



PO Box 284 Mitchell BC ACT 2911  
Phone (02) 6162 1200  
Email: orienteering@netspeed.com.au  
Website: orienteering.asn.au  
ABN 77 406 995 497

## Technical Newsletter – December 2012

### Australian Orienteering Championships, 2012

Report provided to the OA Conference 2012 by Greg Hawthorne

*Comments in purple added by Robin Uppill*

#### Technical issues arising:

1. **“Stay active”, or “wake” time of SI units, SI firmware** The “stay active” time of SI units was inadvertently set to 15 minutes at a number of events. This resulted from using the SI time master in extended master mode where the particular time master unit’s “stay active” time was set to 15 minutes. Although this aspect of the equipment is documented, it is easily missed, and is not mentioned in the SportIdent guidelines for controllers on the IOF website. The “stay active” time is also referred to as active time in SportIdent documentation for the SI Time Master, and working time in SI Config. It was assumed that firmware for all SportIdent equipment used in the competition had been updated to version 5.74. During competition, some competitors using the latest SI cards were disadvantaged by their cards not registering some controls that had been missed in the firmware updates, and were re-instated in the results. The firmware was updated after the problem was identified.

2. **W70 class at the Sprint championships** The course allocation for the W70 class was changed from course 6 to course 5 just prior to the competition, and although the change was made to the event program, maps and control descriptions printed for the competition did not reflect the change to the course allocation. As a result, some competitors ran the course as shown on the control description and map, and some ran the course as specified in the event program. Rather than cancelling the course, the organiser split the class onto two divisions.

*If you were on a jury for this event and the organiser disqualified those taking the wrong map, and a competitor then protested, what would your decision be? Note that this was small field and approximately half did the correct course, and the other half the wrong course.*

*As a competitor – do you know what course you are to do prior to going to the start, or do you rely on the information at the start?*

*Did any competitors raise the issue with the start team, and if so what advice were they given?*

3. **Use of Xerox Nevertear synthetic paper for maps** Maps for non-WRE classes were printed on Xerox Nevertear synthetic paper. This was chosen in preference to Teslin and Pretex. The advantages over Teslin were its better printing characteristics (far fewer misfeeds, whiter paper, and better printing quality on Orienteering Tasmania’s printer). Difficulty in sourcing Pretex was the main reason for not using that paper, although a comparison of maps printed on Pretex and Nevertear indicated that Nevertear was superior in its crispness. Nevertear was tested at two competitions in Tasmania prior to the championships without any problems, however at the championships some competitors noted that ink lifted from the map, and the consensus was that the paper was difficult to fold.

*Nevertear had been used for previous events and the problem with ink rubbing off had been described previously (Christmas 5-Days 2009).*

4. **Schools championships issues** Running the Australian Schools championships as part of the carnival is generally beneficial to both competitions, however there are aspects that can be incompatible. The requirement that the schools teams be fully catered, rather than being self-sufficient, pre-supposes that the competition is held in an area that can support this requirement. This is not always feasible if the competition area is chosen on its technical merits, rather than the area’s ability to provide full catering facilities. Another aspect that created some inconvenience was the team numbering system used in the schools relays, which was incompatible with the event software used, required two sets of team numbers for the Schools and Australian relays, and was fundamentally flawed in that a quarter of competitors’ chest bibs made it easy to confuse the leg number with the team number and should be

revised for this reason alone (admittedly the numbering system used was as insisted on by the co-ordinator of the Schools competition, and may well have simply been his preference; certainly it is not mentioned in the Orienteering rules on the School Sport Australia website). If there are additional rules applicable to the Schools championships, they should be included with the competition rules on the School Sport Australia website to remove potential areas of confusion. As almost all the Schools championships competitors compete in the general carnival events, a single set of competition numbers for the overall carnival would also be a useful simplification.

