



DEBUNKED: WHY GRAHAM HENRY'S CLAIMS REGARDING THE 2007 RWC ARE NOT CREDIBLE

Graham Henry's recently released book includes the revelation that Henry thought the refereeing of New Zealand's quarter final loss in the 2007 Rugby World Cup quarter final against France was so bizarre that there may have been matching fixing involved and that watching footage of the decisions in the match had made him physically ill.

Whilst the history books show that France won the match 20-18 and the penalty count was 8-2 in favour of France, Henry now claims that France committed a significant number of infringements in that match that were not penalised and that had the most obvious of those been penalised the score would actually have been no worse than 42-6 to New Zealand.

I think most people who saw that match believe that France scored the try that won them the match after the officials missed a forward pass and would therefore agree that France were lucky to win the match.

New Zealand had gone into the game as clearly the best team in world rugby having won 19 of their previous 20 internationals and they were raging hot favourites but there's never a sure thing in a two horse race as the result proved.

After the loss there was a lot of disappointment and anger from New Zealand fans. I think it would be fair to say that most New Zealand fans felt that Wayne Barnes should never referee another game of international rugby and Graham Henry should never coach New Zealand again.

At the time Henry didn't blame the officials publicly. He earned praise from most rugby fans for the dignified way he handled the situation, saying that France played well and at the end of the day New Zealand didn't play well enough to win the match. He even won an award for the way he handled that defeat in public. We now know from his book that Henry was keeping his true feelings hidden from the public as the NZRFU had told him if he revealed what he really thought he would never coach New Zealand again.

Henry's book obviously covers a lot more than just this one match but since the revelations have come out many have claimed that the statements were only included to help book sales and that Henry should have remained silent.



New Zealand sports broadcaster Murray Deaker says Henry would "regret this" and that the statement was all to do with book sales. He believes the comments will be badly received, particularly internationally.

"And what average fans overseas will say is, 'There's those New Zealanders whingeing again'. We had just gotten rid of that sort of title because we hosted that Rugby World Cup so well. So many people went out of their way to dispel the whole arrogance which has surrounded New Zealand rugby for so long."

Henry says that he had to tell the truth otherwise it wouldn't be fair to those who paid for his book.

In a recent television interview Henry agreed that the major reason New Zealand didn't win that 2007 match was the referee. Using Henry's logic Marc Lievreumont would be justified in claiming that the major reason France didn't win the 2011 RWC final was the referee. Certainly New Zealand had been the best side in the world in the four years leading up to that 2011 final, certainly they had been the best team in the tournament but in the final France outplayed them and there were numerous infringements by New Zealand that were not penalised by the referee, many that appeared to be blatant. But that's not the way our game works – France beat New Zealand in 2007 and New Zealand beat France in 2011 and nothing anyone says after the event will change those facts.

Whether Henry should have remained silent about 2007 or not is a matter of personal opinion and whilst there will no doubt be plenty of argument on that topic I'm more interested in looking in more detail about the claims Henry has made regarding the match.

If you were able to go back in time and change one decision in a series of events could you really be sure what the subsequent effect would have been on the remainder of the series of events? How could you know for sure that a penalty attempt would have been successful? How could you know that from the lineout after a penalty the attacking team wouldn't have dropped the ball before scoring a try? You couldn't so in my opinion any re-creation of the score in a game is invalid.

There are numerous infringements in every match that do not get penalised at all levels of the game. If every infringement was penalised in a match there would be very little rugby played apart from shots at penalty goal. I think a referee has to make a judgement about the impact an infringement has on a match – if there is no impact on the play, then play on.

In our game decisions are made on the run by the officials – they don't have the luxury of stopping play and going back over the footage in slow motion or frame by frame unless it's a decision regarding a try. I don't think there's much point in analysing decisions by officials post match on a different basis to the way they have to make them.



Graham Henry obviously sees it differently – he’s identified every infringement by France based on his extensive analysis of the footage which he says allowed him to conclude what the score would have been in the match – that’s some crystal ball Graham Henry has!

