCSA Tamis | 6 | 20 | 2 | 51 | 12 | 50 |  | 12 | 231 | 19 | 15/20 | 2 |  |  |  | 9 | 1 | 1/3 |  | 1 | 5 | 337.04 |
| 8 | INWCSSIK Oargs | 6 | 14 | 21 | 87 |  |  | 02 | 50 | 2/2 | 55 | 231 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | $2 / 1$ | 2 | 1 | 3 | 43729 |
| 9 | WhwCSIK Tamia | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 4826 |
| 10 | Hanswiricangly | 6 | 13 | 2 | 52 | 24 | 50 | 02 | 7/44 |  | 45 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | $2 / 4$ | 4 |  | 2 | 5.10 .05 |
| 11 | PuTics Bama | 6 | 12 | 25 | $4{ }^{4}$ |  |  | $0 / 1$ | 34 | 44 | 0 n | 5/16 |  |  | 2 |  | 6 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  | 1.15.42 |
| 12 | FRZEMASNandor | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0n |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 327:19 |
| 13 | MRIVOKAPICS Milonad | 6 | 11 | 21 | 52 |  |  | V1 | 33 | $0 / 1$ |  | 7\% |  |  | 1 |  | 5 | 1 | 6 |  |  | 1 | 1.0531 |
| 16 | Mirler Rdiand | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 23241 |
| 17 | LRUSWCBalia | 6 | 1 | 1 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  | 1/n |  | 6 | 1 | 6 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 3 | 152:17 |
| 18 | NAOY Kamél | 6 | 1 | 5 | 20 |  |  |  |  | V1 |  | $0 / 4$ |  |  | 1 |  | 5 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 10925 |
| 24 | VACKERTI AHIa | 3 | 2 | 3 | 87 |  |  | 01 | 1/1 |  | $1 / 1$ |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | $2 / 1$ | 1 |  |  | 1.1058 |
| 25 | ZUBN Szibdia | 6 | 15 | 22 | 69 |  |  | 12/17 |  | $0 \times 1$ | 20 | 12 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 5 | 1/3 | 1 |  | 1 | 4.0300 |
| 28 | SCHUCH Tmumin | 6 | 2 | 3 | 67 |  |  | $0 \times 1$ |  |  | 1/1/ | 11 |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 3 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 13228 |
| 33 | NICSN Oilar | 6 | 4 | 13 | 31 |  |  |  | 0n |  |  | 412 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1/1 |  |  |  | 42.32 |
| Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Tolata |  |  | 158 | 282 | 46 | צ623 | 78 | 1722 | 24.41 | $17 / 23$ | 2107 | 599136 | ง | 2 | 28 | 0 | 4 | 23 | 35/29 | 11 | 19 | 20 | 6.0000 |


| No | Name | $\begin{aligned} & M \\ & P \end{aligned}$ | Total |  |  | All Sarven / Shota |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 3ives | Tusa | \% | 7 mP | Tras | EmC | Wirg | ET | F月 | 9 m | 9mm | NS | NS\% |
| 12 | FRZEMASNandar | 6 | 48 | 146 | 33 | 18 | 13 |  | 201 | $4 / 4$ | 632 | 289 | 44 | 15/48 | 33 |
| 16 | MHLEER Rodiand | 6 | 28 | 90 | 20 | 2/11 | 18 | $4 / 17$ | 4n9 | 2/13 | 20 | 12/21 | 57 | 104\% | 20 |
| Tolata |  |  | 74 | 23 | 31 | 3n9 | 18 | 627 | งส40 | 6/28 | 8,41 | 3898 | 48 | 2595 | 26 |

## Attacks

| Team | All |  | Payer Majorty |  | Player Mincrity |  | Paition Atacka |  | FB |  | Ind. Fre |  | Team FB |  | T0 | 10\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OTREE. | 8 | O/Res. | \% | OXAE. | 8 | O/REL | \% | Oidel | \% | Oiker | \% | ORAL. | \% |  |  |
| HUN | 199/319 | 4) | 23/43 | 4 | 1535 | 43 | 135287 | 47 | 2192 | 88 | 6 \% | 88 | $8 / 5$ | 60 | 83 | 20 |

## Defence set-up



Orthodox 6-0 played quite flat and man oriented with a single switch of the specialist with the PM.

Basically the LP stood BL and the LB on IL. Only in case of a sub of \#3 the LP will go to IL.

## Offence set-up



## Offence moves



Remark:
This move will be played against a 6-0 defence as well. This is the basic offence move.

This is a long term well rehearsed team with two players on every position.
The only exception is the position of the PM where \#5 CSASZAR is fixed.
Due to the injury of Tamas Ivancsik early in the first match of the tournament \#10 HARSANYI had to play full time since he was the only right winger left.

The PM will meet the upcoming LP and hand over the ball. After that he will move on for the position of LB.
The LB in the meanwhile has moved to the centre and receives the ball from the LP.
LB and LP continue their move as the RB too starts an outside move.

From this the LB launches a surprising counterdiagonal pass back to the PM who now starts for breakthrough.
If OR comes rushing he will pass on to the LW.

The PM will play the ball to the LB and moves in to the line.

The LB continues the inside move and pulls the BC of the defence. After this he passes on to the RB sweeping inside in full move.

If this is prevented by the BL going deep he will play a diagonal pass to the LW.


A very easy thus efficient move started by the PM again.

He will just move explosively on the seam between BL and OL and pull the BL.

After his backhand-pass to the RB there will be free way for this player.

Should the BL stay in position and the OL tackle the pass will go on to the RW starting from the corner.

As usual the team of HUN played nothing very special but very solid and disciplined. They had their solid 6-0 defence that closed the gaps in the near zone and in offence they had a few well rehearsed moves based upon the brilliant skills of their PM CSASZAR \#5.

Funny enough they were at average in all the parameters and they had a fantastic preliminary round. They only had a problem to meet the three best fastbreak-play teams of the tournament SLO, ISL and CRO in the main round and they could not quite cope with that.

At the end of the day they recovered from the disappointing result of the Euro 2010 and they were very close to reach the game 5-6. On the other hand some may say that if you beat FRA and you draw with CRO and ESP the outcome should be something more than finishing ranked $8^{\text {th }}$. But this only proves how close the level of all the top nations has become.