School Relay Numbers: Relay numbers can be used in OCAD to assign team numbers if the following format is used as shown in the Class dialog in OCAD Course Setting (assuming Senior Boys teams are numbered beginning with 1 with the second digit the state i.e. Team 11 is the first Senior Boys team and 17 the last. In OCAD – the maps are then produced with the team/leg number i.e. 11 Leg 1 , 11 Leg 2 etc).

Class:	Course:	Runners/teams:	Start numbers	
			From:	To:
Senior Boys	1	7	11	17
Senior Girls	2	7	21	27
Junior Boys	3	7	31	37
Junir Girls	4	7	41	47

See the document at <http://www.orienteering.asn.au/technical/> for more information on relay course planning in OCAD (this has been referred to in previous technical news). This also describes importing the OCAD course information into OS software.

**5. Printed start lists** Start lists were published on the event website, but were not printed for each competitor for each event. The reason for this is that it is a wasteful practice for a competition with 9 events and over 600 competitors who are not necessarily competing in the same class at each event, and the course-class allocation varies between events. In retrospect, a better option would have been to include the relevant detail on competitors' chest bibs.

The lack of readily available start times by class for event meant competitors were not able to track the results for a class, in particular the elites as they had no idea of the start times. So the issue was more about the lack of information to competitors when they were spectating, an area that orienteering is attempting to improve e.g. with spectator friendly arena design, and the use of spectator controls.

### Event Program

The OA Foot Rules specify the content of the Event Program for major events (Rule 8.2), similar rules are in place for MTBO and NL events.

8.2 The organisers shall make available a program to all entrants at least two weeks prior to the event. The program shall include:

- all information given in the invitation
- full details of venues and travel directions
- description of terrain, climate and any hazards
- scale, contour interval of maps and any other relevant mapping information
- start and finish procedures
- distances from parking to finish and finish to start(s)
- registration times, venue and procedure
- facilities available (changing, refreshments, etc)
- full start list for all classes
- any permitted deviations from the rules
- the length, total climb, number of controls and number of refreshment controls on each individual course and, for relays, on each leg
- notes on competition clothing, if necessary
- method of marking out of bounds areas and marked routes
- jury members' names
- other information of interest.

Although not specified, this information needs to be in a format enabling a competitor to have access to it at the event i.e. they have been able to download and print/save themselves before the event and have this copy at the event (access online only at an event cannot be relied as mobile phone/carrier coverage is not always available and used by all participants). Alternatively copies are made available on registration.

In particular information that may affect the safety of competitors is essential (hazards particular to the map and how they are identified, hazards that may occur in traveling to the event), other information that may cause a disqualification or impact on results (out of bounds area, areas/features not permitted to be crossed etc, time to the start).

With the requirement to improve the spectator aspect of orienteering, an arena map with spectator viewing is also useful, and can also be used to convey much of the event information to competitors (apart from the fact that it is also useful for organisers).

So if you are planning a minimalistic event program for distribution to competitors, the above is to be kept in mind. If your web site content is to function as the Event Program, competitors need to be aware of this to ensure they have access to the necessary information at the event.

## **Orienteering Australia Annual Conference Technical Report 2012**

### **IOF Foot Orienteering Rules Changes**

The IOF recently advised a number of rule changes for 2013, these are generally not relevant to Australian rules with the following exceptions:

*19.6 Minimum height of control codes reduced to 3 cm, previously 5- 10 cm in height.*

*28.3 Time limit for lodging protests after the result of a complaint advised reduced from 1 hour to 15 minutes.*

*31.8 Extra responsibility added to the Event Advisor – “to approve the official results”*

Propose that the following rule changes be made to the Australian rules to match:

19.6 Each control shall be identified with a code number, which shall be fixed to the control so that a competitor using the marking device can clearly read the code. Numbers less than 31 may not be used. The figures shall be black on white, between 3 and 10 cm in height and have a line thickness of 5 to 10 mm. Horizontally-displayed codes shall be underlined if they could be misinterpreted by being read upside down (e.g. 161).

Currently the equivalent to 28.3 in the Australian rules is:

28.3 Any protest shall be made in writing to a member of the jury as soon as possible after the organiser's decision about a complaint.