I hadn’t watched the match in full before Henry’s comments were reported. Sure, I’d seen the furore over Wayne Barne’s refereeing and I’d seen the highlights including the missed forward pass in France’s final try but I found it hard to believe that the officials could have been as one sided as Graham Henry now claims. When I did watch the match in full I saw plenty of mistakes made by the officials but I saw a lot more than Graham Henry claims.

I decided to examine the match in detail for myself and whilst Graham Henry only focussed on infringements by France I made sure that I considered infringements by both teams. Having completed that exercise I looked at what impact all of the decisions or non-decisions had on the match, even though I think any such re-creation is invalid.

There are two questions that I will address:

1. Even if Henry’s assessment of the infringements is correct, can he really be sure of what the outcome in the match would have been had the decisions been made differently?
2. Did the officials make the mistakes Henry claims and were the mistakes so heavily weighted against New Zealand?

If you were able to go back in time and change one decision in a series of events you couldn’t be sure what the subsequent effect would have been on the remainder of the series of events. Here are some examples of the difficulties you face in making the sorts of claims Henry has:

- If the defensive team was not penalised for stealing the ball as a result of a ruck infringement one metre out from their own line when it seemed just a matter of time before the attacking team dove over the line to score, who’s to say that if the defending team hadn’t infringed then the attacking team wouldn’t have knocked the ball on in the next phase and not scored anyway. If the penalty for that infringement had been awarded can you be certain that the attacking team would have chosen to attempt a penalty goal rather than take a quick tap in an attempt to score a try or would have opted for a lineout or scrum. Can you be certain that the goal kicker would have kicked the penalty goal to earn 3 points? Can you be certain that if the attacking team chose an option other than a penalty goal attempt that they wouldn’t have dropped the ball before they scored anyway?



- Had the decision been awarded as you claim it should have been there is no way to tell what would have happened after that play in the remainder of the game. My own team was recently leading a game with two minutes to go and the opposition was awarded a try to take the lead when the ball carrier was clearly held up over the line. My team regained the ball from the kickoff and proceeded to score a try on fulltime to win the match. I was filthy that the referee awarded a try to the opposition that wasn't, but reflected after the game that had the referee made the correct call the opposition would have had a 5 metre scrum and been in good position to score in those last two minutes to win the game anyway. However the mistake by the referee gave us the opportunity for the field position we needed to score the match winning try. Having said that if the opposition had been awarded a 5 metre scrum, who's to say they wouldn't have dropped the ball at the base of the scrum and one of our players wouldn't have picked the ball up and raced down field to score anyway. The only time you could be certain that a decision changed the outcome of a game would be if the decision was made on the last play of the game and a team scored or was denied a try that would be the difference between winning and losing and the try was subsequently shown to be incorrectly allowed or disallowed. The Hurricanes v Chiefs match in the final round of this year's Super Rugby competition was a case in point.
- Whilst Henry claims France were not penalised for 40 infringements he makes no mention of infringements committed by New Zealand that were not penalised. If New Zealand were indeed not penalised for infringements they made, what effect would that have on the outcome of the game had they too been penalised? Surely New Zealand were not that disciplined that they only infringed on the eight occasions they were penalised?
- Even if France infringed as much as Henry claims what is the count if you consider that many of those infringements occurred in the same possession sequence as other infringements. For example, if on the first phase of a possession sequence France had infringed and then infringed again on the fifth and sixth phases in that possession sequence should you count one infringement or three? Surely if you want all infringements correctly adjudicated then the first infringement would have prevented the subsequent infringements as a penalty would have stopped that possession sequence after only one phase? What would that make the infringement count?
- What would the situation be if France committed an infringement in defence on the fourth phase of a possession sequence and were not penalised but New Zealand had committed an infringement on the first phase of their own possession sequence? Surely if the first infringement by New Zealand had been correctly adjudicated then as the possession sequence would have ended, France wouldn't have committed the subsequent infringement? Even more importantly if either team scored points from a possession sequence in which they committed the first infringement, would that mean that if the decision was correctly adjudicated you shouldn't count the points they subsequently scored.



Let's examine every infringement in the game on a common basis before we even consider what impact the decisions or non-decisions had on the game.