## GER－Germany <br> After 6 Games

Coach：HEUBERCER Martin Time outs： 12 Avg．Time outs： 2.0

| No | Name | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M} \\ & \mathrm{P} \end{aligned}$ | Total |  |  | Al Coala／Shota |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pumbhenerts |  |  |  | O\＃linom |  |  | Dedanos |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Coads | Suca | \％ | 7 mP | Tras | 6 mmC | Wirg | ET | F目 | 9m | YC | ac | 2M | 2＊2 | AS | 97 | TOVTF | ST | BS | P7 |  |
| 2 | HENSPracal | 6 | 3 | 13 | 23 |  |  |  |  | $0 / 1$ |  | $3 / 2$ |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3／1 |  |  |  | 1.12 .55 |
| 3 | OENSHEMERUwe | 6 | 28 | 47 | 纤 | 34，18 | 78 | 0／1 | ana |  | 48 | $0 / 4$ | 2 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 3 |  |  | 33939 |
| 4 | ROOOSCH Civer | 6 | 4 | 5 | 80 |  |  | 44 |  |  |  | $0 / 1$ | 3 | 1 | 11 |  | 3 |  | 11 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 30231 |
| 5 | MLEN Damirik | 6 | 10 | 36 | 63 |  |  | 13 | $4{ }^{17}$ |  | 5．8 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4 |  | 3 | 23006 |
| 6 | PFAHL Adrian | 6 | 8 | 龱 | 44 | 1／1 | 300 | V1 | 02 | V1 |  | 5／13 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | $3 / 5$ | 1 | 1 |  | 12750 |
| 7 | WENCEKP年rick | 6 | 4 | 5 | 80 |  |  | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 11 |  |  |  | 2723 |
| a | THELEPTMUF Girstoph | 6 | 16 | 23 | 70 | 0 n | 0 | 1522 | 1／n |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4 |  | 1 |  |  | 2.0150 |
| 11 | OLMOCRF Hodgar | 6 | 14 | 32 | 44 |  |  | 15 |  | 45 | 1／1 | 821 | 1 |  | 1 |  | ${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | 3 | 12／5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4．1646 |
| 12 | HENEVETTER Svis | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 43825 |
| 13 | CIFIS TDPAERSENS unstion | 6 | 9 | 22 | 41 |  |  | $0 / 1$ |  |  | 1／1／ | 820 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 5 |  | 4／1 | 1 | 1 |  | 2.1545 |
| 14 | ORCETZIPatrick | 6 | 13 | 20 | 4 |  |  | 12 | 7／43 |  | 55 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 2 | 32102 |
| 16 | LICHILEN Carsian | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 12129 |
| 19 | STRCEE Martin | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0／1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1158 |
| 20 | SPRENOER Cirdian | 6 | 14 | 36 | 83 |  |  | V1 | 9n1 |  | 44 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 23825 |
| 21 | KALFMWNN Lian | 6 | 23 | 50 | 48 |  |  | 38 | 12 | 35 | 0\％ | 1633 | 3 |  | 4 |  | 11 | 3 | 9／7 |  |  | 2 | 403.10 |
| 24 | Heah Mehad | 6 | 12 | 24 | 50 |  |  | 23 | 0 n | $3 / 3$ | 1／1 | 6／18 | 5 |  | 2 |  | 12 | 1 | 4／4 | 1 |  | 2 | 45046 |
| Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 156 | 292 | 59 | 1500 | 75 | 33154 | 3055 | 11／15 | 2105 | $48 \cdot 123$ | 20 | 2 | 29 | 0 | 60 | 20 | 41／2 2 | 19 | 10 | 17 | 6.0000 |


| N。 | Name | $\begin{array}{c\|} M \\ P \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | All Sawes／Sheta |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 3ives | Suda | 8 | 7 mP | Into | 1 mmC | Wing | ET | F8 | 9m | 9m\％ | NS | NS\％ |
| 12 | HENEVETIER Sivis | 6 | 58 | 177 | 33 | 2／n2 | 17 | 10／43 | 505 | 39 | 502 | 3360 | 48 | $18 / 74$ | 24 |
| 16 | LICHILEN Camsan | 6 | 16 | 59 | 30 | 19 | 33 | $4 / 11$ | 30 | 12 | 0 V | 721 | 33 | 820 | 36 |
| Tolata |  |  | 74 | 230 | 22 | 3n5 | 20 | 1451 | 894 | 411 | 509 | 4090 | 44 | 2698 | 27 |

Attacks

| Team | All |  | Phayer Majorty |  | Player Minarity |  | Pavitont Atacka |  | F8 |  | Hd．FP |  | TeamFB |  | то | T0\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | OiRem． | 8 | O／REL | 8 | CWA崖 | \％ | OVAEL | \％ | O／PREL | 8 | OiPRe | 8 | O／REL | 8 |  |  |
| QER | 159／223 | 4 | 13／30 | 43 | 19／43 | 41 | 135205 | 48 | 2128 | 75 | 14ヶ6 | 83 | 7／22 | 39 | 69 | 21 |

## Defence set－up



In the 6－0 set－up of the team GER the LW will always play BL and the LB will be in the position OL．
The BL will therefore always go pretty deep as will the PM who defends in the position IR．

There is a single switch between the specialist and the LP．

The main task of the defence specialist \＃4 ROGGISCH is to cover the line and close the gaps．And this leads to the weak point：If ROGGISCH leaves the line there will be huge space for the opponent＇s LP．

## Offence set-up



The offence set-up shows two players in every position but there is a clear number 1 on every position the clearest is RB and LP.

The LP will play in offence set-play only as the defence specialist will be part of the fastbreak play.

## Offence moves



The RW sweeps inside with the ball and passes on to the PM who - in a countermove - goes for crossing with the RB.

Shot of the RB from the centre or pass to the PM who simultaneously has moved into the open space behind IR and IL.

Identical start of the move.
The RB does not go for crossing but waits for the ball and with the ball he starts an outside move.
From this move against throwing arm he shoots over the LP who strictly held his position.

The weak point is that the RB is forced to shoot since there is no other option left because the IL will go deep to cut the pass back to the PM.

## Play vs a 5+1 defence set-up



After the inside sweep of the RW without the ball the PM initiates crossing with the ball with the LB.

The LB then will do a re-pass to the PM now in the position LB and this one will pass on immediately to the RW who had used the deep move of the BR to find the line behind this player.

If the OR closes against the RW the PM will pass on to the LW in the corner.

Quite simple move - continuous parallel thrust in the back row and forcing the OL to tackle.

Pass on to the RW.
The other solutions are pretty risky- the shot from a fast outside move as well as the pass to the LP.

## Play 5-6



The LW will start an inside move with the ball and play a diagonal pass to the RW on his inside move.
There will be a first crossing with the ball of the two wing players and after that the RW will launch another diagonal pass to the LB.

The LW will follow the pass flight to the centre and with the RW continuing the inside move a 3-2 situation can be created for the LB.

Play 7-5


In the dying seconds of the match vs SRB and 1 goal down GER had a free throw.

They brought in the extra player \#13
CHRISTOPHERSEN on the position PM and two LPs.

With the LP giving the ball to the RB both LPs moved to the line and the striker on LB \#21 KAUFMANN came in in full speed.

Because of the triple threat the BC hesitated with the tackle and the extra player scored the equalizer.

This EURO 2012 was a real roller-coaster-ride for GER. They started with upset loss vs CZE and then they were lucky because CZE failed miserably in the following matches and that brought the team GER to the main round with 4 points after a very lucky win over MKD and a good match vs SWE.
They started the main round with an utmost lucky draw with SRB after having trailed almost all the match between 2 and 6 goals behind. And that was the last point they gained in this tournament.

At the end of the day all the parameters show that GER has played more or less the same game like they did in the Euro 2010 when they finished $10^{\text {th }}$.
Still they are based upon a good defence and solid goalkeepers but the offence play is too simple by far and the entire load of initiative is burdened on the PM.
The weakest point in offence is the lack of any alternative in the position RB; other teams like DEN, FRA and POL sometimes MKD even will bring in a righthander in this position in order to give a different situation to the defence.
And with that the solutions become too schematic as you could see in the examples shown above. Alternatives in most cases are very risky and may cause loss of the ball.

Therefore in order to achieve better rankings GER has to look for "gamblers" to add them to the good fighters and workers they have in order to make their game more surprising and less predictable.