Not time frame is imposed. The information below was included in the June 2012 Technical News to assist event controllers and organisers. The current rule can lead to misunderstanding due to the lack of specifics on the time frame and because the Jury members for an event are often not specifically identified and instead a potential pool is listed. Possible change to rule 28.3 will be discussed with the Technical Committee.

#### **Process for Complaints and Protests**

The process for lodging, managing and adjudicating on complaints and protests is described in the orienteering rules. In addition, Appendix 10 of the Foot Orienteering Rules provides further guidelines for competitors, organisers and juries. As competitors do not normally attend events carrying copies of the rules, major event organisers generally outline the process to lodge complaints and protests in Event Program booklets. However competitors should be aware, that although complaints may be given orally, a written complaint is recommended as then the issue of the complaint will be clearly defined. The complaint/protest process should follow the rules unless approval is given for a variation.

In particular the organising team needs to be aware of the following:

1. Complaints are adjudicated by the organiser, hence the Program booklet should make it clear who the Event Organiser is. If the complaint is to be lodged via the Registration team, they need to be aware that a complaint needs to be conveyed to the organiser.
2. No standard time limit for complaints and protests applies, however if the organiser requires that all complaints and protests are managed on the day of the event and before results are finalised, they should publish the time frame for lodging complaints in the Program Booklet and possibly announce when this time is approaching at the event.
3. If an organiser adjudicates on a complaint, they need to make it clear to the complainant that if they are not satisfied with the decision, they have the right to protest. A protest is made in writing to a member of the Jury. Hence the organiser must also ensure that the jury members' names are published in the program booklet (or if displayed at the event, then the process for doing so at the event is in the Program Booklet).

The IOF web site has a [Complaints/Protest form available for download](http://orienteering.org/foot-orienteering/event-organizing/organisers-guidelines/), this can be modified and used at Australian events. See the link at :

<http://orienteering.org/foot-orienteering/event-organizing/organisers-guidelines/>

#### **Additional Foot Orienteering Rule Changes**

Some changes to appendices where inconsistencies occur:

1. Appendix 1– General Competition Classes - updates to some winning times in Course – Class tables
2. Appendix 5 – Event Controller Accreditation - some inconsistencies in wording in descriptions of controller accreditation process vs the table of points

No progress has been made on reorganisation of rules relating to Schools Championships

*Update: The new version of the rules will be available early in 2013.*

#### **Australian Three Days Winning Times - 2013**

The Australian Three Days in 2013 will have variable winning times for all classes over the 3 days in order to best use the map areas. Elite winning times are unchanged, other classes will have a shorter Day 1 and Longer Day 2, but the total winning time is unchanged. The Technical Committee may consider modifying the rules to make this an option for future Australian 3-Days. Example winning times are:

	long winning time	80% long winning time	Proposed day 1 WT	Proposed day 2 WT	Proposed day 3 WT
M35	70	56	45	65	56
M40	65	52	45	60	52
M45	60	48	40	55	48
M50	55	44	40	50	44
M55	50	40	35	45	40
W35	60	48	40	55	48
W40	60	48	40	55	48
W45	60	48	40	55	48
W50	55	44	40	50	44
W55	50	40	35	45	40

### ANZ and Oceania Foot Orienteering Rules Changes

Changes were made to these rules after discussion with New Zealand as follows:

1. Inclusion of Middle and Sprint Distance in the ANZ Foot Challenge; these are already in the MTBO Challenge
2. Removal of the requirement for challenge runners to start first in their class (this was contrary to rules that govern the Oceania Championships at which the challenge is now generally run). A reference to the ANZ Challenge in the Oceania Rules concerning start times was then removed.
3. Ability to substitute a reserve if a team member is an official (controller, course planner, organiser) for an event in the challenge. With 4 events in the challenge, potential team members involved in organisation of one event would be excluded from all events if this change was not made.

