

Technical News May 2011

Introduction

This newsletter is a summary of recent meetings and discussions of those areas under the Technical area. Anyone with items of interest they would like included in future newsletters please forward them to the Director Technical (oa_technical@netspeed.com.au).

Technical Committee Meeting

The minutes of the Technical Meeting held at Easter in April are available at <http://www.orienteering.asn.au/technical/TechNewsArchive/>

The meeting discussed some proposed changes to Orienteering Australian Foot Rules as follow-up to those flagged at the OA Annual Conference in 2010 to be considered for change in 2011. These were:

1. Measurement of Course Distance (Foot Events)

Rule 16.3 regarding measurement of course distances requires the course length to be determined to include deviations for impassable objects. This rule is consistent with the IOF Rule and was probably in place before Sprint format became common where courses in urban areas contain numerous impassable objects. In many events up to World Championship level, the distance however is almost always worked out and advertised as the straight line distance (apart from deviations for marked routes). Hence rather than change this rule and make it inconsistent with the IOF Rule, the meeting proposed that the Section on Sprint Format in Appendix 8 be updated to permit course distance for sprint to be measured and advertised as a straight line as long as competitors are notified. Course Planners need to consider the likely "actual" distance run when working out kilometre rates for winning times.

Note also that the proximity rule for controls not being any closer than 15m on a map at 1:4000 or 1:5000 still applies to the straight line distance (see Appendix 2 of the Rules, Item 3.5.5)

2. Rules relating to the Schools Championship

These rules will be extracted into a separate section by Blair Trewin and refer to the ASSOC Rules where possible to avoid duplication.

3. Controller and Event Reports

Section 32 is to be simplified. This section requires a number of event reports which in practice are mostly not done. The reporting requirements are to be reviewed to target the preparation only of reports which will provide useful information to be passed onto future event organisational teams.

The following comments are made:

- These should apply to all group A events
- Annual progress reports in advance of the event are not submitted in practice, and are probably not useful although Exception reporting should be considered as required
- Results do not need to be included with these reports as they are available elsewhere
- Financial reports are usually only relevant to the organising state
- Use of the simplified controllers' report proforma is recommended

The suggested rewording is below; only 2 rules are necessary.

- 32.1 No more than 6 weeks after the event, the Orienteering Australia Controller shall send a report to the Orienteering Australia Controller appointing body with copies to Technical Director, Technical Chair, and OA Executive Officer. Report may be on a proforma as made available from the Technical Chair and include at a minimum:

- Details of complaints and protests
- Details of issues that impacted on the event
- Deviations from the rules

The controller may include additional reporting material from the organiser and planner as necessary.

- 32.2 If requested the Orienteering Australia Controller shall submit a progress report to the Orienteering Australia Controller appointing body with copies to Technical Director, Technical Chair, and OA Executive Officer

4. Controller Accreditation

The following changes are proposed

1. Accreditation period be 4 years for all Levels, however the points can be accumulated over rolling periods of 5 years for Levels 1, and 8 years for Level 2 and 3 (previously 10). Process to implement the changes needs to be defined, and would be done with the Manager Coaching and Officiating once the current backload is resolved.
2. Group C Events –the current categorisation here is unnecessary and should be simplified to
C1 – OY and/or Pre-entry events justifying a controller
C2 – other minor events
3. Re-accreditation Points – changes to remove less relevant activities from higher levels, and require attendance at a mandatory update session over the period at which points can be accredited e.g. at least once in a 8 year period since initial accreditation and in each 8 years thereafter for a level 3 controller. Attendance at update courses provides opportunities to interact with other controllers. Considering the changes that can occur to event formats, technology, rules and event organisation requirements (e.g. Risk Management, Environmental Requirements) over the periods in which points can be accumulated, update courses would assist all controllers in keeping up to date.

Suggested Changes to align the points to be available from Controlling events are also made i.e. Level 3 must control a Group A event. Level 2 can be Group B or A2 (which only requires a level 2 controller)

The proposed changes (taking into account the changes proposed for C1 above and events to be controlled) are below. Removed point options are shown with strikethrough.