## SLO－Slovenia <br> After 7 Games

Coach：DENEC Boria
Time outs： 10 Avg．Time outs： 1.4

| No | Name | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{M} \\ \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | Tetal |  |  | Al Coala／Shots |  |  |  |  |  |  | Puniahmerta |  |  |  | Ollance |  |  | Delanos |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Couls | Thata | \％ | 7 mP | Ims， | 6 mC | Wing | ET | F⿴囗十⺀⿺𠃊⿻丷木⿴囗十 | 9m | YC | AC | 2M | 2＋2 | AS | ［ 77 | TO／TF | ST | HS | $P 7$ |  |
| 4 | MIRCANCIC David | 7 | 9 | 10 | 90 |  |  | 22 |  | 44 |  | $3 / 4$ |  |  | 3 |  | 3 | 1 | 4／5 |  | 2 | 1 | 221.13 |
| 5 | Oceel sex dra | 7 | 8 | 10 | 80 |  |  | $0 / 1$ | 45 | 1／1 | 22 | 1／1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1／1 | 1 |  | 1 | 15347 |
| 6 | Puceul Pater | 7 | 5 | 8 | 81 |  |  | 44 |  |  | 12 |  | 1 |  | 6 |  |  |  | 11 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2.1145 |
| 7 | Brumen Matiaz | 7 | 5 | 7 | 71 | 12 | 50 |  | 4.4 |  |  | $0 / 1$ | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 11 |  |  |  | 12914 |
| 8 | BEZİAK Marko | 7 | 3 | 8 | 50 |  |  | 1／1 | 12 | 1／1 |  | 02 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1 | 5／4 | 1 |  |  | 5410 |
| 10 | OCLENEC Jun | 7 | 30 | 47 | 64 | 45 | 80 | 44 | 24 | 10／11 | 13 | 920 | 5 |  | 7 |  | 18 | 3 | 10／4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 454.42 |
| 11 | SKUEE Sabastian | 7 | 18 | 22 | 58 | 0 0， | 0 | $3 / 4$ | 19 | 87 |  | $9 / 17$ |  |  | 1 |  | 15 | 16 | 8／3 |  |  |  | 23339 |
| 12 | SkOF Garad | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 44828 |
| 13 | SPLEA Dwid | 7 | 14 | 30 | 47 | 12 | 50 | 113 | 12 | 810 |  | 3／13 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 4 | 2 | 9／8 |  |  |  | 204.42 |
| 18 | PqOET Pimas | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21857 |
| 19 | ZMIEJ Mina | 7 | 15 | 21 | 71 |  |  | 12117 | $0 \cdot 1$ |  | 33 |  | 3 | ， | 9 |  | 4 | ， | 3／4 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 43050 |
| 20 | ZMIEJ Luka | 7 | 30 | 41 | 73 | 23 | 87 | 58 | 1322 |  | 10， 0 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 8 | 1 | $2 / 1$ | 3 | 2 | 2 | 512.12 |
| 22 | cheER Mami | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 8 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 5 | 5 | 2.52 .10 |
| 23 | ZOAMPN Uras | 7 | 19 | 30 | 63 |  |  | 1／2 | 12 | 15／15 | 09 | 24 | 3 |  | 2 |  | 43 | 13 | 11／8 | 1 |  | 2 | 51020 |
| 25 | MACVOVSEX Borut | 7 | 3 | 5 | 60 |  |  |  | $1 / 1$ | 1／1 |  | 1／3 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1958 |
| 30 | OAJC Drapan | 7 | 48 | 67 | 72 | 1928 | 88 | 22 | 12．79 | 1／1 | 14，76 | $0 / 1$ |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 2／6 | 4 |  | 2 | 52754 |
|  | Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tolata |  | 207 | 312 | 㒸 | 2741 | 88 | 35＊＊ | 40.85 | 4751 | 3139 | 2770 | 23 | 2 | 41 | 0 | 103 | 41 | 59／46 | 18 | 15 | 24 | 70000 |


| No | Name | $\begin{gathered} M \\ P \end{gathered}$ | Total |  |  | AI Save／Shots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 3eves | Thasa | \％ | 7 mP | Ins | 6 mc | Wing | ET | F⿴囗十 | 9m | 9mis | NS | NS\％ |
| 12 | SKOF Garad | 7 | 87 | 211 | 22 | 3／15 | 20 | 423 | 2151 | 2／13 | 527 | 3277 | 42 | 2722 | 29 |
| 16. | P90ST Pimaz | 7 | 32 | 102 | 2 | 08 | 0 | 2／12 | 1192 | 08 | 1／13 | 1820 | 62 | 1350 | 28 |
| Tolata |  |  | 99 | 311 | 22 | 323 | 13 | 8440 | 2883 | 219 | 840 | 501006 | 47 | 40174 | 28 |

Attacks

| Team | All |  | Phayer Majorliy |  | Player Minarity |  | Panition Amacka |  | FB |  | Ind． 用 |  | Team FB |  | T0 | 10\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0／6en． | \％ | OMEL | \％ | 0．A星 | \％ | O／Rer | \％ | Q／ber | \％ | $0 \times 10$ R | \％ | O／R4L | \％ |  |  |
| 820 | 207／208 | 52 | 2\％／41 | 69 | 2887 | 42 | 178350 | 50 | 3148 | 85 | 58 | 8 | $28 / 42$ | 22 | 103 | 28 |

## Defence set－up



Like GER this team plays in 6－0 with the LW as BL going very deep．
The RW as OR is very aggressive too constantly looking for steals．
The PM stands OL in defence．
There is a single switch of the specialist with the LB．

They play very tight in the centre and with excellent legwork they go for fastbreak with every given chance．

## Offence set-up



## Offence moves



Play 5-6


Dr. W. Pollany - May 2012

Rush in of the LW with the LP standing wide.
Then continued parallel thrust.
If there is any chance for direct breakthrough they will take it, if not they will continue as shown.
This move will be played flip-flop sometimes.
Remark: the 1-1 action will take place on 8 m approx. it is done here on 10 m to avoid confusion only and make the picture clearer.
All the play is directed by the PM. Usually they go very close aiming for breakthrough in the first place.
They are all very fast in the 1-1 move and try to play an extremely fast ball.

Main tactical means is the parallel thrust after an explosive 1-1 start in most cases continued up to the wing.

Very efficient move.
PM \#23 ZORMAN goes to the line after his pass to the RB.
The RB does a long inside move by this pulling the IR and passes on to the LB in the full straight inside move.
\#13 SPILER does an explosive switch of the direction as soon as he receives the ball and aims for breakthrough.

If the OR shall come for the tackle he will pass on to the LW.

## Play 6-5



Rush in of the LW during passing PM - RB.
With the LW in position a double give\&go action is started by PM and RB to pull the OL.

Diagonal pass by the PM to the RW follows.
If the OL does not move inside short pass to the RB will lead to direct breakthrough.

The young team of SLO played very fast and they were a positive surprise of this Euro 2012. The weak point in their game was the turnover play which was not half as good as their fastbreak play.
Because of their attempt to play a very fast ball and their style of going very close for the 1-1 action they had the most technical faults of all the teams. And from that losses of ball a high number of makes resulted by opponent's fastbreaks.

They had the best shot percentage at $66 \%$ but on the other hand they allowed most shots on target in defence. This was influenced of course by suffering the most suspensions of all teams, an average of 6 per game.
GK played very well too and the same applies to ZORMAN in the first place. He played a great PM appearance totally unlike from what he is allowed to play in his club.
In the team he is the boss and all actions are directed by him.
All in all SLO clearly seems to be on their way up and if they manage to decrease the figures in suspension and in ball losses in the first place they will perform even better in future championships.