The IOF has asked that the Oceania rules *for elite competitors* only become an Appendix in the IOF Foot Orienteering rules, as some other regional championship rules are currently included. Blair Trewin has prepared a draft version.

### Mountain Bike Orienteering Rules

A draft update to the rules has been prepared by Kathy Liley to obtain greater alignment in some areas with the Foot Orienteering rules and appendices. These need review by other members of the MTBO community. The rules do not yet have a event classification as in the Foot rules (Group A, B, C etc) nor the classification of Event Controllers. Having event control is a requirement of the

*Update: The draft rules have been approved by the MTBO community and the new version will be available early in 2013.*

### Major Event Controllers

The following are the OA L3 Controllers for upcoming Group A events.

Date	Event	Location	Controller
March 2013	NOL Round	SA	Robin Uppill/Alison Radford
Mar-Apr 2013	AusThreeDays	Vic	Chris Norwood
May 2013	NOL – WOC Trials	ACT	
Oct 2013	Aus Middle Champs	ACT	Bob Allison
Sep 2013	Aus Sprint Champs	ACT	Blair Trewin
Sep 2013	Aus Long Champs	ACT	Andy Hogg
Oct 2013	Aus Relay Champs	ACT	Bill Jones
April 2014	AusThreeDays	NSW	Rob Vincent Day Controllers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Andrew Lumsden</li> <li>• Nick Dent</li> </ul>

Date	Event	Location	Controller
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alex Davey</li> <li>• Basil Baldwin</li> </ul>
Oct 2014	Aus Middle Champs	WA	Ken Brownlie/Ian Fletcher
Sep/Oct 2014	Aus Sprint Champs	WA	Ken Brownlie/Ian Fletcher
Sep 2014	Aus Long Champs	WA	Ken Brownlie/Ian Fletcher
Sep/Oct 2014	Aus Relay Champs	WA	Ken Brownlie/Ian Fletcher
April 2015	AusThreeDays	SA	TBA

## Items for Future Discussion

### 1. Format of Australian Championships week

a. Around 2006, the schedule of holding all Australian championships in sprint, middle, long and relay in the one week from 2008 onwards, was approved (acknowledging possible exceptions in an Oceania Championships year. If any championships were being held on a week day, they had to be on a day adjacent to the weekend. The commonly agreed format is the Aus Middle and a State Long Distance event one weekend, followed by the Aus Sprint. Long and Relays on the following Friday- Sunday.

b. Australian Schools Championships have considered adding a sprint event to their program. The following proposal was defined at the last conference and referred to the schools committee.

i. It was agreed that the integrity of the national carnival week be preserved, i.e. that there continue to be national events on the Saturday and Sunday of the first and second weekends and that the Australian Schools events be in the Tuesday to Thursday period.

ii. Grant Bluett recommended that the Schools Relay day be reformatted to an Australian Schools Sprint Championship and an Australian Schools Sprint Relay, with a public event in between. This recommendation was supported by Conference and will be referred to the Schools Committee.

iii. No official feedback has been received from the Schools Committee but it was discussed at the Australian Championships in Tasmania, and the conference recommendation was not supported with preference being for the sprint being an additional event.

### 2. Badge Scheme – refer Appendix 6 of the rules

a. Time may not permit this and if so it will be referred to the Technical Committee

### Update to Item 1

After this report was prepared the following was presented in the schools report

Australian Sprint Championships. The option of including an Australian Sprint Championships into the schools carnival was again brought up at the ASOC post event meeting. As a result a recommendation was made to not proceed with a new event due to scheduling and workload issues. I took this motion to the SSA conference for discussion with suggestion of an unofficial test event being run within the next 2 years to provide an opportunity to test the concept without affecting the current program. This recommendation was accepted by virtually all states. We now have a mandate to try an event within the Australian Orienteering Carnival. It will be optional for states to attend but with the right planning and negotiation I believe we now have a window of opportunity to make this work.

Note that both the ACT and OWA have declined the option to include a School Sprint event in the Australian Champs carnivals in 2013 and 2014 respectively.

