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1. Introduction

The event took place from 26 Jan – 5 Feb in the cities of Bern and Sursee (preliminaries only), St. Gallen and Basel (preliminaries and main round) and Zürich (final stage).

The organisation and the set-up of the venues was excellent, the commitment and the passion of all the volunteers and other people involved in the event was fantastic.

At many matches the halls were packed and the atmosphere was just great, unfortunately the host team did not make it to the main round so this meant a set back for the matches of main round 1 in Basel in terms of audience and atmosphere. All the other matches of main round and final round were sold out and the venues crowded.

Media coverage was excellent, in total more than 800 journalists were listed for accreditation to give a full scale coverage in writing, photos and broadcast. For details please check the specific media report which will be issued in short time.

The quality of the matches could stand against the high level of organisation and public interest. We had a lot of very good performances, some of the matches were brilliant although it was very difficult for the teams to play up to 8 matches in 10 days only.

And it was not only the level of the players that was outstanding but we can be proud to state that the performance of the referees and the appearance of the officials met the high demands of the event as well.

Due to the excellent cooperation between the responsible persons of both the organiser and the EHF and the readiness of all the people involved in the project the 7th European Championship for Men really brought a step forward in terms of popularity, increasing quality and acceptance of handball. This is of high importance in our days of increasing pressure on all the team sports to maintain grounds not only in the field of sports but in the whole context of social environment of people in general.

Thanks a lot indeed to all who contributed.
2. Some statistical parameters of interest

Table 1. FINAL RESULTS OF EUROPEAN CHAMPIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>ESP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>YUG</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>DEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>ISL</td>
<td>CRO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>YUG</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>RUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>POR</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>ISL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BLR</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>SCG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>ROM</td>
<td>LTU</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>POR</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>SCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>YUG</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>POL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ROM</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>ISL</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>NOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>POR</td>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>MKD</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>SUI</td>
<td>UKR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SUI</td>
<td>ISL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>POR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By looking at this table you will see that 5 of the first 6 nations remained unchanged. It is only defending world champion ESP to replace the 2004 host SLO.

Furthermore, no newcomer made it to the championships, for NOR it was the second entry, SUI and POL had their third, UKR and ISL fourth, HUN, POR and SCG competed for the fifth time, DEN and SLO for the sixth.

And the teams who made it for all the seven championships – FRA, ESP, CRO, GER and RUS – all were classified among the top 6 teams.

This seems to indicate a three level league of performance in Europe in general.
Table 2. 2004 – 2006 Match of the team parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cm/04</th>
<th>cm/06</th>
<th>kg/04</th>
<th>kg/06</th>
<th>Age/04</th>
<th>Age/06</th>
<th>IM/04</th>
<th>IM/06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>190.3</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>192.9</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>189.9</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>186.8</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>195.4</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISL</td>
<td>190.5</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLO</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCG</td>
<td>189.4</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>192.1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>190</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>193.9</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark: From now on we will deal with the top 12 teams only.

Some direct statements to be taken from this:

1. Body indices are very much alike among the teams – the height is from 191-193 and the weight of 6 teams is 92 – 93. ESP, SLO and FRA are heavier, funny enough the tallest team UKR at the same time is the lightest.
2. DEN and NOR are very much alike and a little different from the others. Shorter (190) and older (29) with many matches (81 and 86).
3. The range of age is very narrow 27-28. Only ESP played on from 2004 with the identical team almost, all the others became slightly younger, some of them are less experienced now due to the lower figures of international appearances.
4. This IM-parameter seems to be an indicator for the performance since the first four teams of the championships are listed 1st, 3rd, 5th and 6th in a ranking of IM figures.
Table 3. Match dynamics and development of scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>total average</th>
<th>1st halftime</th>
<th>2nd halftime</th>
<th>development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>27-32</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>12-16</td>
<td>Off. - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>30-30</td>
<td>14-16</td>
<td>16-14</td>
<td>Off. / Def. +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>27-33</td>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>14-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISL</td>
<td>32-32</td>
<td>15-14</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>Off. + / Def. - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>30-29</td>
<td>15-13</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>Def. - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>32-28</td>
<td>16-14</td>
<td>16-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRO</td>
<td>29-29</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>16-15</td>
<td>Off. + +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>32-29</td>
<td>15-13</td>
<td>17-16</td>
<td>Off. + / Def. - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>32-29</td>
<td>16-14</td>
<td>16-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>31-24</td>
<td>16-11</td>
<td>15-13</td>
<td>Def. -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The total score has increased from 2004 (29-26).
2. Scandinavian teams tend to stronger offensive play in the second halftime.
3. ISL, RUS and DEN show much less effective defence play in the second.
4. FRA is a little less effective in the second overall.
5. The top five run better scores than the others in general.
6. FRA represented a class of their own in this event.

The Danish and French figures might be seen due to the fact of tournament dynamics with taking down efforts in the second in case of a clear lead, whereas the ISL and RUS figures resulted in the loss of decisive matches.
General Trends

High speed game – high scores
All the teams tried to initiate fast-break play with every win of ball possession. This does not mean that they tried to go all the way but at least they tried to bring the ball deep into the opponents’ half of the court as fast as possible.

In the same moment all the teams aimed for fast throw-off although the very same applies to that situation. There was only the German team who was very serious in trying to score from fast throw-off immediately, the other teams just used it for speeding up the game in the first place. So the fast throw-off has become a very regular element of the game of all the teams.

The result of this was a clear incline of active playing time thus resulting in high scores just by eliminating dead times in the game.

The second factor for the speed game is the fact that all the teams cut down their preparation in set-play. There are three to five passes only before termination linked to transition play or fast parallel thrusting. Sometimes crossing without the ball is used as initial action.

In general we just see 2-2 or 3-3 actions, team tactics have vanished completely.

All the top teams showed remarkable progress in turnover play. DAN and FRA held their opponents at 2-3 scores from fast-break in all their matches. In the close games of high quality this factor has become a success-deciding parameter.

Defence characteristics
All the teams have their specific basic defence system, most of them play 5-1 or 6-0, but they all have very different interpretations. The 5-1 of the team CRO for instance is far away from the 5-1 of the French team. The same applies to the 6-0 of GER and ESP.

In general the systems have diversified, almost every top nation has a very unique realization of the schematic figures. Therefore it is necessary to be more accurate in the analysis and in seminars or other lectures on defence systems.

From this basic system every team has at least one additional system at hand for specific situations. In 6-5 all the teams try to be more active in defence and put more pressure on the shorthanded offence team thus using more aggressive systems like 4-2, 5+1 or 4+2 even.

The Scandinavian teams confronted RUS with a tailor-made defence set-up that found them extremely vulnerable.