## MKD－FYR Macedonia After 7 Games

Coach：SHUNDONSK Zaerko

| No | Name | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{P} \end{gathered}$ | Tobal |  |  | AI Coala／Shata |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pundahmerts |  |  |  | Otlanta |  |  | Delanta |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Oodia | Sida | $\%$ | 7 mP | Inse | 6mC | Wing | ET | FP8 | 9 m | YC | AC | 2 M | $2+2$ | AS | F7 | TOMTF | ST | BS | P7 |  |
| 3 | MANHSWOVDeian | 7 | 4 | 5 | 80 |  |  | 1／1 | 22 |  | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 4704 |
| 5 | STCILOV Stajunche | 7 | 27 | 34 | 79 |  |  | 2228 | 34 | 1／1 |  | 1／11 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 8 | 12 | 15 |  | 3 |  | 32827 |
| 1 | RLUSHONSKISIew cha | 7 | 23 | 38 | 64 |  |  | 34 | 1120 |  | 8.11 | 1／1 |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6．0144 |
| 7 | LAZAROV Kinl | 7 | 61 | 114 | 54 | 2228 | 85 | 74 | 22 | 03 | 6．7 | 2468 |  |  |  |  | 30 |  | 11／1 | 2 |  | 2 | 6.0452 |
| 8 | MITKOCN Watho | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 13100 |
| 9 | JONOVSVO Ras | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1.1953 |
| 10 | RNGELOVSMEranidion | 7 | 4 | 8 | 50 |  |  |  | 22 |  | 1／1 | $1 / 5$ | 2 |  | 2 |  | 1 |  | 3／2 |  | 5 | 4 | 22723 |
| 11 | TEMELHON Madimir | 7 | 15 | 22 | 63 |  |  | 1／3 | 9.14 |  | 55 |  | 2 |  | 5 |  |  | 1 | 1／1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 55157 |
| 13 | MA以LONSV Fif | 7 | 14 | 20 | 70 |  |  | $2 / 4$ |  | 67 | 12 | 57 | 2 |  | 3 |  | 13 | 6 | 5／4 | 3 | 2 |  | 45156 |
| 14 | MAFOCEK 1 Walios | 7 | 2 | 2 | 100 |  |  | 1／1 |  |  | $1 / 1$ |  | 5 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 2 | 2 | 25844 |
| 15 | MOUSOENZIatio | 7 | 2 | 2 | 100 |  |  |  | 1／1 |  | 1\％ |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 12 |  |  |  | 2459 |
| 18 | AB TOVSK0 Berko | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 0， |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |  | 5 |  |  |  | 6.0358 |
| 18 | MOUSONSKNaumehe | 7 | 22 | 48 | 44 | 29 | 67 | 49 |  | 44 | 22 | 10／28 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 15 | 3 | 9170 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4.1453 |
| 19 | OMOVSW Vands | 6 | 5 | 7 | 71 |  |  | 56 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | $2 / 4$ |  |  |  | 4722 |
| 20 | ANGELOV Pidre | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3923 |
| 23 | LAZAROV Filp | 7 | 8 | 14 | 43 |  |  | $3 / 4$ |  |  |  | $3 / 10$ |  |  |  |  | 9 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  | 12725 |
|  | Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tolaba |  | 185 | 311 | 92 | 2429 | 83 | 4928 | 30146 | 11／15 | 2433 | 45120 | 20 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 88 | 22 | 42120 | 23 | 20 | 20 | 70000 |


|  |  | M |  | Tobal |  |  |  |  |  | All San | ／Sh |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | Niante | P | 3avea | Sida | \％ | 7 mP | Tren | 6 maC | Wing | ET | FP8 | 9m | 9m\％ | NS | NS\％ |
| 18 | ASETOVSKO Borlo | 7 | 81 | 230 | 岳 | 6，17 | 35 | 13449 | 1494 | $8 \times 3$ | 1028 | 30770 | 43 | 35115 | 30 |
| 20 | ANCELOV Pitra | 7 | 11 | 31 | 爯 | 02 | 0 | 1／8 | 27 |  | 13 | 713 | 54 | 3／13 | 23 |
| Talab |  |  | 94 | 203 | 妥 | 6．19 | 32 | 1495 | 17／43 | 838 | 1191 | 3878 | 43 | 39131 | 30 |

## Attacks

| Team | All |  | Payer Majorty |  | Player Minarity |  | Panition Remacka |  | FB |  | hid．Fir |  | Team FB |  | то | 10\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | O／RE．E． | $\%$ | O／RaL | \％ | QA晨． | $\%$ | O／Rat． | \％ | O／Rert | \％ | Q／Rer | \％ | OVALL | \％ |  |  |
| MK0 | 14／486 | 52 | 43／70 | 61 | 1433 | 42 | 159317 | 50 | 2439 | 87 | 913 | 20 | 17／38 | 感 | 71 | 20 |

## Defence set－up



The basic set－up is a 5－1 with the RW on BR and the RB on OR．
There is a triple switch in the centre；the specialists substituting PM，LB and LP．

The backs will play to 9 m in any case； sometimes there will be a fast switch to a 3－2－1 set－up．

The BC will go for immediate substitution as the two other will be part of the fastbreak play．

## Offence set-up



This is the basic set-up resulting from the triple switch.

Sometimes there is a double switch only with \#13MIRKULOVSKI coming in the position PM and \#18 MOOJSOVSKI taking the LB position.

The wings and \#7 K. LAZAROV are hardly substituted.

## Offence moves



Double crossing in the back row supported by an inside move of the LP.

Played very frequently to bring the main striker in firing position.


Inside rush by the RW against ball flight.
The BL is forced to tackle the main striker because this one will shoot; now OL is behind the LP and does not stand any chance for defending.

If the IL should tackle the PM is ready to receive the ball in his support move and will fire a fast ground shot or will go for the breakthrough.


Very simple move in which the LP uses the forward move of BR to demark into the open space and receives the ball from the striker on the inside switch.

This move is played on either side without any remarkable preparation. The LP will always be ready to receive the ball and terminate.

PM passes to LB and moves on to the line.
LB moves inside with the ball.
If the defence stays flat he will pass on to the $R B$ in an inside swing for the shot or the pass to the LP.

If the defence goes deep against the RB he will launch the diagonal pass to the RW.

A very unusual move and therefore most difficult to defend against it.

Straight rush-in of the LB after passing to the PM. The PM passes on to the RB and swings outside.
Now the RB will come on his regular inside swing with the ball and aims for the shot over the double screen by LP and LB.

The two additional options are shown here; if the OL moves in there will be a diagonal pass for the RW.
If the BC should go deep for the tackle there will be the pass to the LP.

MKD was another big surprise of this EURO 2012.

But we have to be accurate and serious. So we have to state that their final ranking was a combination of good play in several games but on the other hand they took a lot of profit from the configuration and the sequence of the matches.
With SRB being already through to the semi-finals before their last game in the main round SRB like in the preliminaries vs SVK did not play with full effort. With this win MKD jumped for rank 3 in MR 1. If this had not been the case their final ranking would have been $9^{\text {th }}$.

This does not mean to bring them down or deny that they played a good tournament; we just have to make clear that their final ranking could raise hopes for the future that might not be possible to fulfil.

The basis for their good game was their very good defence work. The triple substitution worked fantastic they did it so well that they managed to create a positive balance in the fastbreak play. And once they had their set-up standing it was pretty difficult to score against the very flexible formation with a GK behind them whose percentage was the second best of all.

In the offence play they put most of their chips on Kiril LAZAROV of course but it would be false to forget to mention the brilliant performance of the LP \#5 STOILOV. He scored 27 goals out of 34 shots and received another 12 penalty shots.
And all the others really performed quite well riding high on the cheering of their fabulous supporters. For them it was as much a home event as it was for SRB. And still they played with very good discipline in terms of behaviour as well as in terms of game plan.