The laws in 2007 were slightly different to those of today and interpretations were also different. The major differences relevant to this match were:

1. The law regarding the offside line for players not involved in a scrum was different and was a line at the last feet on their own side of the scrum compared to five metres behind that line today;
2. The law regarding the action the referee was required to take if there had been a deliberate infringement was different – more on that later;
3. The interpretation of the law around the tackle was different in that a tackler could maintain contact with the ball when they made a tackle even when a ruck subsequently formed – there was no obligation for the tackler to first regain their feet and release the ball before playing it again.

My references to laws in this article are to the current laws (unless the law has changed) so that you don't have to go searching for a 2007 law book.

My list of all infringements in the match can be found on the last page of this report with details of the time, the player who committed the infringement, details of the infringement and which law relates.

How Many Infringements Did France Commit?

Graham Henry claims that France committed 40 infringements that were not penalised during the match. I've not seen any listing of these infringements to support the claim so I conducted my own analysis.

In conducting my analysis I first cut up the match footage into clips of every play. I then examined each of those clips frame by frame – that's 25 frames per second which allows you to see a lot more detail than you do watching an event in real time or even in slow motion.

Whilst most of the footage only has one camera angle there is also plenty of footage where the three camera angles Henry says he used in his analysis are also publicly available. There were many events that looked like an infringement on first viewing and even some that looked like an infringement after multiple viewings that I subsequently satisfied myself were not by examining the footage frame by frame.

I found 34 infringements by France during the match of which only two were penalised. I found that France committed seven infringements in attack and 27 in defence. One of those infringements involved two players so I suppose you can say I found 35 infringements of which only two were penalised – only seven short of Henry's claim.



So, even though my numbers are slightly different to Henry's, there is no doubt that his claim regarding France not being penalised for numerous infringements is correct.

How Many Infringements Did New Zealand Commit?

Was the refereeing of this match as one sided as Henry claims?

I found 45 infringements by New Zealand in the match, one of which involved two players, making it 46 in total compared to the eight infringements for which New Zealand were penalised – a difference of 34, one more than France.

I found that New Zealand committed 21 infringements in attack and 24 in defence.

Graham Henry has said that he actually threw up whilst watching the game footage before he even got to half time. In the first half I found 23 infringements by New Zealand and 22 by France whilst the penalty count in that first half was six to two in favour of France.

How Does Graham Henry Come Up With His Revised French Score?

Graham Henry claims that France should have been awarded no more than six points in the match. Given that France were awarded two converted tries for 14 points and kicked two penalty goals for six points in the match it's obvious that Henry believes neither try by France should have been awarded but concedes that their penalty goals should have been allowed – that's the only way you can reduce France's score down to six points.

The first penalty from which France kicked a penalty goal was awarded in the last play before halftime at 39:40 on the game clock when Ali Williams was penalised for joining a maul from not behind the last feet and then not leaving the maul as instructed by the referee. When you zoom in and examine the footage frame by frame it's clear that Williams did join the maul in front of the last feet so was liable to be penalised. He then worked his way into the middle of the maul on the French side and was trapped by French players so couldn't leave the maul even if he'd wanted to. The New Zealand commentators didn't agree this should have been a penalty saying "How can you return if you're stuck in there? Well if you're the referee it doesn't matter does it? Wayne Barnes has given more penalties in this area against New Zealand than they've conceded in the whole tournament so far." Regardless of the fact that he was trapped he got into that position by infringing when he joined the maul.



The second penalty from which France kicked a penalty goal was awarded at 45:29 on the game clock when Luke McAlister was penalised for deliberately obstructing a French attacker and was subsequently given a yellow card. This was one of the most controversial incidents in the match and the New Zealand commentators certainly didn't agree a penalty should have been awarded saying "There's nothing wrong with that. That's absolutely ridiculous. Well that's garbage – Luke McAlister was turning, he's entitled to do it. I've got to say that Wayne Barnes having his first big game is feeling the nerves a little bit."

Having analysed the game in great detail Graham Henry obviously disagreed with the commentators because those were the only two penalties from which France kicked penalty goals to get to the six points Henry conceded. That provides some interesting information regarding the penalty that was awarded against McAlister but I'll go into more detail about that a little later.