A 2 players switch offence-defence has become the most common procedure but the character of the switch has changed. The defence specialists do form a double block in the set-up, in most cases they will play back centre and half back on one side.

The playmakers of the teams will stay on court in defence set-play. In most of the teams they will stand on the position LO (Left-outside) since they are right-handers. In a few teams they will play point (SCG). They control the play in fast-break now as well as in set-play.

Therefore they have to stay on court since the teams will start for fast-break with every turnover immediately.
Fast-break play
All the teams play first wave with one or two players very fast and very determined. Second wave follows immediately, all the six players go for fast-break. There is no substitution in this stage of the game, the specialists are included in the first and second wave. Only after stopping the fast-break for any kind of reason the specialists go for substitution. In this stage of the game all the teams try hard to prevent the defending team from organising a set-play defence.

Different from the past the transport of the ball is carried out by one player only in most cases. The running lanes of all players are clearly defined, the guy carrying the ball does not have to look for team-mates since he knows their defined positions on the court, he can focus his attention upon the positions of the defence players.
This gives the basis for fast play based on fast decision making.

Offence set-play
The most common offensive action was transition play 3-3 to 4-2. In most cases done by rushing in of a wing player, sometimes we had diagonal moves of backs too. In 6-5 play some teams had their playmaker to do this move. After this transition very short play in small groups took place, 2 on 2 or 3-3 very similar in most of the teams.

From the 4-2 set up one player started a 1on1 action (more than 80% towards throwing arm) and tried to create a man advantage situation as fast as possible. The aim was to open a gap for breakthrough for the next player or creating a chance for firing a fast shot through this gap.

If the defence should move up to challenge, the line-player will run behind them immediately following the move of the ball. For this move of the pivot only very little room was necessary. The pivots were able to manage this action with only one step of the defender from the line. The combination of hard firing strikers and fast moving pivots is the most effective instrument in offence set play at this moment.

Two more characteristic elements could be seen: Short crossing of wing and back on one side followed by a diagonal rush-in of the wing after that or a short move of the wing towards 6m trying to build up a screen for the back who moved inside again from the wing position in a semicircular move.

Another solution that was very common with many teams was a very long move towards throwing arm side in order to fire a shot from the so called “wrong side”.

Goalkeepers
In general the performance of all the goalkeepers was on a very high level all throughout this tournament.

The most impressive improvement in performance could be seen in 1on1 actions against free shots. Due to fantastic anticipation and (obviously) very good scouting the goalkeepers managed a lot of saves in that particular situation. Team ISL who came on really strong obviously suffered from less effective performance of their goalkeepers in the 1 on 1 situation, especially in case of wing shots and penalty shots.
Behind the defence one could monitor a certain basic system with all the keepers, in this respect explosive jumps and going fast down to low targets were much more likely than static play. But this basic system was altered according to specific situations or against specific opponent teams. The top keepers had two or three different systems at hand which they applied on the respective situations.

Most of the teams had a clear #1 keeper and a #2, only the team DAN seemed to have two guys on an equal #1 mode. Expressive systems in terms of switching the keepers could not be seen.

All the goalkeepers aimed for an extremely fast and accurate outlet pass, the level of which was very, very high. This passes could be done in all different ways according to the situation: short, medium, long – all of them very fast, the shooting ability of all the goalkeepers was amazing.

General findings in terms of probability of success
The level of the turnover play is a clear indicator for success. The two teams with the best performance in this parameter won gold and bronze.

In general there is a huge progress in the quality of the turnover play. Running lanes are defined and in most of the teams 3-4 players are nominated to slow down, fight and stop the fast-break. Many teams were able to do that so good that they could even switch their specialists and still not suffer from a make.

A second parameter that goes along with success is the number of faults in ball handling. A lower number in wrong passes and miss-catches makes it more likely to win the game. Other technical mistakes like steps or passive play do not have any real influence on the outcome of the game.

Teams with a long bench are more likely to succeed in the tournament. Teams that had to play with a limited number of players only suffered from weariness in the second half of the tournament. With this we have to discuss the implementation of one more rest day at least since the final four teams had to play 8 matches in 10 days in total. This packing up the physical load has to be reconsidered obviously.

Some more statements
The performance of the referees was very good indeed. The former problems with the application of progressive punishment and advantage have decreased to a minimum. Passive play that had been a drag for some time gave no troubles at all. After some deficiencies at the start of the Euro 06 the application of direct red card improved a lot and was accepted.

As the referees did a good job the same applies for the teams. There was no problem with discipline on the court, no suspensions were necessary for misbehaving. The mutual respect of the players was immense and since the matches were very tough no brutality had to be prosecuted. In fact this was a very clean Championship and the dramatic change in the habit of the players was represented by D. Dinart / FRA in the best way. He became a MVP in terms of defence coordination, no ugly play, no stupid fouls, in fact he made his way through the event without suspensions even.
And this trend might be seen as the most welcome of all the trends of the Euro 06. We are on a very good way to improve the image and polish the shield of sportsmanship in handball.

Unfortunately we have to state that the gap between the first row of teams and the others has become wider due to the system of qualification which makes it very difficult to find entrance for teams who failed to qualify for one or two times. It is very difficult to find partners for relevant matches to close up again, so most of them fall behind.

This is the backside of the shining medal of the Euro 06 that brought the best final tournament for several time and progress in almost all of the relevant parameters for the quality of our sport.
## Qualitative Analysis Euro 06 Switzerland

The top 12 teams

### UKRAINE

7th MEN’S EUROPEAN HANDBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

EURO2006

### Cumulative Statistics

#### UKR - Ukraine

**After 5 Matches**

*Coach: KUSHNYUK Sergiy*

### Time outs: 1  Av. Time outs: 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Ass.</th>
<th>Def.</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>VT</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>SH3</th>
<th>SH4</th>
<th>SH5</th>
<th>SH6</th>
<th>SH7</th>
<th>SH8</th>
<th>SH9</th>
<th>SH10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Attacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Foul</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
<th>FO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Legend

- **3**: Goal / Shots
- **6**: Save / Shots
- **W**: Wing
- **D**: Defense
- **F**: Foul
- **B**: Block
- **V**: Vertical
- **P**: Point
- **T**: Total
- **VT**: Vertical Total
- **TR**: Total
- **TO**: To %

---

### Notes

- w., pollany – march 2006

---

10/56
Defence set-up

Basic system was a 5-1 with 1 specialist, in the 6-0 they used a double-switch. In case of 6/5 they played more open 5-1.

Due to an injury of one of their goalkeepers in the very first match they had to play with 1 keeper only throughout the rest of the tournament which was an obvious disadvantage.

Defence with very good blocking.

GK performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12 / 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 27 average 4.5

Offence set up

Regular 3-3 with very few alternatives. This seems to be the reason for the set-back in offensive play in the second half time.