## ESP－Spain <br> After 8 Games

Coach：RNERA Valero
Time outs： 13 Avg．Time outs： 1.6

| No | Name | $\begin{array}{\|c} \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | Al Coala／Shota |  |  |  |  |  |  | Puniahmerts |  |  |  | OMAnom |  |  | Delanta |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Coula | Toda | \％ | 7 mP | Ins， | 6 mC | Wing | ET | F⿴囗十⺀⿺𠃊⿻丷木⿴囗十 | 9 m | YC | AC | 30 | 2＋2 | AS | F7 | TO／TF | ST | ［85 | $P 7$ |  |
| 1 | HONERAOOS disiduvier | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 40916 |
| 2 | ENTRERAOS Abarto | 8 | 13 | 37 | 感 |  |  | 1／1 | 14 | 33 | 19 | 728 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 17 | 2 | 8／3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 32138 |
| 3 | QUFEINDO Eluando | 8 | 12 | 17 | 71 |  |  | 173 | 55 | 45 | 0 0， | 23 | 4 |  | 3 |  | 10 | 13 | 8／2 | 2 |  | 3 | 44222 |
| 5 | MAOUEOA day ga | 8 | 15 | 23 | 59 |  |  | 35 | 45 | 23 | 0 0， | 8／12 | 1 |  | 8 |  | 13 | 1 | 3／7 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 338．45 |
| 8 | TCMHS Vidtor | 8 | 21 | 31 | 63 |  |  |  | 1321 |  | 8，70 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 4／2 | 2 |  | 1 | 35540 |
| 9 | ENTRERAICS Rail | 8 | 17 | 4 | 44 |  |  | 25 | 12 | 23 | 39 | 928 | 2 |  |  |  | 11 | 1 | 5／4 | 3 |  | 3 | 33347 |
| 11 | SARMENTODİnial | 8 | 18 | 2 | 62 |  |  | 48 | 1／1 | 45 |  | 917 | 1 |  |  |  | 11 | 5 | 4／6 | 1 |  | 2 | 300.07 |
| 12 | SEERAA Jose Manual | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 35044 |
| 13 | HOUNAOHLOE Jum | 8 | 17 | 23 | 74 |  |  | 1520 | 0.1 | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 15 | 219 |  |  |  | 32325 |
| 14 | QAACA R A berto | 8 | 20 | 30 | 87 | 8.71 | 73 | 011 | 5／11 |  | 77 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 4／3 | 3 |  |  | 4.0023 |
| 15 | UCHDE Cristian | 8 | 18 | 5 | 72 | 0 0， | 0 | $1 / 2$ | 12，17 |  | 55 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 43934 |
| 17 | OHAOA duan Artionio | 8 | 11 | 21 | 52 | 02 | 0 |  | 8 8， |  | 34 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 33003 |
| 18 | ROMEAOIMar | 8 | 28 | 40 | 尔 | 1925 | 78 | 34 | 1／7 |  |  | 3／10 |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1 | 3／1 |  |  |  | 11157 |
| 21 | CANELAS Joan | 8 | 28 | 2 | 87 | 7，10 | 70 | 58 | 1／1 | 1／2 | 29 | 10／17 | 2 |  |  |  | 10 | 2 | 4／3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 31518 |
| 24 | MOAROB Wian | 8 | 2 | 4 | 50 |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |  | 5 |  | 2 |  | 7 | 1 | 2／2 | 4 | 13 | 8 | 338.13 |
| 30 | OUAROICLA Catean | 8 | 8 | 8 | 100 |  |  | 44 | 1.7 |  | 39 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2／1 |  | 7 | 1 | 20650 |
|  | Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tolats |  | 224 | $3{ }^{2}$ | 61 | 3449 | 69 | 3957 | 5985 | 1823 | 34.44 | $48 / 111$ | 5 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 102 | $4{ }^{4}$ | 48146 | 24 | 28 | 24 | 80000 |


|  | Name | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | All Saxea／Shats |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No |  |  | Sanes | Thasa | \％ | 7 mP | Treso | 6 mmC | Wing | ET | F⿴囗十⿴囗十⺀⿺𠃊⿻丷木斤丶 | 9m | 9m\％ | NS | NS\％ |
| 1 | HOMERADOS disidiovier | 8 | 43 | 160 | 27 | 1／10 | 10 | 431 | 1494 | $2 / 19$ | 623 | 18／43 | 37 | 2034 | 24 |
| 12 | SEGRA Josan Manual | 8 | 48 | 142 | 22 | 2115 | 13 | 920 | 222 | $2 / 15$ | 724 | 1737 | 48 | 2003 | 30 |
| Tonas |  |  | 89 | 30 | 2 | 325 | 12 | 1300 | 2956 | 434 | 13，47 | 3380 | 41 | 40150 | 27 |

## Attacks

| Team | All |  | Player Majpeliy |  | Player Minarity |  | Paxition Amacla |  | FB |  | hid．FPB |  | Team FB |  | T0 | 10\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | O／Rem． | \％ | OMel． | \％ | O．A． | \％ | $0 \times \mathrm{Re}$ ． | \％ | O／Rent | \％ | $0 \times 10$ | \％ | 0／6al | \％ |  |  |
| ESP | 224／435 | 51 | 33／9 | 60 | 419 | 21 | 1903繇 | 49 | 3450 | 68 | 70 | 78 | 27／41 | 施 | 94 | 22 |

## Defence set－up


！

Very aggressive 6－0 with two specialists in the very centre．
All the four players in the middle go very deep \＃24 MORROS will cover an extreme range．

This set－up was more effective than the 5－1．


This style of 5-1 had been shown at the euro 2010 for the first time.

This year it has changed a little: There is only one defence specialist in this set-up and the OL and OR will stay between 6 and 8 m only.

For the concept and the moves of the point please refer to the analysis of Euro 2010, p.7.
But there is some further development that you will see below.


If the PM or the LB of the opponent team is in possession of the ball, the basic 5-1 set-up will be switched into a 3-3.
The LP will be doubled not to let him move towards ball side.
This is played on either side.
Sometimes, if the RB has made use of the dribbling already this set -up will be used on nonball side in order to force the lefthander to risk an unprepared shot.

Both the 6-0 and the 5-1 have been played approx. $50 \%$ of the time each. In this tournament the $6-0$ seemed to be more effective than the $5-1$. We will have to wait for the future development of both.

## Offence set-up



When the 6-0 defence was played there was a double switch for the LP and the PM.

If the 5-1 set-up was used there was a single switch for the LP only and the PM will be OR in defence.

There was a lot of flux in the position LB which did not seem to work so well.
Besides that the positions were pretty clear.

## Offence moves



With the pass PM - LB the LW sweeps inside for the BL.

The LB starts the parallel thrust continued by the PM but the RB will start a countermove simultaneously that will give the chance either for a shot through the gap between BL and IL or even for a breakthrough.
This move will frequently start with the PM in position LB aiming for a direct pass to the LP or looking for pick\&roll.

As mentioned above the PM will frequently start from LB-position; shown here on a 5-1 defence.

If the point does not tackle the PM will continue with a diagonal pass to the RB thus giving the identical effect.

Sometimes the LP will stand between OR and BR at the start but the move will be the same.

Application of the basic wing sweep vs the aggressive 5-1 of FRA.

The LW will stop the rush for the position BL and swing back for a pick against the point to offer the PM free running lane towards throwing arm.

This will create a 4-2 superiority for the offence and the PM will solve the situation according to the moves of the two separated defence players.

ESP showed the most convincing performance of all the teams until the end of the main round. They played very well in defence where they were the only team having two completely different concepts at hand. They played a good offence with the second best shot percentage at $62 \%$. And still they did not make it for a medal again. At the end of the day two factors killed their hopes:

First of all they had the weakest turnover play of all teams allowing an average of 8 shots on target from fastbreak to the opponents. That means that together with HUN they had the worst fastbreak balance of the competition.
This was a surprise because in the Euro 2010 they had surprised by showing a new forechecking concept (please refer to the respective analysis page 37) that was very efficient. This approach has not been seen at the EURO 2012.

And second just like in Austria at the Euro 2010 their GK denied them a better result. The percentage of the GK was $29 \%$ the second weakest of the tournament. The problem was the inconsistency - they had phases of brilliant saves and then again phases when they did not touch any single shot. These ups and downs were too much in the end.

But in some respect I do think that the main focus of ESP lies on the 2013 WCh on home soil and we are looking forward to what additional ideas this very creative nation will present then and there.