The first try France was awarded came at 53:45 on the game clock and was scored by Thierry Dusautoir. There didn't appear to be any controversy about the try at the time and the New Zealand commentators certainly didn't raise any objection.

The possession sequence for France leading up to that try started at 52:23 on the game clock with a 22 restart after Dan Carter had missed a penalty goal attempt. France regained the ball and made a break towards the halfway line where Leon MacDonald made a good tackle. Richie McCaw was close by and stayed on his feet whilst legally attempting to play the ball. At this time it was a tackle situation as no French player was in contact over the ball. That changed very quickly with Imanol Harinordoquy arriving who knocked MacDonald off his feet and by joining and staying on his feet he created a ruck. MacDonald was now off his feet in a ruck but interfered with the ball anyway and should have been penalised under law 16.4 (d). Moments later Lionel Beauxis joined the ruck ahead of the last feet and France should have been penalised under law 16.5 (c).

Neither penalty was awarded but if you want to rely on every infringement committed for one side of the argument then the penalty should have been awarded to France 55 metres out from the New Zealand goal line. Who knows whether the French would have scored their first try if that penalty had been awarded? It wasn't and play continued on without infringement until 52:52 on the game clock when France made a break that came from a forward pass and it's this incident that I suspect Graham Henry believes is the reason the first French try should not have been awarded. At the time the New Zealand commentators made no comment about the pass but when you examine the footage closely the ball is thrown marginally forward.

If you want to re-create the match result based on a video review of the match, don't worry about the forward pass – start with a discussion on what would have happened if France had been awarded the penalty they were entitled to earlier in the play.



The second try France were awarded came at 68:06 on the game clock. There are very few people that would argue that the lead up to this try didn't involve a forward pass from Damien Traille to Frederic Michalak and I'm not one of them.

That possession sequence for France started at 67:47 on the game clock from a scrum and there were no infringements by either side that should have been penalised in the lead up to the try.

Interestingly, when you examine the head on footage of the tackle made by McCaw on Traille as he passed the ball you could argue that McCaw actually knocks the ball out of Traille's hands and that it was actually a knock back by New Zealand rather than a forward pass by France. However, the footage is not totally conclusive and regardless, there's no way the referee or assistant referee could have seen that sort of detail on the run so a forward pass should have been ruled.

Rule out both of those tries and France would have scored a maximum of six points as claimed by Graham Henry.

How Does Graham Henry Come Up With New Zealand's Revised Score?

New Zealand scored 18 points from two tries, one conversion and two penalty goals. So we need to find another 24 points to get to Henry's 42 points he claims New Zealand should have scored.

The most likely explanation for those 24 points is an additional two tries, one of which would have been converted and four penalty goals. I believe the six most likely plays Graham Henry might claim led to possible scoring events are:

- **Penalty Goal** – at 10:26 on the game clock Dan Carter was tackled well after he passed the ball and the French player should have been penalised under law 10.4 (e) giving Carter a shot at penalty goal from 25 metres out and 20 metres off centre.
- **Penalty Goal** - in the 17th minute of the match after McAlister had made a break from half way, Ali Williams was tackled into touch whilst trying to score in the corner and the French were awarded a lineout. However at 16:00 on the game clock as McAlister was tackled after his break only five metres out from the French line the tackler didn't move away and should have been penalised under law 15.4 (b) right in front of the posts giving Carter an easy penalty goal attempt.
- **Penalty Goal** – at 33:06 on the game clock from a scrum the French defence was in front of the last feet on their side of the scrum and at 33:07 McCaw is illegally obstructed by Harinordoquy. If either infringement was penalised Carter would have had a shot at penalty goal from 45 metres out and about 15 metres off centre.



