

# IOA Technical Conference Oct 8th Presentations

## Session 1 - WOC205 Long - Course Analysis and Planning

Introduction - see separate Commentary Document

1. Leg Analysis Slide show
2. Phi-Loop Slide Show

## Session 2 - Challenges and Practicalities

1. Challenges and Practicalities Slide Show
2. Age Group Planning Slide Show

## Major Events - Lessons

### Engagement

- Planning is a big commitment
- Potentially expensive - agree costs/budget in advance
- Time
- Travel
- Stress
- Thankless, dirty job, but someone has to do it
- However, it can be enjoyable
- Use field visits for technical training
- Dont overdo the physical
- Establish a friendly base
- Take a weeks holiday a year in advance..

### Preliminary Issues

- The area - sufficiently technical and big enough
- Potential for long legs and some technical controls
- Landowner/Estate Management and Permissions -
- Arena ? Car Parking ? Finish in Arena ?
- Future plans of landowner
- Access for initial visits and mapping
- Existing map ? Upgrade - same season for vegetation

- New map - draft must be ready -1 yr in same season for vegetation

## Starting Planning

- “Run” “line” of potential long legs
  - Gauge average terrain running speed - run at your own speed but know your ratio of elite
  - How far is the forward visibility - and ditto the rear view
  - Controls used to balance route choice - can be relatively easy sites
  - Longest leg target: 15-20mins split (25% to 33% of winning time)
  - A second long leg: 10 mins split (20% of winning time)
- Look for natural features that will separate runners
  - Impassable water features (lochs) with routes either side
  - Hills (1 or 2 major contours sufficient) with routes around either side, or over
  - Thick forest with routes either through or around
- Identify “good” feature-full technical parts
  - Suitable for short legs with interesting navigation
  - Suitable for medium legs requiring careful execution
  - Complex topology
  - Lots of features (boulders, crags, depressions, small hills) requiring careful navigation
- Establish ‘flow’ around area, so competitors don't run towards each other, or outgoing running lead approaching runners into controls
- Test run prototype courses - “training exercise” for potential non-competitives

## Mapping Issues

- Check Magnetic North lines
  - Condes - changed North lines means re-enter all course data..
- Check distance between N lines is correct for scale (also check)
- Sanddune/All-Open areas - check density of yellow screen
- Bag maps - waterproof paper is'nt (WOC2016 Long!!)

## Logistics

- Canes and site “taping”
- Avoid taping too early
- Controller should approve courses/sites in principal before taping
- Location specific control identifiers of codes possible in CONDES
- Divide area into 4 to 6 blocks based on geography, ease of access..., size
- Initial planning use codes prefixed to identify the block by e.g. N, S, W, E, (points of compass) and C(central)
- e.g. N1, S2, W3, E8

- These blocks would be used for control deployment, control recovery, competitor searches..
- Put these location codes in the annotations
- Change to final numbers (starting from 40 or 100 as appropriate) once courses all but finalized- randomize numbers over entire area..
- Water - needed for elite courses

## Control Site Quality Control

- Circle centred according to rules
- Feature mapped with clarity as well as correctness
- If the control feature is shown on the map symbolically rather than to scale, the circle should be drawn so that the symbol lies exactly at the centre....
- N>B> Pits and holes with distinct steep sides which cannot be shown to scale by symbol 106 (minimum diameter 2 m). Minimum depth from the surrounding ground should be 1 m. **Location is the centre of gravity** of the symbol which is orientated to north.
- Similarly for small depressions and knolls
- Flag will be visible from 20m at least 25% of circle (10m in rules is not always sufficient) - depending on the landform. Good distinct landform leading into feature then flag may only be visible close up e.g. from cliff foot. Indistinct landform then atleast 20m all round!!
- Description unambiguous but uncomplicated
- Description includes dimensions (boulders, pits, walls, fences...)
- Proximity to another other site - rules of spirit
- Proximity to confusable features - rules of spirit of sport

## Planning and Course Overprint, Loose Descriptions

- Ensure Classes are listed on the course title - not just course number
- Ensure loose descriptions printed from same master file as the maps...
- Condes helps as the prints include the name of the file printed from
- Consider smaller font and box sizes for the loose descriptions so they fit in holders..
- Note the overprint symbol/line dimensions in the updated BOF 2016 rules

## Contentious Course issues -specifics

- old tape nr control site
- wrong version of condes file for loose descriptions
- small error in site placement sufficient for some competitors to miss
- control unit misplaced 10m (old tape?) - checked twice/thrice!?
- Elite marked route - competitors missed streamers – continuous tape better..
- TD4 course had tough site

- another TD4 course had tough site ?