## CRO－Croatia <br> After 8 Games

Coach：00UZA Sliwho
Time outs： 15 Avg．Time outs： 1.9

| No | Name | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M} \\ & \mathrm{P} \end{aligned}$ | Total |  |  | AIL Coala／Shots |  |  |  |  |  |  | Puniahmerta |  |  |  | OMlanos |  |  | Delenos |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Couls | Thasa | \％ | 7 mP | Inso | 6 mmC | Wing | ET |  | 9m | YC | AC | 3 M | 2＋2 | HS | F7 | TOMF | ST | BS | $P 7$ |  |
| 4 | BALIC ivano | 8 | 8 | 13 | 62 |  |  | 22 | 0 n | 55 |  | $1 / 5$ | 1 |  | 1 |  | 18 | 5 | 11／1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 23137 |
| 5 | OUVNLAKDemaga | 8 | 13 | 34 | 34 |  |  | 1／1 | 14 | 44 | 02 | 727 | 3 |  | 4 |  | 23 | 4 | $11 / 4$ | 5 | 8 | 4 | 45942 |
| 6 | LACHOCVIC Elazanio | 8 | 32 | 58 | 57 |  |  | 22 | 2A | 99 | 1，7 | 1840 | 2 |  |  |  | 15 | 3 | $4 / 5$ |  |  | 2 | 32406 |
| 8 |  | 8 | 25 | 37 | 66 |  |  | 45 | 0 n | 77 | 34 | 11／20 | 3 |  | 4 |  | 14 | 3 | 7／4 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 52024 |
| 9 | VCAIligor | a | 18 | 27 | 67 |  |  | 1017 | 22 | 1／1 | 5\％ |  | 4 |  | 1 |  | 9 | 7 | 3／8 | 2 | 1 |  | 53020 |
| 10 | COUJN Lakav | 8 | 2 | 4 | 50 |  |  |  |  | 1／1 | 13 |  | 3 |  | 4 |  | 2 |  |  | 3 | 8 | 3 | 23748 |
| 12 | LOEEAT Werio | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12152 |
| 13 | HOFNATZlatio | 8 | 17 | 24 | 71 | 1／1 | 100 | $0 / 1$ | 8n3 |  | 89 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 24515 |
| 14 | VukOwic Drago | 8 | 5 | 7 | 71 |  |  | 22 |  | 1／1 | $0 \cdot 1$ | 23 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 6 |  | 1／2 |  | 4 | 3 | 20548 |
| 17 | BA TINOVIC Hvop | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | $0 \cdot 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1323 |
| 20 | BaCAUC Damir | 8 | 4 | 12 | 39 |  |  | $0 / 1$ |  | $1 / 3$ |  | 38 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 4 |  | $2 / 2$ | 1 | 1 | 3 | 14938 |
| 21 | BUNTIC Denis | 8 | 19 | 3 | 54 |  |  | 33 | 39 | 78 |  | 821 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 11 | 4 | 13 | 1 |  | 3 | 2.42 .11 |
| 25 | ALILONIC Mílio | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 838.08 |
| 28 | STRLEKManual | 6 | 17 | 23 | 74 | 0 n | 0 |  | 8 811 | 1／1 | 8,10 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 21853 |
| 27 | cupic ivan | 8 | 42 | c | 78 | 2428 | 92 | 011 | 12，${ }^{\text {\％}}$ |  | 8，70 | $0 / 1$ | 1 |  | 1 |  | 5 | 1 | $3 / 3$ | 1 |  | 2 | 50342 |
| 28 | MUSA Zalion | 8 | 1 | 4 | 25 |  |  | 113 |  |  | $0 \cdot 1$ |  | 2 |  | 4 |  | 2 |  | 1／6 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 14538 |
| 29 | NWCEVIC Nan | 8 | 13 | 23 | 57 | 1／1 | 100 | 113 | 48 | $1 / 2$ | 89 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 3 |  | 1／3 |  |  | 3 | 45337 |
| Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tolata |  | 218 | 3 외 | 00 | 2429 | 20 | 28／41 | 40.84 | $38 \cdot 4$ | 3358 | $48 / 123$ | 2 | 0 | 28 | 0 | 213 | 2 | $48 / 46$ | 19 | 30 | 42 | 80000 |


| No | Name | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline M \\ p \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | All Smea／Shots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Sevas | Thata | \％ | 7 mP | Imes | 6 mmC | Wing | ET | F⿴囗十 | 9m | 9m＊ | NS | NS\％ |
| 12 | LOEEATWurio | 8 | 12 | 59 | 29 | 3n8 | 19 | 25 | 04 | 03 | 15 | 820 | 30 | 2／12 | 17 |
| 25 | ALILOMC Mirin | a | 80 | 240 | 33 | 828 | 31 | 14441 | 1746 | 1／24 | 524 | 3579 | 44 | 32／111 | 29 |
| Toma |  |  | 92 | 298 | 31 | 1142 | 28 | 18／48 | 1750 | 1／27 | 829 | 41／92 | 41 | 34123 | 28 |

Attacks

| Team | All |  | Pイayer Majpeliy |  | Player Minarity |  | Panition Amacka |  | FB |  | hid．FPB |  | Tam FB |  | TO | T0\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q／Rem． | \％ | $0 / \mathrm{ALL}$ | \％ | 0．A需 | \％ |  | \％ | Q／Rer | \％ |  | \％ | O／bat | \％ |  |  |
| CRO | $2181 / 422$ | 51 | 30，52 | 59 | 14／3 | 40 | 178360 | 49 | 33818 | 61 | 78 | 8 | $31 / 54$ | 57 | 91 | 22 |

## Defence set－up




## Offence set－up

Dr．W．Pollany－May 2012


## Offence moves



PM starts crossing with the ball with \#4 BALIC in the position LB.
The LP will simultaneously sweep inside as will the RB with short delay.

According to the reaction of the defense there are two options for the pass

- Forward moving defense leaves the LP uncovered;
- Flat defense gives way for the shot of the tall lefthander.

From the identical set-up they launch a doublecrossing move which will give BALIC two options in the end

- Pass to the LP on his inside move
- Diagonal pass to the PM who will aim for breakthrough

If the OL tackles there will be continuation to the RW.


After initiating passes PM - LB the PM will start an explosive move against throwing arm side and aim for breakthrough.

If BR and IR together should block this attempt he will play a backhand pass to the LB on a fst inside swing.

The LB will fire a fast jump shot over the LP who will screen the IL.

This move will be played flip-flop as well.

The very common basic move has been extended by CRO with an inside sweep of \#27 CUPIC.

The LP with the ball now can continue the move with the standard pass to the RB or he can play the ball to the RW on the inside move.

## Move vs 5-1 (ESP)



Specific move vs the 5-1 of ESP.
LW passes to LB and moves to the corner. With this the LP starts his long run.

The LB pushes straight and launches a diagonal pass to the RB on his full inside sweep.

Besides a possible chance for the shot there is an option for a diagonal pass to either corner wing.

## Play 6-5



The traditional concept of CRO in the 6-5 play.
Crossing followed by a diagonal pass to the LB on his inside swing pulls all the defence away from the LW who will receive the counter diagonal pass from the LB.

CRO use to play this concept to either side for several years now.

CRO clinched their third medal in a row at EChs and remain a solid factor in the very top of world handball.
Again they had the second best defence in terms of allowing shots on target, they had good goalkeepers and a strong offence.
They had the third best balance in the fastbreak play mainly because of excellent turnover play.
There was no real surprise in their game since they still play their well known but well rehearsed moves and concepts both in offence as well as in defence.

One thing though is important to mention - KOPLJAR who had been a promising lefthander two years ago left this image as a talent and proved to be a full scale factor of the strong squad. The most impressive thing was his progress in defence work.

All the other main actors are well known, two good wings on either side, two playmakers, LACKOVIC still around. The only risk position might be the LP in case of an injury of VORI because there does not seem to be a full proposition for substitution yet. This has to be monitored in the future as well as another sub as a PM in case BALIC should not be able to keep his level any further.