- **Try** – at 49:33 on the game clock with New Zealand having held the ball for nearly three minutes and only a few metres out from the French goal line near the touch line, Jean-Baptiste Elissalde was well in the front of the last feet at the ruck and rushed forward which caused a poor pass and New Zealand lost the ball. There's a good claim that this infringement should also have resulted in a yellow card being issued and given how much pressure the French were under at the time had New Zealand opted for a lineout from the penalty, they would have been a good chance to score a try.
- **Penalty Goal** – at 59:52 on the game clock Dimitri Szarewski clearly interferes with the ball in a ruck whilst off his feet. That would have resulted in Carter having a shot at penalty goal from 25 metres out and right in front.
- **Try** – at 76:29 with New Zealand having held the ball for over 3 minutes and again only a few metres out from the French goal line near the touch line, Harinordoquy clearly handles the ball in a ruck and the French gain possession of the ball. There's a good claim that this infringement should also have resulted in a yellow card being issued and given how much pressure the French were under at the time had New Zealand opted for a lineout from the penalty, they would have been a good chance to score a try.

If those opportunities were all converted into points and one of the possible tries was converted, there's the extra 24 points Henry claims New Zealand should have scored.

On first viewing of those plays it seemed obvious that they were solid point scoring opportunities that featured infringements that were not penalised. However there are some problems with those opportunities as follows:

- The break McAllister made in the 16th minute came from a lineout steal by Ali Williams but that steal was an illegal play. In 2007 law 19.9 (a) said that a lineout player must not be offside and defined the offside line after the ball had been thrown as a line through the ball. A player may not play the ball from an offside position and should be penalised if they do so but under 2007 law 19.13 (b) if a jumper jumped across the line and did not catch the ball the player would not be penalised if they moved back onside without delay. Williams crossed the offside line after the ball had been thrown and did not catch the ball – he knocked the ball out of the French jumpers hands from an offside position and should have been penalised under 2007 law 19.12 (b). Who knows if the French could have scored points from a lineout after that penalty but it certainly shouldn't be classed as a point scoring opportunity for New Zealand.
- The penalty New Zealand should have been awarded at 49:33 on the game clock was actually the fifth infringement in that possession sequence. The first at 47:15 on the game clock was committed by New Zealand's Keith Robinson when he played Julien Bonnaire without the ball so rather than being a possible try scoring opportunity for New Zealand and a possible yellow card for France, a penalty should have been awarded some two minutes earlier to France.



- The penalty New Zealand should have been awarded at 59:52 on the game clock was actually the second infringement in that possession sequence. The first at 58:29 on the game clock was committed by New Zealand's Carl Hayman when he joined a ruck from in front of the last feet so rather than being a possible penalty goal opportunity for New Zealand, a penalty should have been awarded a minute earlier to France.
- The penalty New Zealand should have been awarded at 76:29 on the game clock was actually the third infringement in that possession sequence. The first at 73:20 on the game clock was committed by New Zealand's Ali Williams when he joined a ruck from in front of the last feet so rather than being a possible try scoring opportunity for New Zealand and a possible yellow card for France, a penalty should have been awarded three minutes earlier to France 40 metres from the New Zealand goal line and straight in front of the posts.

This is the difficulty with an analysis after the event. Of those six solid scoring opportunities four should not have occurred if every infringement was picked up and in fact had the original infringements by New Zealand been awarded it would have been France in reasonable position to score points.

How Many Infringements Did Each Team Commit That Occurred First In A Possession Sequence?

If the original infringement in a possession sequence had been penalised there are many infringements that occurred later in the same possession sequence that should not have been penalised. On that basis instead of the 79 infringements I found by both teams in the match the total for the match would only have been 44.

On that basis New Zealand infringed 28 times in the match and were penalised for five of those whilst France only infringed 16 times and were penalised for two of those. So New Zealand infringed first nearly twice as many times as France!

How Many Of The 18 Points New Zealand Did Score Would Have Been Affected by Infringements?

In the lead up to Rodney So'oialos's try in the 63rd minute New Zealand committed three infringements for which they should have been penalised so they should never have been in position to score that try.

At 62:41 on the game clock McCaw plays Bonnaire without the ball and should have been penalised under law 10.4 (f). At 62:42 on the game clock Carl Hayman runs in front of the ball carrier which obstructs Dusautoir and should have been penalised under law 10.1 (b). At 62:44 on the game clock Hayman joins a ruck from in front of the last feet and should have been penalised under law 16.5 (c). Whilst McCaw also joins in front of the last feet just before Hayman I'm of the view that he joined when it was a tackle situation and as he didn't play the ball that was not an infringement.