Offence parameters (Average per match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 / 3.5</td>
<td>3.3 / 4</td>
<td>5 / 7.3</td>
<td>5.5 / 7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many misses in fast-breaks, weak turnover play.

Offence moves
Split centre of 6-0 – Crossing with ball

PM starts crossing with the ball and continues for the line in a 4-2 transition. LP lays off the ball.

Split centre of 6-0 – Crossing without ball

PM passes to LB and goes for a 4-2 transition. LP moves with the ball, RB sweeps inside.
Two options for LB to continue.

They used to play these two moves pretty frequently and schematic. The longer the matches ran the less effective were the moves in general for a direct score. But due to the striking power of the RB and the LB even free throws resulting still gave a good chance for scoring.

The team had the problem of very few players available with high quality. Therefore whenever they were forced to additional substitutions the level of the team performance decreased.

Nevertheless they never gave up and showed high fighting spirit and went on to the very end with all their effort regardless of the actual score.
Defence set-up

Basic system was a tough man oriented 6-0 with double switch of the specialists.
Second system was a 5-1 with same characteristics.
In case of 6/5 they shifted to the more open 5-1.

Performance of the GK just average, blocking as well.

GK performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.6 / 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 15 average 2.5

Offence set up

Regular 3-3 with few alternatives.
The first row almost without any substitutions.
Back row with changes of positions in the first place.

Offence parameters (Average per match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 / 5.8</td>
<td>5.2 / 7.3</td>
<td>4.3 / 6.8</td>
<td>3.5 / 4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many misses in 1 on 1 situations.
Tough defence causes a lot of penalty shots.
Good turnover play.

**Offence moves**

**Move vs. 5-1**
Pressing back the point plus cut-in of LB.
Shot LB or pass to LP.

**Move vs. 6-0**
Outside move of **right-handed** RB with pass to LP or fast pass back to cutting PM with fast forearm shot.

Very straight and tough play of all the team.
Very high fighting spirit combined with excellent physical condition gave them better results in the 2nd halftime of the matches.
A lot of players with very fast forearm-shots or hip-shots.
Very good LP, pretty effective in close quarters.
# Qualitative Analysis Euro 06 Switzerland

## Poland

### 7th Men's European Handball Championship

**EURO2006**

**Cumulative Statistics**

**POL - Poland**

**After 6 Matches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach: WENTA Bogdan</th>
<th>Time outs: 9</th>
<th>Avg. Time outs: 1.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 |

| Overall | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 |

### Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Goal %</th>
<th>Fielder</th>
<th>Blocker</th>
<th>Defender</th>
<th>Power A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>100/100</td>
<td>100#</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- G: Goal / Shots
- D: Deflections
- M: Minutes
- S: Shots
- B: Blocks
- P: Power A

**Notes**

- Dr. W. Pollany – March 2006
Defence set-up

Task distribution in 6-0: #9 goes high against PM or any other player cutting in, #8 will always stay on 6m fighting the LP.

6-0 was first pick, in case of 6/5 switch to very aggressive 5-1. In the progress of the matches the 6-0 concept seemed to become more and more vulnerable.

Performance of the GK better than average, high number of shots allowed by the defence, blocking only average.

GK performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14 / 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 21 average 3.5

Offence set up

Regular 3-3 with few alternatives during the tournament due to injuries and illness. The first row almost without any substitutions. No real PM available.

Offence parameters (Average per match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7 / 4.8</td>
<td>4.8 / 5.3</td>
<td>4.7 / 7.5</td>
<td>4.8 / 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both RW with extreme low percentage in fast-breaks. Turnover play only fair.

dr. w.. pollany – march 2006
The Polish team who had qualified with an upset win against SWE could not continue with that performance. They had some troubles with injured and sick players as well as disciplinary problems before the start, so their offence seemed to be without structure. Their biggest problem was the lack of a PM, therefore the top strikers could not be loaded properly and seemed to be obstacles for one another sometimes even. All that put a strain on their psycho performance too so they never were able to reach their common level of strength and fighting spirit.
# SERBIA & MONTENEGRO

## 7th MEN'S EUROPEAN HANDBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

### EURO2006

## Cumulative Statistics

### SCG - Serbia Montenegro

### After 6 Matches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach: VIJOVIC Veselin</th>
<th>Time outs: 10 Avg. Time outs: 1.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LUKOVIC Mirko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LUKOVIC Dragan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VIJOVIC Veselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VIJOVIC Veselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>VIJOVIC Veselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VIJOVIC Veselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VIJOVIC Veselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VIJOVIC Veselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>VIJOVIC Veselin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>VIJOVIC Veselin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attractions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>All Goals</th>
<th>PIP</th>
<th>PIP M</th>
<th>Popularity</th>
<th>PoP</th>
<th>Match-2</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRB</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Qualitative Analysis Euro 06 Switzerland

Dr. W. Pollany – March 2006
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Defence set-up

Basic system was traditional 3-2-1 with a double-switch of specialists. Due to the high physical load of this kind of set-up there was a lot of substitutions.

Also traditional with double-switch.

As usual the 3-2-1 put a lot of pressure upon the opponent teams and with a lot of substitutions this team managed to have better performance in the second halftime of the matches.

In case of 6/5 they will switch to aggressive 4-2 or 4+2 even sometimes.

The performance of the GK average only, blocking was underrepresented which is only just when you play a 3-2-1 set-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GK performance:</th>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12 / 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 9 average 1.5

Offence set up

Regular 3-3 with few alternatives.
All actions are initiated by the PM #18.
No second PM at hand which gives a problem in case of suspension or injury of #18.
Offence parameters (Average per match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 / 6.1</td>
<td>3.9 / 6.1</td>
<td>2.7 / 3.7</td>
<td>5.8 / 7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very good performance of the GK in 1 on 1 situations. Surprising low figures in fast-break, especially when you consider the 3-2-1 defence set-up. Lousy turnover play. Therefore the fast-break stats are disastrous.

This team had some ups and downs. Clear losses came along with good matches and wins. Good defence was cut by disputable actions of excessive roughness resulting in injuries of some opponent players.

Their main offensive instrument was initiative by the PM followed by continuation with parallel thrust. Sometimes this was very effective due to good strikers and reliable wings, sometimes it was just too simple to be successful.

Without their PM the offence could hardly reach 50 % of the previous level. The most striking proof was the collapse vs. CRO when #18 was out with his third suspension and the team suffered from a 0-6 strike within some 5 minutes.