## SRB－Serbia <br> After 8 Games

## Coadt：VUKOVC Veserin

Time outs： 15 Avg．Time outs： 1.9

| No | Name | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \mathbf{M} \\ \mathrm{P} \end{array}$ | Total |  |  | AIL Coala／Shots |  |  |  |  |  |  | Puniahmarts |  |  |  | OMlanos |  |  | Delanom |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Conils | Shata | \％ | 7 mP | mas | 6 mm | Wing | ETT | F⿴囗十 | 9m | YC | AC | 3 M | 2＋2 | 43 | F7 | TO／TF | ST | BS | P7 |  |
| 1 | MARLANHCC Drapan | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2.1433 |
| 5 | SESUM Zarko | 8 | 10 | 24 | 42 |  |  | 37 |  | 44 |  | 3／13 | 2 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 3／2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 23104 |
| 6 | VU．JIN Marko | 8 | 29 | 72 | 40 | 35 | 80 | 49 | 12 | 47 | $1 / 1$ | 164혀 |  |  |  |  | 8 | 1 | 3／3 |  |  |  | 35150 |
| 7 | NKCEVIC Ivan | 8 | 23 | 30 | 77 |  |  | $1 / 3$ | 11／14 | 1／1 | 10：11 | $0 / 1$ | 2 |  | 2 |  | 3 | 2 | 14 | 3 |  | 2 | 80938 |
| 9 | MANOLOMC Niwa | 8 | 4 | 9 | 44 |  |  | 1／1 |  | 1／2 |  | 28 | 6 | 1 | 9 |  | 6 |  | 1／2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 33915 |
| 11 | TCESOC Nam | 8 | 11 | 18 | 61 |  |  | 11／17 |  |  | 0.1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 3 | 4 | 11 |  |  | 4 | 33955 |
| 12 <br> 18 | STANIC Darko | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 4 |  |  |  | 54500 |
| 13 | LUC Mamir | 8 | 34 | 72 | 47 | 14，77 | 82 | 45 | 29 | $1 / 2$ |  | $13 / 46$ | 4 |  | 3 |  | 17 | 6 | 6／2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 45951 |
| 15 <br> 17 | MARFOOMC Dotarivgie | 8 | 4 | 9 | 44 |  |  | 1／2 | 38 |  | 0 n |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1／3 | 1 |  |  | 150.15 |
| 17 |  | 8 | 20 | 30 | 67 |  |  | 33 | 14.23 |  | 34 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 4 | 1 | $2 / 2$ | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8．4447 |
| 18 | STOKOVIC Aaske | 8 | 9 | 12 | 75 |  |  | $9 / 11$ |  | 1／1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 2 | 16 |  | 3 | 2 | 23125 |
| 20 | RNuC Mamir | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |  | 03 |  |  |  | $0 / 1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |  |  |  | 18.17 |
| 21 | FOCST ADINOMC Milas | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 |  |  |  | 13 |  | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 37.07 |
| 22 | BELIWNSNO Ejan | 8 | 1 | 3 | 绍 |  |  | $1 / 3$ |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 3 |  | 2 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 31959 |
| 23 | Vuchowl Panad | 5 | 5 | 9 | 58 |  |  |  | 1／1 | 1／1 | 1／1 | 28 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 13 |  | 3 | 1 | 14750 |
| 25 | cutura Dalibar | a | 12 | 2 | 41 |  |  | 3／10 | 1.1 | 58 |  | $3 / 10$ |  |  | 3 |  | 14 | 4 | 10／7 |  |  |  | 30833 |
| 28 | STANHOMC Inan | 8 | 10 | 20 | 50 |  |  | 1／1 | 1，7 | 33 | 1／1 | 4／14 | 1 |  |  |  | 4 | 1 | 1／3 |  |  |  | 21948 |
| 31 | Nendocic matar | 5 | 3 | 9 | 33 |  |  | 24 | $0 \cdot 1$ | 1／1 |  | 03 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 3255 |
| Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tolata |  | 178 | 354 | 50 | 1722 | 77 | 4379 |  | 2230 | 18.21 | 43／147 | 22 | 1 | 28 | 0 | 80 | 23 | $33 / 44$ | 17 | 18 | 27 | 80000 |


|  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |  | Al Sm | ／Sher |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 。 | Name | P | 3avas | Thas | \％ | 7 mP | Ins， | 6 mc | Wing | ET |  | 9m | 9m\％ | WS | NS\％ |
| 1 | MARLANUGC Dragan | 8 | 22 | 74 | 30 | 3 n 2 | 25 | 4／17 | 4， | 25 | 28 | 716 | 44 | 10／34 | 28 |
| 12 | STANIC Darko | 8 | 84 | 200 | 42 | 4174 | 29 | 1737 | 1732 | 3／13 | 524 | 3890 | 48 | 3712 | 45 |
| Tolats |  |  | 106 | 274 | a | 728 | 27 | 21.54 | 2148 | 518 | 732 | 4598 | 47 | 47120 | 39 |

## Attacks

| Team | All |  | Phayer Majortiy |  | Player Mincrity |  | Panition Remacka |  | FB |  | Hed．Fir |  | Team FB |  | то | 10\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Q／Rem． | $\%$ | Q／al | \％ | OA龺． | \％ | O／Rer | \％ | O／ber | \％ | O／Rer | \％ | Q／bal | \％ |  |  |
| SP日 | 178／398 | 46 | $27 / 47$ | 57 | 12739 | 38 | 160360 | 44 | 1628 | 57 | 29 | 67 | 14／25 | 5 | 77 | 20 |

## Defence set－up



SRB play a very flat 6－0 with tall inner block and moving sideways very well thus closing the gaps against breakthrough．
There is a single switch only for the RB in offence at the start but when the second PM is brought in there will be a double switch．

The LP will always be doubled up to give no way for pick \＆roll or for passes．

Wing players move far inside leaving wing shots to the GK in the first place．

## Offence set-up



The wings are rarely substituted; for the RB there is a constant switch with the specialist as it is for the second PM \#25 CUTURA who will not play in defence.

## Offence moves



After the inside sweep of the RW the PM will start an explosive move for breakthrough against throwing arm side.

From this move he will also launch a short bounced pass to the RW at the line.

If both solutions are blocked by the defence the PM will do a short backhand pass to the LB who will find a double screen for his shot.


The PM passes on to the RB and goes for an empty crossing with the LB.

With this pass the LW will rush in and the ball will go back to the LB for a shot from the centre. If the shot is not possible the LB will pass on to the PM.

The PM from position LB will start a breakthrough move towards throwing arm side pulling the BR from the LP.
So there is another option for a short bounced pass to the LP.

## Move vs 5-1



Transition by the LB following the ball flight.
The RB will sweep in with the ball in a countermove in order to pull the point.

Diagonal pass to the PM on his outside swing continued with breakthrough or pass to the LP.

The host team had the best defence only allowing 34 shots on target by the opponents on average per match and had the GK with the best saving percentage.
So they ended up with an astonishing 21 makes per match only - a remarkable figure.
Their turnover play was very good and therefore their fastbreak balance is nearly equalized. And they did not give to many easy fastbreaks to their opponents by having the second lowest figure in ball losses.

The first principle of the defence was to deny breakthroughs so they stood extremely flat and beside this they used to double up the LP. The position from which shooting was accepted was the wing position on either side knowing about the strength of their GK in this situation.

On the other hand their offence play was the weakest of all participants with the lowest shot percentage by far.
They played with very high discipline in all the offence actions and managed to play very long offence sequences. Of course there was some home advantage on their side in this respect but not more than usual in championships.

A huge surplus was the support of the crowd of course that seemed to bring them on the wave of flow and carry them to the final. And although we have to take this home advantage factor into consideration there was clear progress in their game compared to the Euro 2010. This progress was marked by an enormous increase in the discipline of all the players personally as well as in terms of tactical behaviour.