The Decisions That Most Annoyed New Zealand's Fans

There were three decisions in this match that seemed to most rile New Zealand fans and certainly got the New Zealand commentators very agitated as follows:

1. The forward pass to Michalak that led to France's final try;
2. The ball illegally stolen by France in the 77th minute when it seemed France were going to score a match winning try; and
3. The yellow card issued to Luke McAlister in the 46th minute.

As I've already said I'm of the view that the pass to Michalak should have been ruled forward and as I've shown the infringement by France in the 77th minute would never have occurred if the first infringement by New Zealand in that possession sequence had been penalised.

Whilst the commentators were incredulous that a penalty was even awarded against Luke McAlister and even more so that a yellow card was issued, as I've already pointed out Graham Henry was obviously not as he conceded that France should have scored a maximum of six points, which had to include the penalty goal kicked from the penalty issued against McAlister.

There is another interesting thing to consider in this incident. Whilst it was McAlister that was penalised and issued with a yellow card, just moments earlier on the other side of the posts the referee had awarded an advantage against Carl Hayman for deliberately collapsing a maul. When Hayman collapsed that maul France were just a few metres from the New Zealand goal line and advancing towards the line. Had McAlister not infringed I'm sure the referee would have come back for the penalty against Hayman. Given that he later referred to that infringement as cynical it's likely he would have issued a yellow card to Hayman instead of McAlister.

The referee ruled that both infringements were deliberate and when he issued the yellow card to McAlister he made it clear to Richie McCaw the basis of his decision to issue a yellow card.

"We've got cynical play over there by deliberate collapse; we've got a cynical piece of play here by the man taking out the man. He goes to the bin for ten minutes."



Today the law on intentional infringements says:

10.2 UNFAIR PLAY

(a) **Intentionally Offending.** A player must not intentionally infringe any Law of the Game, or play unfairly. The player who intentionally offends must be either admonished, or cautioned that a send off will result if the offence or a similar offence is committed, or sent off.

However in 2007 there were additional words on the end of that law as follows:

After a caution a player is temporarily suspended for a period of ten minutes playing time. After a caution, if the player commits the same or similar offence, the player must be sent off.

So in 2007 having decided that the infringement by McAlister was deliberate the referee had no choice but to follow the law and also issue a yellow card.

It's pretty clear that the infringement by Hayman was deliberate - you don't accidentally collapse a maul. The law says "A penalty try must be awarded if the offence prevents a try that would probably have been scored." There was every reason to expect that a penalty try should have been awarded to France given the field position and forward movement of the French maul when the infringement occurred.

The decision to penalise McAlister rather than penalise Hayman and award a penalty try may have actually cost France points as they only kicked a penalty goal after McAlister was penalised. What impact it would have had for New Zealand to have Hayman off the field as opposed to McAlister is an unknown.

In relation to the McAlister infringement he was penalised under law 10.4 (f) for obstructing a player not carrying the ball. When you watch the footage it's quite clear that the French player was not going to receive the ball – it had been kicked well before McAlister got anywhere near the French player.

If McAlister was turning to chase the ball he had plenty of time to make that turn and you'd see his head turn to follow the ball like Mils Muliaina did. If he had held his line that he was running he would have run behind the French player and avoided the collision but the wide and close footage from side on shows he clearly took one step to the right to change his line to make contact when he was about three metres away from the French player. He didn't keep changing his line to chase the ball despite the fact that it was already in the in-goal area. The end on footage shows Muliaina turning his head to follow the ball – he had no intention of making contact with a French player but McAlister kept his eyes firmly on the French player, only turning his head a split second before contact.



There's no doubt in my mind that the contact by McAlister was a deliberate infringement that should have been penalised and therefore a yellow card had to be issued under the law.

As far as I'm concerned the claims by Graham Henry of refereeing bias by the officials against New Zealand in this match are not balanced or credible – they completely ignore the infringements made by New Zealand that were not penalised which I've shown could have had a significant impact.