All in all a lot of very good individualists but with troubles to form a team.
# Qualitative Analysis Euro 06 Switzerland

## SLOVENIA

### 7th MEN'S EUROPEAN HANDBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

**EURO2006**

Cumulative Statistics

**SLO - Slovenia**

**After 6 Matches**

| No | Name                  | H | F | D | Q | A | G | G+/G- | FB | FB% | FB%L | FB%R | FB%T | FB%TL | FB%TR | FB%TRL | FB%TRL | FB%TTL | FB%TTL | FB%TTR | FB%TRR | FB%TLL | FB%TTRR | FB%TTLR | FB%TTRLR | FB%TTLR | FB%TTRL | FB%TTRL | FB%TTLR | FB%TLLR | FB%TTRLL | FB%TTLRL | FB%TTRLLR | FB%TTLRLL | FB%TTRLLR | FB%TTLRLLR | FB%TTRLLRLL | FB%TTLRLLRL |
|----|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|-----|------|------|------|-------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1  | Kosir Marjan           | 31| 10| 22| 15| 5 | 10| 10/10 | 6  | 6/6  | 1/1   | 2/2   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 2  | Rutar Marko            | 28| 10| 18| 12| 6 | 12| 12/12 | 6  | 6/6  | 1/1   | 2/2   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 3  | Perković Blaž          | 27| 10| 17| 10| 7 | 10| 10/10 | 5  | 5/5  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 4  | Kamnikšek Gregor       | 25| 10| 15| 9  | 6 | 9 | 9/9   | 5  | 5/5  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 5  | Frančič Matjaz         | 24| 10| 14| 8  | 6 | 8 | 8/8   | 5  | 5/5  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 6  | Budim Dvorčič          | 23| 10| 13| 7  | 6 | 7 | 7/7   | 5  | 5/5  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 7  | Murič Domen            | 22| 10| 12| 6  | 6 | 6 | 6/6   | 5  | 5/5  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 8  | Mihelčič Mihovin       | 21| 10| 11| 5  | 5 | 5 | 5/5   | 5  | 5/5  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 9  | Mihelčič Blažen         | 20| 10| 10| 4  | 4 | 4 | 4/4   | 4  | 4/4  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 10 | Škrlin Žiga             | 19| 10| 9  | 3  | 3 | 3 | 3/3   | 3  | 3/3  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 11 | Msič Blaž              | 18| 10| 8  | 2  | 2 | 2 | 2/2   | 2  | 2/2  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |
| 12 | Mihelčič Domen         | 17| 10| 7  | 1  | 1 | 1 | 1/1   | 1  | 1/1  | 1/1   | 1/1   | 1/1   | 6/6   | 1/1   | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    | 1/1    |

### Notes:

- **H/F**: Home/Foreign
- **D**: Dribbling
- **Q**: Quicks
- **A**: Assists
- **G**: Goals
- **G+/G-**: Goals Plus/Minus
- **FB**: Free Throws
- **FB%**: Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%L**: Left-handed Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%R**: Right-handed Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%T**: Total Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%TL**: Left-handed Free Throws Percentage of Total%
- **FB%TR**: Right-handed Free Throws Percentage of Total%
- **FB%TRL**: Left-handed Free Throws Percentage of Right-handed Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%TRL**: Right-handed Free Throws Percentage of Left-handed Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%TTL**: Left-handed Free Throws Percentage of Total Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%TTR**: Right-handed Free Throws Percentage of Total Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%TTRR**: Left-handed Free Throws Percentage of Right-handed Free Throws Percentage of Total Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%TTRL**: Right-handed Free Throws Percentage of Left-handed Free Throws Percentage of Total Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%TTRLL**: Left-handed Free Throws Percentage of Right-handed Free Throws Percentage of Left-handed Free Throws Percentage of Total Free Throws Percentage
- **FB%TTRLR**: Right-handed Free Throws Percentage of Left-handed Free Throws Percentage of Right-handed Free Throws Percentage of Total Free Throws Percentage
Defence set-up

The basic system was a very flat 3-2-1 which shifted to a 5-1 and vice versa. There were several variations of the central defence positions.
Double-switch of specialists.

Orthodox 6-0 with IR and IL flat and BR and BL going high for the approach.
Double switch as well, PM not to play in defence in this set-up

The defence set play as well as the turnover play of this team was not good at all. Especially they allowed more shots on target than any other team.
It seemed that some players had no motivation to take defence duties and so the team could not stand against the offence as a whole.

The GK played well in 1 on 1 situations but they had troubles in cooperation with the defence. Blocking was average, very low number of penalty shots against.

GK performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15 / 46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 23 average 3.8
Offence set up

Regular 3-3 with very few alternatives. All actions are initiated by the PM #18. Short crossing followed by diagonal pass or continued with parallel thrust.

Offence parameters (Average per match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 / 5.8</td>
<td>1.8 / 3</td>
<td>5.5 / 6.8</td>
<td>7.2 / 8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The performance of the 2004 silver medallist was somewhat disappointing. Especially the presentation in terms of defence work was lousy. Since they had both the lowest figures in penalty shots committed and highest figures in fast-breaks of the opponent the question of motivation arises.

Looking at their matches it seemed that some of the players focused on personal presentation and neglected the basic requirements of team play thus putting effort on the offensive activities only.

In offence play they played quite well with fast parallel thrusting and fast diagonal passes after short crossings but they could not equalize their deficiencies in the defence work.
# Qualitative Analysis Euro 06 Switzerland

## 7th MEN’S EUROPEAN HANDBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

**EURO2006**

### Cumulative Statistics

#### ISL - Iceland

**After 6 Matches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Time out;</th>
<th>Avg. Time out;</th>
<th>1:3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coach: SIGURDDSON Víggó</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Final</th>
<th>% Positional</th>
<th>% Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISL</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Blocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Final</th>
<th>% Positional</th>
<th>% Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISL</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Defence set-play

The basic system was a very flat 3-2-1 which shifted to a 5-1 sometimes. Single-switch of specialist.

Scandinavian 6-0 with triple-switch. Played vs. DEN min. 48 - 60

Versus RUS they played this tailor-made 4-1+1 trap defence. With the common move of the PM towards throwing arm they will trap the Russian players by forming a funnel in the central area. Either they will interrupt the game or they will cause a turnover directly. And with that the LW #9 will start for fast-break immediately and will not be tackled since his opponent player is the offensive specialist. This concept was very, very effective and brought an early decision in this particular game.
5-1 “Red Indian” - defence

Used vs. NOR in the second halftime to prevent the threatening loss of the game and to fight Norwegian striker STRAND (#6). Double-switch. With part-time success only.

The team showed very good performance in defence and surprised with a lot of creative variations. Due to the fact of a small number of players of equal quality and some injuries during the tournament that caused additional load for the other players they could not hold on to their high level to the very end.

The GK were not convincing in 1 on 1 situations and had the lowest overall percentage of all GK. This seemed to be the clearest deficiency of the defence play besides the practically not existing blocking.