## Orienteering Australia Conference Mapping Report 2012

Adrian Uppill, Chair Mapping Committee

A mapping workshop “Orienteering: A guide to urban map making” was presented at St Helens during the 2012 Australian Championships Carnival in Tasmania. It was well attended with a smaller group of about 6 staying on to try their hand at field work and mapping of features for a school map. The practical exercise in the school ground fostered group discussion on simplification, the level of detail and generalization issues involved in the mapping of urban areas.

As requested at the 2012 Mapping Meeting additional colour blocks were added to the OA mapping pages. These can be used to fine tune colour settings (CMYK) for a printer to give the best match to the IOF colour swatch. As supplies had run out more IOF colour swatches were obtained and are available from myself. Approval was granted for the 2012 Australian Sprint Distance Championships at Bicheno, a WRE, to use ISOM symbol 209 'Boulder cluster' on the Sprint map, there being no equivalent symbol under ISSOM. Approval to use digital printing was also granted for the 2012 Easter carnival. In respect to map deviations, organizers and course planners are again reminded that all requests for map deviations require at least 6 months' notice before the event.

An issue that arose during the year was about the mapping of Lantana in regard to the choice of symbol that best represents this vegetation feature. It is considered that the vertical green stripe symbols, the full green area symbols or a combination thereof are sufficient for the mapping of difficult vegetation such as Lantana. In particular the use of random green 'blobs' is not permissible. Where uncertainty exists in the interpretation, agreement should be reached between the mapper and the controller early in the mapping process. Further, mapper's notes on the treatment of mapping difficult vegetation are essential for information to orienteers in the event information.

At long last the first draft of the revision of ISOM2000 was released early this month for consultation. My initial reaction is that the document is too large and complex for general usage hence will need significant editing to a smaller document more in keeping with the size and content of ISOM 2000. As a member of the Reference Group I am posting comments on the draft ISOM 201x document via a Wiki platform. All comments are expected by 2 December 2012. Some of the more significant proposals include:

- Use of dark gray for Rocks and Boulders (to distinguish from tracks & paths, being 100%K)
- Use of Pale brown for Form lines, or other alternatives ie dotted line, longer dash line etc
- New alternative symbols for vegetation
  - Undergrowth / green stripes to alternative graphic 'worm' shapes (or banana shape)
  - Semi open land 'regular pattern' graphic to alternative stochastic raster (a random pattern)
- New vegetation symbols
  - 4th dark green for 'Vegetation impassable' (similar to Sprint)
  - A solid green line or dotted green line for vegetation boundary
- Deletion of vegetation symbol 'Forest runnable in one direction'
- Stony ground and Boulder field symbols combined to form 3 levels of Stony ground using stochastic raster area symbols (dot, pentagon & triangle)
- Boulder cluster symbol 'triangle' replaced by 3 closely spaced dots in a triangle shape
- New Water symbols & definitions accommodating current Australian mapping usage for dry water beds
- Additional point symbols for Landform, Vegetation & Special feature being asterisk & triangle in Brown, Green & Black respectively
- New Broken ground area symbol (stochastic)
- Two new Prominent water feature symbols being a blue square and a blue asterisk
- Deletion of Settlement symbol where buildings not drawn (thin black vertical line screen)
- Calling the 'Yellow' colour setting used for vegetation as 'Orange'!

Whilst open to further discussion & consideration I am not in favor of using Dark gray for Rocks & Boulders nor am I in favor of using stochastic raster's for Stony ground and vegetation. There are associated legibility problems when these symbols are combined with other symbols such as contour lines (particularly over detailed terrain), bare rock and point features of green and brown. The legibility problem is also exacerbated for colour blind orienteers. And some symbols like the directional Forest symbol should be retained for our pine forests here in Australia. Also the proposed Boulder cluster symbol is often impossible to distinguish in the proposed three tiered Stony ground area symbol.

At the Conference the Technical Director will display some of symbol proposals as listed above.