## DEN－Denmark <br> After 8 Games

Coach：mLBex urik Time outs： 14 Avg．Time outs：1．8

| No | Name | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & M \\ & P \end{aligned}\right.$ | Total |  |  | Al Coala／Shots |  |  |  |  |  |  | Puniahmerts |  |  |  | OMence |  |  | Delanion |  |  | TP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Oodis | Snada | \％ | 7 mP | Ins | 6 mmC | Wing | ET |  | 9 m | YC | RC | 2 M | 2＋2 | HS | \％ 7 | TOMTF | ST | ES | P7 |  |
| 1 | LTNDN JHCOESEN RELIEA | 8 | 1 | 1 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  | $1 / 1$ |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 73823 |
| 2 | MOCensen Thama M． | 8 | 18 | 44 | 41 |  |  | 54 | 02 | 58 | 45 | 421 | 4 |  | 2 |  | 9 | 3 | 4／2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4．4443 |
| 3 | CHAISTHNSEN Mads | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |  |  | $0 \cdot 1$ | 011 | 0.1 | 0／1 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 11827 |
| 8 | LIUJE SCHMDT Rastua | 8 | 18 | 37 | $4{ }^{4}$ |  |  | 54 | 35 | 38 |  | 718 |  |  | 1 |  | 11 |  | $3 / 5$ |  |  |  | 223.04 |
| 9 | CHAISTMNSEN Lara | 8 | 14 | 2 | 58 | 58 | 83 |  | 5，10 | 1／1 | 38 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 11 | 1 |  | 1 | 31454 |
| 10 | MAFMOSSEN Nimaid | 8 | 7 | 21 | 39 |  |  | 33 |  | 02 |  | 4／18 |  |  | 1 |  | 7 | 1 | 14 |  |  | 1 | 114.09 |
| 11 | EGGERT JENSENAndiars | 8 | 30 | 9 | 77 | 13， 7 | 76 | 1／1 | 89 |  | 10，12 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 406.17 |
| 13 | SPELEABERO Bo | 8 | 8 | 14 | 57 |  |  | 1／4 |  | 48 |  | $3 / 4$ |  |  |  |  | 8 | 5 | 8／2 |  |  | 1 | 13901 |
| 17 | SVANHANSENLASom | 7 | 7 | 13 | 54 |  |  |  | 8172 |  | $1 / 1$ |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 11 | 2 |  |  | 13333 |
| 18 | LNDEERO Hans | 8 | 29 | 48 | 63 | 22 | 100 | 1／1 | 15.27 |  | 11／78 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 2 | 3 | 14 |  | 2 | 2 | 828．44 |
| 19 | TOFTHANSENAind | 8 | 13 | 13 | $6{ }^{6}$ |  |  | 11／16 | $1 / 1$ |  | 12 |  | 4 |  | 5 |  | 2 | 2 | 2／2 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 52452 |
| 20 | CLEVEPLYMa Mas | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2137 |
| 22 | SONDERTMALSARIP Kapir | 8 | 13 | 30 | 4 |  |  | 27 | 19 | 1／2 |  | 978 |  |  |  |  | 13 | 4 | 3／8 |  |  | 2 | 22820 |
| 23 | TOFTHANSEN Hinnt | 8 | 12 | 13 | 22 |  |  | 910 |  |  | 33 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 4 | 6 | 11 | 4 | 4 |  | 23828 |
| 24 | HANSEN Midual | 8 | 45 | 42 | 51 |  |  | 6174 | 25 | 78 | 33 | 27뇌 | 5 |  | 1 |  | 30 | 1 | 11／4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 70528 |
| 28 | NELSEN Koapar | 8 | 1 | 3 | 39 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | $0 / 1$ | 8 |  | 8 |  | 2 |  | 11 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 35002 |
|  | Team |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Tolata |  | 216 | 398 | 54 | 2027 | 74 | 4472 | 20.75 | 21／34 | 3 3952 | 54138 | 28 | 0 | 25 | 0 | Q | 27 | 30／29 | 21 | 24 | 24 | 80000 |


| No | Name | $\begin{gathered} M \\ p \end{gathered}$ | Total |  |  | All Saves／Shots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Sawas | Thasa | \％ | 7 mP | Tres | 6 mc | Wing | ET | F⿴囗十 | 9m | 9m＊ | NS | NS\％ |
| 1 | LNDON JMOCBSEN REIGA | 8 | 105 | 298 | 38 | 724 | 29 | 2247 | 1297 | 522 | 990 | 5093 | 54 | 39746 | 27 |
| 20 | CLEVEPLYMȧas | 8 | 4 | 17 | 24 | 02 | 0 | 27 | 12 | $0 / 1$ | 0.1 | $1 / 4$ | 25 | $3 / 10$ | 30 |
| Tolata |  |  | 102 | 310 | 采 | 728 | 27 | 2494 | 1339 | 529 | 931 | 5197 | 53 | 42／156 | 27 |

Attacks

| Team | All |  | Pイayer Maperity |  | Player Minarity |  | Panision Amacka |  | FB |  | Ind．Fir |  | Team FB |  | то | 70\％ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | O／Ren． | \％ | 0／8al． | \％ | O．4． | \％ | O／Re． | \％ | O／Rers． | \％ | O／Rat． | \％ | 0／bal | \％ |  |  |
| DEN | $216 / 422$ | 51 | 32／51 | 63 | 14／3 | 40 | 178368 | 49 | 3 395 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 22／48 | 70 | 69 | 18 |

## Defence set－up



DEN had changed their system from 2010 as sometimes there is only one defense specialist playing now if \＃2 MOGENSEN will be on court．If he is out，the second specialist \＃3 CHRISTIANSEN will stand as BR．

The LP on IR will not go so deep but both backs go more deep than in previous competitions especially on non－ball side in order to fight diagonal passes．
MOGENSEN will go extremely deep from either position and therefore is used as a very specific tactical tool to fight the main striker of the opponent．

## Offence set-up



The first row is very clear in the set-up.
As for the others \#24 M. HANSEN will be LB most of the time when he is on court, \#22 SÖNDERGAARD will remain on RB strictly.
\#2 MOGENSEN, \#8 LAUGE SCHMIDT and \#13 SPELLEBERG will all appear in the position PM but in all the other back row positions as well.

## Offence moves



A very easy and therefore characteristic move for this team.

PM starts running fast against throwing arm side pulling by this the BR as he receives the ball in full speed.

Now parallel thrust is continued to the LW.


DEN extended the basic move mentioned in "General trends" by an additional inside sneak of the LW.

The result will be a screened shot by the LB or shot by the LW from the line after a pass by the LB.


Played vs GER with three righthanders in the back row.
\#2 MOGENSEN passes to the PM and moves to the line. The PM goes for a crossing move with the ball towards the LB.

From this move he will launch a short bounced pass to MOGENSEN or complete the crossing with \#24 HANSEN who will shoot from the centre.

Tailor-made move vs GER 6-0.
As the LP takes position with the BL the LW in this position cannot go deep as usually.

PM starts crossing with the ball with LB; after that the LB passes on to the tall lefthander who pushes in an inside move.

This brings a forward move of \#4 for the block or the tackle thus giving huge rooms for an inside move of the LP that cannot be prevented.

## Moves vs 5-1

DEN - MKD


Transition of the RB after pass to the PM.
PM passes on to the LB so the point moves with the ball. Because the PM has started for a give go move the point rushes back to cover the centre.
Now the LB starts for the second give go move and finds the chance for a screened shot over the RB at the line.


DEN - ESP


## Play 6-5



A characteristic move for the team DEN in man advantage.

Wide crossing with the ball between PM and LB plus support move of the lefthander on RB pulls all the defence to the middle.

Long diagonal pass to the RW in the corner.
If OL should stay in position - short pass and breakthrough of the RB.

DEN is the first European Champion coming up from a start of the main round without any points. They had a terrible preliminary round with losing two matches in the last three minutes of the game. Then they played a pretty good main round and still owed it to the Polish team with their win over GER that they made it to the semi final. In this semi final they had to face another last three minutes nightmare when the Spaniards equalized from trailing by three goals but they made it in the end. And they managed to succeed against the high flying home team in the final.

At the end of the day there is a list of factors why this gold medal was well deserved:

- Their GK was the second best of the tournament (14 saves per match - 35\% in total) equalizing a defence performing only on average.
- The offence fired most shots on target and they improved clearly with the best score of the main round of all teams at 31-27.
- They had the third best turnover play and together with the fastbreak performance that gave a positive balance in the fastbreak play.
- And they had the lowest figure in ball losses by far at an average of 8.5 per match only.

Finally they had the squad with the most versatile back row resulting in the most creative offence play of all the teams at the tournament. With three players being able to take over the full load of a PM; two very efficient strikers on LB; a 1-1 specialist and an extremely tall lefthanded striker on RB they had more options than all the other teams by far. And they made use of it.

So for the next big tournaments to come there will be a fierce battle between DEN, CRO and ESP together with FRA who will come back for sure. Not to neglect ISL if all should be on deck and well and SLO and.......