## Contentious Organisational issues

- Relay bib numbering – team gets spare team numbers in bag
- car park too muddy
- start teams fail to arrive before first starts..

## Near Misses over the years:

- storm damage in winter- major impact on courses requiring remapping and replanning
- last minute exclusion zone around protected species
- evening before: electric cattle fence around control site..farmer persuaded to move...
- evening before: 3m pile of scrub blocks routes nr end...  
ranger locks 3m tall gate across 1st leg of relay
- control disappears within 30mins of deployment
- river rises overnight - roped crossing..
- minibus transport to starts – poor forest track

## References

- <http://www.scottish-orienteering.org/soa/page/information-sources-for-event-officials>
- [http://www.scottish-orienteering.org/documents/natcen/COURSE\\_PLANNING\\_GUIDE\\_final.pdf](http://www.scottish-orienteering.org/documents/natcen/COURSE_PLANNING_GUIDE_final.pdf) -- Hilary Quick's 2016 updated version of Graham Nilson's Guide
- <http://www.scottish-orienteering.org/soa/page/electronic-resources>
- <http://www.scottish-orienteering.org/soa/category/how-to>
- <http://www.scottish-orienteering.org/soa/page/information-sources-for-event-officials>
- [https://www.britishorienteering.org.uk/page/handbook\\_mapping](https://www.britishorienteering.org.uk/page/handbook_mapping) - includes guidance/examples of agegroup colour codes courses
- <http://www.routegadget.net/spreading/> -- Comments on phi/butterfly loops being unfair
- [http://www.scottish-orienteering.org/documents/natcen/Common\\_Problems\\_at\\_the\\_Start\\_and\\_Finish.pdf](http://www.scottish-orienteering.org/documents/natcen/Common_Problems_at_the_Start_and_Finish.pdf)
- <http://news.worldofoc.com/2016/09/01/were-the-woc-2016-maps-good-enough/>
- [http://www.attackpoint.org/viewlog.jsp/user\\_15725/period-7/enddate-2016-08-28](http://www.attackpoint.org/viewlog.jsp/user_15725/period-7/enddate-2016-08-28)
- <http://www.tulospalvelu.fi/gps/>
- 
-

- 
- ROugh notes:
- THE Jury was convened to consider whether the location of the Finish, and the navigation from the last control (150), complied with the requirements set out in the British Orienteering Rules (effective 1st May 2016) and the Appendices to those Rules.

The Jury comprising Rob Hickling, Colin Matheson and Hilary Quick (controllers grade A, A and B respectively) have met and considered the protest.

Para. 30.1 of the British Orienteering Rules states that “the precise location of the finish must be clear to all competitors approaching it”; this requirement is repeated in para 5.1.1 of Appendix B, along with the requirement that it must be “easily located” (5.1.2). It was indeed clear to all approaching, properly marked and easy to find, but it wasn’t obvious to any who had headed out of the last control (150) in the wrong direction.

Para 5.1.3 of Appendix B goes on to state “There should be no possibility of a competitor being unable to find the finish.” A number of people found considerable difficulty in finding the Finish, and had very long finish leg splits. The jury’s view is that there is sufficient evidence that the requirements for the Finish, set out in the Rules and Appendices, have not been fully and fairly met. Therefore the jury decided to uphold the protest, and concluded that the proper course of action is to void the leg 150 - Finish for all courses that used it, and to require the results to be re-calculated with those courses being deemed to finish at control no. 150.

A