GK performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11 / 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 8 average 1.3

Offence set up

Regular 3-3 without alternatives. The subs came in only because of injuries of the first pick player (1 match each)

3-3

Offence parameters (Average per match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 / 5.3</td>
<td>4.7 / 5.8</td>
<td>3.8 / 5.8</td>
<td>2.7 / 3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fast-break concept

Clear concept and prefixed running lanes. Two things are of interest:
LW (#9) moves far to right half of the court.
RB (#11) moves inside as a PM for the fast-break.
So the outlet pass for the GK remains identical in terms of direction.

Offence moves

Transition 3-3 to 4-2 vs. 5-1:
Sweeping in of LW with the ball flight.
LW will move inside with the pass PM – RB and get to his position when RW receives the ball.

Remark: Also played vs. 6-0 with high effectiveness.

RW brings the ball back to RB and this player thrusts. With the approach of the defender LW follows for a pick but does not roll.
Since CB is forced to move there is space enough for the LP to move.
Solutions: Shot RB, pass to LP, pass to PM.
PM will fire a fast forearm shot or Load the LP.
Play 6/5

Very easy set up:
PM passes to LB and takes his position at 6m. RB sweeps inside and receives the ball in full move.

Solutions: Shot of RB, pass back to LB and continued parallel thrust to wing (most common), sometimes fast switch against throwing arm and break-tough or pass to RW.
Extremely effective against all opponents.

The “ISIS” came on really strong with four very convincing matches straight. They played very courageous and fast unfortunately they missed a lot of fast-break chances. Their turnover play was among the best of all teams.
The point was that they used to play with 7 court players only and did their offence substitution just in case of injuries (#11 missed DEN and #15 NOR).
In the end the high physical load turned out too much and they could not fight back against NOR after their lousy luck defeat versus CRO.
A weak point was the performance of the GK who remained beyond average, so their defence struggled in the second halftime (worst of all teams with 18 makes).

Nevertheless this team played great handball and showed high fighting spirit. They demonstrated brilliant offence abilities and some great moves. Their creativity in the defence set-ups gave a good deal of contribution to the high level of this tournament in total.
Defence set-play

Modern style of 5-1, strictly man-oriented: LP on ball side – second player on non ball side goes high, point closes centre. CB stays with the LP.
Double-switch of specialists.

With the pass LB – PM the point returns to his position and the BR stays with his direct opponent thus resulting a 4-2 set-up.

If the LP is off ball-sided, all the defenders on ball-side will go high thus resulting an asymmetric 3-3 defence set up against the ball.

This kind of defence works a lot different and is very dynamic. In first halftime they had the second lowest number of makes. In the second they suffered from a clear decline which might be caused by the high level of physical load.
They are very good in approach and they will do an immediate step back in case of 1 on 1 actions of the offence player. So they prevent being passed even by stepping inside the area.
In 6/5 situation they will play 5+1 on the PM.
The biggest problem seemed to be the turnover play and if it was not for their GK who did extremely well in 1 on 1, some matches might have ended even worse.
Blocking was pretty good as usual with Russian teams.

GK performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13 / 43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 33 average 4.8
Offence set-up

Traditional 3-3 with some variations. Second pick on RB #17 is right-handed.

Offence parameters (Average per match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7m score</td>
<td>4.4 / 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7m makes</td>
<td>2.7 / 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-breaks score</td>
<td>5 / 6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-breaks makes</td>
<td>6.4 / 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Play 6/5

Very simple but effective concept: PM passes left and takes his position on 6m. LB passes on to LW in order to give PM enough time for the move. With the pass back from LW he will do the traditional move of all the Russian LB forcing the defence to reaction and loading the LP (most common solution by far).

The team played very physical and strong as long as they felt in command. They seemed to loose their line completely when they were trailing. Play both in offence and defence was very schematic and without any surprising actions. This might be due to some lack of tactical flexibility of the single players. GK unspectacular but very effective in 1 on 1.

They had the second best first half-time of all the teams but suffered from a clear decline in the second. Surprisingly their turnover play was the worst of all the teams in the tournament. Their biggest problem seems to be how to stabilize the good starting performance throughout the matches as well as throughout the whole event.
# Qualitative Analysis Euro 06 Switzerland

## GERMANY

### 7th MEN’S EUROPEAN HANDBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

**EURO2006**

### Cumulative Statistics

#### GER - Germany

**After 7 Matches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>BRAND Hainer</th>
<th>Time outs: 7</th>
<th>Avg. Time outs: 1.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final</strong>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### All Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>All Games/Goals</th>
<th>Final:</th>
<th>Time outs: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Spread</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alleged

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Alleged/Goals</th>
<th>Time outs: 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Spread</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table

#### GER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>GER 2012</th>
<th>G1 1505</th>
<th>G2 2055</th>
<th>G3 1405</th>
<th>G4 2555</th>
<th>G5 1205</th>
<th>G6 1955</th>
<th>G7 1705</th>
<th>G1 2255</th>
<th>G2 3255</th>
<th>G3 3055</th>
<th>G4 3255</th>
<th>G5 3205</th>
<th>G6 2455</th>
<th>G7 2655</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Chart

**LEGEND**

- G1: Goals 1st Half
- G2: Goals 2nd Half
- G3: Goals 3rd Half
- G4: Goals 4th Half
- G5: Goals 5th Half
- G6: Goals 6th Half
- G7: Goals 7th Half
- G1: Goals 1st Quarter
- G2: Goals 2nd Quarter
- G3: Goals 3rd Quarter
- G4: Goals 4th Quarter
- G5: Goals 5th Quarter
- G6: Goals 6th Quarter
- G7: Goals 7th Quarter

**Data**

- Created: 05.02.2006 18:30
- Page: 1/3
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Defence set-play

6-0

German 6-0, pretty traditional with flat centre.
Many line-violations.
Single-switch of specialist.

Second pick of their set-up.

4-2

This 4-2 set-up was used in case of 6/5 situations sometimes.
Funny enough the wing players are in flip-flopped position.

5-1

This offensive 5-1 set up was used only in very short periods.

The team played the traditional German style in defence, physical and with utmost determination. Their physical shape was excellent, they were able to keep their level of performance for all the 60 minutes.
Blocking was good, the turnover play a little shaky but that was equalized by their brilliant performance in fast-break.
GK very, very strong as usual with German teams. They only used a single-switch of the specialist but they did a lot of substitutions in the offence play to distribute the load on a larger number of players.

GK performance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15 / 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 28 average 4

Offence set-up

Traditional 3-3 with a lot of variations. Frequent switches in the back row, wings hardly substituted.