Yes, the officials made mistakes and missed plenty of infringements but it was France who was disadvantaged most when it came to infringements not being penalised.

Perhaps Graham Henry thought no-one would take the time to examine his claims more closely but I would have hoped for more from a man with his standing in the game!

Scott Allen
August 2012

Infringement Number	Half	Time on Game Clock	Team Infringing	Number of Player Infringing	Player in Attack or Defence	Infringement Order in Play	Infringement	Law	Penalised
1	1	00:00:53	FR	5	A	1	Lifter stepping across the line of touch	19.14 (c)	No
2	1	00:00:56	NZ	8	D	2	Dragging player out of a maul	17.3 (a)	No
3	1	00:00:57	NZ	7	D	3	Collapsing a maul	17.2 (e)	No
4	1	00:00:58	FR	8	A	4	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
5	1	00:02:50	NZ	5	A	1	Lifter stepping across the line of touch	19.14 (c)	No
6	1	00:03:10	FR	4	A	1	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
7	1	00:04:19	FR	3	D	1	Tackler not moving away	15.4 (b)	No
8	1	00:04:32	FR	4	D	2	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
9	1	00:04:52	NZ	7	D	1	Tackler not moving away	15.4 (b)	Yes
10	1	00:05:56	FR	4 and 19	A	1	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
11	1	00:07:57	NZ	3	D	1	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
12	1	00:07:59	NZ	7	D	2	Tackler not moving away	15.4 (b)	Yes
13	1	00:08:55	NZ	8	A	1	Tackling player above shoulders	10.4 (e)	No
14	1	00:10:08	FR	8	D	1	Player offside and interfering with play	11.1 (b)	No
15	1	00:10:26	FR	4	D	2	Tackling a player late	10.4 (e)	No
16	1	00:11:59	FR	4	D	1	Tackler not moving away	15.4 (b)	Yes
17	1	00:14:21	NZ	5	D	1	Tackling jumper in the air	10.4 (i)	No
18	1	00:15:46	NZ	5	D	1	Playing the ball from an offside position at lineout	19.12 (b)	No
19	1	00:15:57	FR	8	D	2	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
20	1	00:16:01	FR	3	D	3	Tackler not moving away	15.4 (b)	No
21	1	00:19:26	FR	4	A	1	Dragging player out of a maul	17.3 (a)	No
22	1	00:19:35	FR	19	A	2	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
23	1	00:21:03	NZ	3	D	1	Tighthead pulling back	20.8 (g)	No
24	1	00:22:07	FR	4	D	1	Tackler not moving away	15.4 (b)	No
25	1	00:22:12	FR	7	D	2	Tackler not moving away	15.4 (b)	No
26	1	00:23:28	NZ	6	A	1	Player not staying on feet in ruck	16.3 (a)	Yes
27	1	00:27:41	NZ	4	A	1	Lifter stepping across the line of touch	19.14 (c)	No
28	1	00:28:55	FR	7	D	1	Player offside and interfering with play	11.1 (b)	Yes
29	1	00:31:00	FR	5	D	1	Tackling jumper in the air	10.4 (i)	No
30	1	00:32:38	NZ	3	A	1	Tighthead binding on arm and exerting downward pressure	20.3 (d)	No
31	1	00:33:06	FR	10	D	1	Offside at scrum	20.12 (g)	No
32	1	00:33:07	FR	8	D	2	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
33	1	00:33:14	NZ	7	A	3	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
34	1	00:33:15	NZ	4	A	4	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
35	1	00:33:40	NZ	13	D	1	Tackling player above shoulders	10.4 (e)	Yes
36	1	00:33:42	NZ	7	D	2	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
37	1	00:34:34	NZ	5	D	1	Tackling jumper in the air	10.4 (i)	No
38	1	00:35:00	NZ	6	D	1	Overstepping offside line before lineout ended	19.15 (a)	No
39	1	00:35:08	NZ	4	D	2	Player offside and interfering with play	11.1 (b)	Yes
40	1	00:35:14	FR	19	D	3	Tackling player above shoulders	10.4 (e)	No
41	1	00:35:17	NZ	1	D	4	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
42	1	00:36:53	NZ	10	D	1	Running in front of ball carrier	10.1 (b)	No
43	1	00:37:48	FR	3	D	1	Tackling a player late	10.4 (e)	No
44	1	00:39:17	FR	13	D	2	Tackling jumper in the air	10.4 (i)	No
45	1	00:39:30	NZ	5	D	1	Offside at maul	17.4 (c)	Yes
45		1st Half Total				27	1st Half First Infringement in Possession Sequence	1st Half Penalties	
			22	Against France		12	Against France		2
			23	Against New Zealand		15	Against New Zealand		6
			45			27			8