Offence parameters (Average per match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7 / 3</td>
<td>4.4 / 6.1</td>
<td>7 / 8</td>
<td>4.3 / 5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offence moves

Transition LW to 4-2.
Sweep inside of the LW with the ball flight. Additionally the PM pushes back the point before his pass to RB.
Solutions for RB:
With a short move towards throwing arm the RB will fire a forearm shot through the gap. If this is prevented by BC, there will be room enough for the LP to run and receive the ball. Parallel thrust for the wing is a further option if the BC will stop the LP from running.

Continuation to LB:
The defence played very well – the BR kept the LP from running, the BC closed all the central area, the BL did not allow the thrusting of the RB. With this the LB starts sweeping inside on 12m and receives the ball from RB. Shot, if BR approaches - pass to LP, if BC goes for the challenge - pass to rolling LW.

Pick and roll extended vs. 5-1
PM moves left for a long crossing with the ball with LB and continues for 6m. LP moves up for a pick to support this move.

Since LB has moved very far and in quite some distance from the point, this one cannot tackle – Shot of LB. If BC approaches – pick and roll. If BC stays and BL tackles – pass to RB.
The defending champion started the tournament with a draw against current world champion ESP which was more than one could have expected since they had a lot of players resigning last year and after the loss of Daniel STEPHAN they had clear problems in filling this gap on the position of the playmaker. Furthermore, Euro 06 had to be seen as a step on their way to the WC 2007 which they are going to host. Still they reached their primary goal of direct qualification for Norway 2008 and proved that they still belong to the very top teams even after a good number of personal changes. They made it due to the second best defence-goalkeeper set-up and an offence based on the most effective fast-break play of all teams and on a very good mix of excellent strikers and a very efficient LP. Their physical shape was brilliant as usual and let them overcome RUS in a very tough fight in the placement match.

The weak point seems to be the extra schematic game behaviour in defence as well as in offence which makes them predictive and thus vulnerable as demonstrated by FRA. In terms of offence this is not surprising considering the PM-problem, but funny enough they were the one and only team with one effective defence set-play at hand only. The attempts of 5-1 and 4-2 were insufficient in this tournament.

It will be very interesting to monitor the development in next years WCh in their home country.
CROATIA

7th MEN'S EUROPEAN HANDBALL CHAMPIONSHIP
EURO2006

Cumulative Statistics

CRO - Croatia

After 8 Matches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>All Games / Matches</th>
<th>Wins</th>
<th>Ties</th>
<th>Losses</th>
<th>Goals For</th>
<th>Goals Against</th>
<th>Goals Difference</th>
<th>TFT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time outs: 12  Avg. Time outs: 1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attack</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Player Efficiency</th>
<th>Player Accuracy</th>
<th>Pattern Attacks</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>Int. FB</th>
<th>Team FB</th>
<th>TFT</th>
<th>TO %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND

W16 DATA
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Defence set-play

5-1

Traditional 5-1 with double-switch of specialists. PM on position OL.

5-1 flat

Flat formation vs. FRA to close the central area. Double-switch including PM.

3-2-1 high

Alternative set-up in most of the matches. With single-switch only.

3-2-1 flat

Variation with double-switch.

6-0

Starting set-up vs. DEN.
With LW (#17) but without PM. Double-switch including PM. Both LP in central defence, one of them will go for switch.

Very creative in defence with a lot of variations, during the matches they will switch between these set-up several times with good success.
In case of 6-5 they switched to a 5+1 set-play. The most effective seemed to be the 5-1, the 6-0 was not convincing and brought an additional problem for the offence set-play since they left the successful concept of playing with two LP.

It is remarkable to point out that they left the traditional way of playing with the wingers on the second positions in the 3-2-1. On the other hand they had both their LP (#3 and #9) building up the central block in most of the set-ups. Future will tell if this is a general chance of the in-fight philosophy or if this is just due to the abilities of these players in question.

Blocking of course was not the primary aim of the defence as usual, the turnover play was only average but this was compensated by the extraordinary performance of their GK. In denying fast-breaks they were among the best when the total play of the GK was only average since they had some ups and downs.

**GK performance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13 / 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 16 average 2

**Offence set-up**

Starting set-up is 3-3 formation with two LP (#9 VORI will start on LW).

Variation with a regular LW (#17 SPREM). In offence they will play on with these 7 players only, substitution just in case of injury.

**Offence parameters (Average per match)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.4 / 5.5</td>
<td>3.4 / 4.3</td>
<td>3.5 / 5.3</td>
<td>2.5 / 5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Offence moves**
Brilliant concept vs. 6-0:
Taken the fact that a 4-2 transition is the target they start with 2 LP and let one of them sweep inside with the ball flight from LW. If there should pop up a chance for shooting over the double-screen, #6 LACKOVIC will do so. If not he will pass on to the PM and the second LP will take his target position.

First set of solutions:
#4 BALIC moves to 9m towards throwing arm thus creating a 3-2 situation in the centre. Due to his great abilities ha can fire a fast shot through the gap or do a lay-away shot against throwing arm side. If any of the two defenders will close up to him he will pass the ball to the respective LP.

Second set of solutions:
Breakthrough against throwing arm side supported by a pick of the LP. If the BR reacts perfectly – pass on to LB with shot through the gap or over the double screen.

Third set of solutions:
Continuation to throwing arm side with breakthrough or pass to the LP. Sometimes he will play a “Kempa” even with RW. If all gaps are closed – pass to the RB according to the respective move who will find his chances for shooting. If the defence comes on really strong on this side – fast diagonal pass to LB who will find a lot of space for action.

For my personal rating this is the winner of the “concept of the tournament” award. The basic idea of having two specialists on 6m and the playmaker forming the 3-2 situation in the centre of the defence is fantastic and the first set of solutions can be done by any PM in fact. For the continuation and the correct decision making in close quarters under pressure it will take an outstanding player like BALIC of course. They played it vs. 5-1 as well but then it was less striking obviously, even for this team.
Every now and then they will play a variation in order to take some of the load away from their PM.

PM will pass to RB and goes for crossing without the ball with LB. With this pass the second LP will sweep in from position LW as usual. RB passes on to RW to give extra time for the moves.

RW starts parallel thrusting which is continued as long as necessary. Both strikers will find a chance for the shot or the pass to one of the LP. With excellent defence work not permitting one of these options the ball will go on to the PM who has a good chance for a fast bounced pass to the LP. In any case he will find “clear floor” for a 1 on 1 action with a lot of space available.

The ruling Olympic champion played very well and very spectacular with an enormous range of variations both in defence as well as in offence. Although in offence you can see that the range of variations do emerge of just one clear transition concept only. Of course they will play some fast parallel thrusting and short crossings as well but the main part of the offence work was based on these individual solutions from the 4-2 set-up. Defence played well too but due to the concept of playing with one wing only the fast-break play was not as effective as known before. When they played with both wings like vs. SCG they were still deadly in the fast-break. Asking why they still did not make it for the title we have to state that playing all the tournament with 7 offence players only was too much of a load for the team. Meeting a well prepared French team after 6 straining matches had all the odds against them. Like with some other teams (ISL, SLO, SCG) their PM had to play on all the time and the second pick on this position did not get play time at all. We will come back to this in the summary later on.
# Cumulative Statistics

## DEN - Denmark

### After 8 Matches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Assists</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Foul</th>
<th>Foul During</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Block During</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Madsen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dahlberg</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nielsen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Christensen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kristensen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jepsen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Salander</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Andersen</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Time outs: 13  Avg. Time outs: 1.6

## Attacks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Foul Bag</th>
<th>Foul During</th>
<th>Defense Attacts</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEN</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEGEND

- Goal: Goal
- %: Efficiency
- Own: Own Goals
- Assists: Assists
- TP: Total Points

---
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Defence set-play
6-0

Basic 6-0 traditional style with double-switch. They played it with different players, only #14 and #9 remained unchanged. #10 will play BL as well.

5-1 high

First pick of alternating systems. Double-switch and pretty active point.
Last 20 min vs. RUS.

5-1 flat

Played vs. ISL from min 20-30. Brought them back to the play. No switch defence – offence.
### Qualitative Analysis Euro 06 Switzerland

**Starting set-up vs. RUS min 1-20.**
Dedicated to break the rhythm of the offence constantly by causing free-throws.
Double-switch.

**Played vs. RUS min 20-40.**
Adoption of the successful concept of team ISL due to the different characteristics of the players available.
Double-switch.

**Basic set-up in the bronze medal match with CRO. Double-switch.**

**Second pick in the bronze medal match.**
Double-switch.

This team was the most creative in terms of different defence set-play. Not only changing their set-up during the matches, they would also start some matches with surprising variations. Because of this they had the second best defence figures in the first half-time along with team RUS. The second factor to achieve this was their fantastic turnover play which was the very best of all the teams.

Blocking was not the main aim of their defence but they had two GK who played very well especially in terms of the defence-goalkeeper coordination. Some others were better in 1 on 1 but they did extremely well behind the set-play defence.

**GK performance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15 / 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 20 average 2.5

---
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Offence set-up

This picture is very much different from all the others. As you can see they played with 12 offence players, much more than any other team. These constant switches gave some good distribution of the physical load and resulted in the bronze medal.
DEN has to be rated as the team with the largest number of players at a certain level that allows substitutions without loss of quality.

Offence parameters (Average per match)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7m score</td>
<td>3.6 / 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7m makes</td>
<td>3.6 / 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-breaks score</td>
<td>4.9 / 6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast-breaks makes</td>
<td>2.5 / 3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Offence move

Basic concept against all defence set-plays. Most effective vs. point defences. Short crossing of RB – RW with the ball followed by sweeping inside of the RW, pass to PM and continuing for 6m position.

Fast approach of RB - pass from PM into full move. With BC going for the tackle there is room for the LP to move for the ball. If the defence closes all spaces on this side there will be a 3-2 situation on the left side of the court.
Here we see the final pass against a 3-2-1 set-play, with a 5-1 defence set-up the pass will go to the LB more likely and this one will terminate.
Transition play vs. 5-1 high. RB passes to PM and sweeps inside. PM passes on to LB who starts with a straight move towards 9m.

With a switch of direction LB now goes to 9m for a jump shot in the back of the point just over his own LP. With the BC closing the gap, LB does one dribbling from the air and continues for breakthrough.

If this is blocked by BL – bounced pass to the static LP.

If OL comes running to challenge – pass to the RW who will find huge space at hand.

DEN made it for the bronze medal hat-trick. The team was the most creative in terms of defence set-play variations, they were the team with the best turnover play and they initiated a lot of fast-breaks as well, although their reliability in scoring from fast-break was not good at all.

They were the team with the most equal playing-time distribution among the court players as well as the goalkeepers.

By means of these switches and substitutions going on constantly throughout every match of the tournament they never were really predictable and that gave a lot of problems to all their opponents.

They played fast and very disciplined with a very low number of technical faults and showed impressive fighting spirit and teamwork.
Qualitative Analysis Euro 06 Switzerland

SPAIN

7th MEN'S EUROPEAN HANDBALL CHAMPIONSHIP
EURO2006

Cumulative Statistics

E SP - Spain

After 8 Matches

Coach: PASTOR GOMEZ Juan Carlos

Time outs: 11  Avg. Time outs: 1.4

---

Attacks

Team | Country | Pts. | FG % | 3P % | FT % | FG3P | LO | 7m | 9-metre Shots | 9m | 9m % | Total 9m |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
ESP | Spain | 220 | 80.5 | 64 | 29 | 12 | 12 | 3 | 20 | 20 | 100.0 | 20 |

---

Legend:
- FG: Field Goals
- 3P: 3-pointers
- FT: Free Throws
- FG3P: Field Goal 3-pointers
- LO: Losses
- 7m: 7-meter shots
- 9m: 9-meter shots
- Total 9m: Total 9-meter shots

---

Notes:
- FG %: Field Goals Percentage
- 3P %: 3-pointers Percentage
- FT %: Free Throws Percentage
- FG3P: Field Goal 3-pointers
- LO: Losses
- 7m: 7-meter shots
- 9m: 9-meter shots
- Total 9m: Total 9-meter shots

---

Data:
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Defence set-play

**6-0  Spanish style**

Basic 6-0 Spanish style with double-switch. BL and BR will go high to 10-11m on non-ball side fight long diagonal passes. With the ball in the middle they will retreat to 7-8m.

**6-0 high against PM**

6-0 with single-switch. #18 will go high to fight the PM, #14 will stay on 6m and fight the LP.

Starting set-up in the gold medal match. Did not work due to specific reaction of the French players (see FRA).

**3-2-1**

Traditional 3-2-1 with double-switch. Man-to-man against the LP by #6. Wings stay in their position, the key positions are taken by specialists. Alternative set-play in some matches.

The Spanish defence was not convincing in this tournament. Yes, their defence figures seem to be pretty good but we do have to state that this was due to the outstanding appearance of both their goalkeepers.
The turnover play was below average, the number of shots allowed on target is beyond average and the number of penalty shots against is very low. All these parameters are indicators for problems with defence work. Besides all this the number of shots blocked is pretty low for a 6-0 set-play.
It was the coordination between the “Twin Towers” in the centre in the first place and the timing of the withdrawal of the BR and IR in the second that caused the main problems. Surprising bad legwork of the central defence seemed to be the biggest deficiency. In the 6-5 situation they shifted to a 4-2 set-up with both wings.

Both the goalkeepers played just great and covered a lot of the problems mentioned. They were brilliant in 1 on 1 as well as in saves behind the defence.