Infringement Number	Half	Time on Game Clock	Team Infringing	Number of Player Infringing	Player in Attack or Defence	Infringement Order in Play	Infringement	Law	Penalised
46	2	00:40:40	FR	11	D	1	Tackling jumper in the air	10.4 (i)	No
47	2	00:40:22	NZ	4	A	2	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
48	2	00:43:09	NZ	7	A	1	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
49	2	00:43:31	FR	19	D	2	Player offside and interfering with play	11.1 (b)	No
50	2	00:43:40	NZ	4	A	3	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
51	2	00:43:53	NZ	8	D	1	Tackling player above shoulders	10.4 (e)	No
52	2	00:44:01	NZ	2	A	1	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
53	2	00:45:15	NZ	3	D	1	Collapsing a maul	17.2 (e)	No
54	2	00:45:22	NZ	12	D	2	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	Yes
55	2	00:47:15	NZ	4	A	1	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
56	2	00:47:32	NZ	13	A	2	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
57	2	00:47:59	FR	19	D	3	Player offside and interfering with play	11.1 (b)	No
58	2	00:49:13	FR	2	D	4	Player offside and interfering with play	11.1 (b)	No
59	2	00:49:33	FR	9	D	5	Player offside and interfering with play	11.1 (b)	No
60	2	00:50:18	NZ	1	D	1	Loosehead not binding at scrum	20.3 (c)	No
61	2	00:51:05	NZ	5	D	1	Tackling jumper in the air	10.4 (i)	No
62	2	00:51:23	FR	3	D	1	Collapsing scrum	20.9 (a)	No
63	2	00:51:40	NZ	1	A	2	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
64	2	00:51:43	FR	16	D	3	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
65	2	00:52:30	NZ	13	D	1	Interfering with ball in a ruck whilst off feet	16.4 (d)	No
66	2	00:52:31	FR	10	A	2	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
67	2	00:58:29	NZ	3	A	1	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
68	2	00:59:52	FR	16	D	2	Handling ball in ruck	16.4 (b)	No
69	2	01:00:45	NZ	6	D	1	Not staying bound on the scrum	20.1 (e)	Yes
70	2	01:02:41	NZ	7	A	1	Playing an opponent without the ball	10.4 (f)	No
71	2	01:02:42	NZ	3	A	2	Running in front of ball carrier	10.1 (b)	No
72	2	01:02:44	NZ	3	A	3	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
73	2	01:10:24	NZ	1	D	1	Loosehead not binding at scrum	20.3 (c)	No
74	2	01:13:20	NZ	5	A	1	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
75	2	01:15:33	NZ	3	A	2	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
76	2	01:16:29	FR	19	D	3	Handling ball in ruck	16.4 (b)	No
77	2	01:18:29	FR	8	D	1	Charging lifter in lineout	19.9 (e)	No
78	2	01:18:46	NZ	8	A	2	Player joining ruck from offside position	16.5 (c)	No
79	2	01:20:41	FR	19	D	1	Player offside and interfering with play	11.1 (b)	No
34		2nd Half Total				17	2nd Half First Infringement in Possession Sequence	2nd Half Penalties	
			12	Against France		4	Against France		0
			22	Against New Zealand		13	Against New Zealand		2
			34			17	2nd Half First Infringement		2
Match Infringements							Match Infringements Committed First in Possession Sequence	Match Penalties	
79		Match Total	34	Against France		16	Against France		2
			45	Against New Zealand		28	Against New Zealand		8
			79			44			10