**GK performance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16 / 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 26, average 3.3

**Offence set-up**

The picture is somewhat misleading. The team did not do so many substitutions during the matches but due to the unbalanced matches in their main round they played with second seed for long periods. In some matches top players were not on the sheet even.

**Offence parameters (Average per match)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9 / 4.7</td>
<td>1.7 / 3</td>
<td>4 / 5.5</td>
<td>4 / 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the fact mentioned above the team tried to save fuel in the main round for the semi-final match already. Therefore their offence play was reduced to three elements mainly.

Very fast parallel thrusting on to the wings with the RB and LB going extremely deep and playing their pass for the wing behind their back as a standard. This forces the outside defender to move far inside and offers great angles to the wingers. This might be the best offence move of the team.

Second they do fire a lot of fast shots from distance through gaps provided by screening or blocking of the LP.

Third due to the quality of the single players they will use these actions for breakthrough or for pick-and-roll of the LP.

To sum it up this team relied on the outstanding quality of the individualists in the first place which made them very strong in the offence as long as they had a chance to play on with their rhythm.

In close matches though when teamwork and coordination was on the stake they seemed to have problems. This could be proved by the French defence who kept them without score for
12 minutes (44-56) in the final match thus extending their lead from 22-20 to 28-21 and clinching the gold.

But do not forget that it was the very team that held FRA on a disastrous 13-24 after 40 minutes in the preliminaries which shows the huge potential of the ruling world champion.
## Qualitative Analysis Euro 06 Switzerland

### FRANCE

**7th MEN'S EUROPEAN HANDBALL CHAMPIONSHIP**  
**EURO2006**

**Cumulative Statistics**

**FRA - France**

**After 8 Matches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>ONESTA Claude</th>
<th>Time outs: 8</th>
<th>Avg. Time outs: 1.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Player Quality</th>
<th>Player Quality</th>
<th>Positive Actions</th>
<th>Fr</th>
<th>Int. Fr</th>
<th>Team Fr</th>
<th>T9</th>
<th>T40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **G**: Goals / Shots  
- **%)**: Success / %  
- **E**: Efficiency  
- **Em**: Em-metric Shots  
- **7m**: 7-meter Shots  
- **Em**: Em-metric Shots  
- **Bi**: Bi-metric Shots  
- **Fr**: Fr-metric Shots  
- **RT**: Rebound shots  
- **BK**: Block shots  
- **PP**: Penalties  
- **PP**: Penalties awarded  
- **PP**: Penalties awarded  

---
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Defence set-play
5-1 French style

Basic French style 5-1 with the well-known move of the BR and BL going high on non-ball side and the point fighting every move to the centre with the ball.
Single-switch.

5-1 different set-up

This set-up changes the characteristics on the right side of the defence as shown.
OR works more aggressive and BR stays closer to the line than in the start set-up.

5-1 with double-switch

Another change in the characteristics – BR plays very high against LB on ball-side, the centre of the defence will play more flat.

The French defence was the deciding element in the Euro 06.
Based upon their specific 5-1 set-play they came out with some variations according to the situation of the matches.
Although they played tough the most impressive factor was their great ball orientation.
Players like ABATI (#18) and DINART (#3) stole almost every fumble and Dinart had a personal blocking record of 2.4 per match.
The whole defence worked very clean which can be seen in the fair play record.
Blocking was average only and so was the turnover play. This was influenced by fuel saving in matches with clear margin in the last minutes.

FRA had the best set-play defence, the best individual defence player (Dinart) and the best goalkeeper as well behind the set-play. OMEYER (# 16) was not spectacular in saving fast-breaks or penalty shots, but he had an incredible 38 % record overall.

With the second goalkeeper matching with this level team FRA made it to a total score of 31-24 in average – a clear demonstration of their defensive power that allowed 40 shots on target per match only.

**GK performance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Saves</th>
<th>Shots on target</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Average per match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16 / 40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blocked shots: total 30 average 3.7

**Offence set-up**

Starting formation in all the matches.

Variation with one left-handed player only.

In both set-ups the players of the back-row will do a lot of position switches during the set-play. In the first version there will be switch PM-LB only, in the second set-up all the right-handed players will switch.

**Offence parameters (Average per match)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7m score</th>
<th>7m makes</th>
<th>Fast-breaks score</th>
<th>Fast-breaks makes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7 / 4</td>
<td>2.7 / 3.6</td>
<td>4.5 / 6.6</td>
<td>3.7 / 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Offence moves
All these moves are based upon individual abilities and creation of a 2-2 situation with support by the LP.

With the pass of LW the LB moves straight and forces the BR to approach. With a fast switch of direction against throwing arm side he will fire a fast jump shot from 9 or 10m. Sometimes he will do a semicircular run to the middle and shoot over the screen.

LP is off the middle now – run for jump shot through the gap. In case of tackle by IR pass on to PM who will do the direction switch and breakthrough. #2 and #13 will do this in flip-flopped positions as well.

Against Spanish 6-0.
PM makes use of the slow retreat of the BL and goes for shot from 9m.
With the OL coming for the save – continuation to RW.

Penalty-killing
In 5-6 LW moves to centre and asks for the ball. LB lays off to the sideline. Very fast and determined breakthrough against throwing arm side finished by shot from 6m or pass to running LB.
The European champion 2006 based their offence play on small group tactical means. They will do a short set-up only and go for finishing immediately and with utmost determination. The players are all pretty fast and they are able to control the ball under pressure in very close quarters even. Since all the players can do this and they all go for fast termination it is very difficult for the defence to stand against this constant stress. This will cause mistakes and all the flaws of the defence will be used without mercy. Funny enough the weakest point of the French offence play was scoring from fast-break. With that exception they played pretty convincing in offence too being a well deserved champion in the end.

Some final remarks
With all the details already pointed out there are only a few final words to be said.

1. The EURO 06 brought a step forward in many directions:

   The matches became faster and thus more controlled due to individual solutions in a small group set-up.

   The turnover play has improved tremendously with many of the teams.

   Defence work became much cleaner due to outstanding performance of the referees who managed to eliminate most of the deficiencies of the past (application of advantage, progressive punishment, direct red card, passive play).

   The cooperation and the mutual respect of team officials and event officials has improved as well as the discipline in the substitution area in general.

2. Some set-backs have to be considered:

   The two groups of main round were unbalance which gave a clear disadvantage to the teams of St. Gallen. (If this could be prevented seems disputable to say the least.)

   Due to the elimination of the host team many matches in Basel lacked of audience and atmosphere.

   It seems that the mode of the qualification has created a three level population in European handball. This problem is reconsidered already and changes are in progress.

3. All in all it was a great event with great organisation and performances and for sure it was kind of a huge promotion tour for our sport in general and it was my pleasure to be a part of the whole thing.

Looking forward to Norway 2008, good luck and see you there.