Task	Number of points towards re-accreditation at:		
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Controlling – Group A event	NA	NA	40*
– Group A2 or B event	NA	30*(a)	30
– Group C event	20*	20	20
Course-planning – Group A event	25	25	25
– Group B event	20	20	20
– Group C1 event	15	15	15
– Group C2 event	10	10	10
Organising – Group A event	25	25	25
– Group B event	15	15	15
– Group C1 event	10	10	10
– Group C2 event	5	5	5
Attend controller update session	10-20*	10-20*	10-20*
Attend organiser/course planning course	10	10	
Conduct controller workshop	20	20	20
Train new controller	10	10	10
Other appropriate tasks	As determined by State Association Technical Director		As determined by OA Technical Director
Total points required	40-60	60-75	80-100
Re-accreditation period	4 years	4 years	4 years
Points can be accumulated over	5 years	8 years	10 years

* Mandatory task in each period in which points can be accumulation from the initial accreditation (i.e. each 5 or 8 year period). For Level 3, accreditation points may also be obtained from controlling Oceania Championship Events

The Manager Coaching and Officiating Development is currently catching up on outstanding Accreditations and a more up to date list is now at <http://www.orienteering.asn.au/technical/controllers/accredcont/>

OA is planning Level 3 Controller update course on a biennial basis. The next workshop is proposed for Thursday October 6th in Canberra during the Oceania Carnival.

4. Winning Times for Elite Courses

Changes to these have been reviewed by the High Performance Group and based on their suggestions the following were the recommendations of the technical Committee. Note that winning times for the Aust long champs were not discussed and so will need to be considered separately. The proposed changes are the values in Yellow highlight.

General event formats	M 21E	W21 E	M21 A	W21 A	M17-20E	W17-20E	M17-20A	W17-20A
Sprint	12-15	12-15	12-15	12-15	12-15	12-15	12-15	12-15
Middle distance	30-35	30-35	30-35	30-35	20-25 30-35	20-25 30-35	20-25 30-35	20-25 30-35
Long distance	75-90	60-70	75	60	70	55	60	50
Relays*	135	120	135	120	120	110	120	110
Specific events								
Australian 3-Days Prologue	12	12	n/a	n/a	12	12	n/a	n/a
Australian 3-Days Day 1	30	30	55	45	25 30	25 30	45	40
Australian 3-Days Day 2	80 85-90	60 65-70	55	45	65 70	50 55	45	40
Australian 3-Days Day 3	45	40	55	45	40 45	35 40	45	40
Australian Long Distance Championships	90	70 85	75	60	70 75-80	55 65-70	60	50
Australian Relay* Championships	135	120	n/a	n/a	120	105	n/a	n/a

In addition, a provision is needed to allow NL winning times to be varied with the approval of the HP Manager – e.g. to make a WOC trial longer than 90/70 minutes. So this may need to be a separate category e.g. 85 mins for W21E and 100-105 for M21E.

Event Controlling Overview

Major Foot and MTBO Events over the last few months have highlighted areas where Controllers need to be vigilant in order to produce the best and fairest outcome for competitors. These include:

Sprint Events Out of Bounds and Impassable Areas/Features

Competitors are still not always aware of what features are out of bounds or forbidden to be crossed on Sprint Maps or in some cases they are not observing the rules. Organisers need to reiterate the details in the event information and possibly at the start. Course planners need to minimise the temptation of competitors to cross such area, and where the possibility is high that this may happen e.g. because an out of bounds area is small and/or narrow, these areas may need to be

1. Flagged on the ground
2. Manned and competitors disqualified when they cross them

The latter option although difficult to manage fairly may ultimately lead to reduced incidence of competitors disobeying the rules.

Misplaced Controls and Field Checking Controls

Both MTBO and Foot O events have had misplaced controls and/or incorrect control numbers. Controllers need to ensure that final control placement is both checked independently and both the person placing and checking the controls do this with a master Map printed at the same time or from



the same “file” as the Course Maps. This ensures that last minute changes are not missed when placing and verifying controls.

Contra Legs

Course planners often debate about whether course legs should not be run in opposite directions on different courses. Although these are not explicitly excluded in the Course Planning Guidelines in the OA Foot Rules, the following Guideline from Appendix 2 in the effectively means that “Contra Legs” would generally go against this guideline .

3.5.4 Fairness of control sites

It is necessary to choose control sites with great care and notably to avoid the ‘acute angle’ effect where incoming competitors can be led into the control by outgoing runners.

Winning Times and Grouping of Classes on a Course

The Foot Rule Guidelines have recommended groupings but these should be taken as a guide and are recommended for Long Distance winning times only. Variations from this may be needed for

1. Complex areas with difficult terrain as these may slow the older age groups down more relative to elites so the relative run rates may need to be modified
2. Other event formats – Sprint and Middle – where the winning time relationship between classes is different from Long Distance events
3. Entry numbers are large so that the grouping means that the number of entrants on a course exceeds the available start window so that more courses are required. Expected numbers at the event need to be factored into the planning phase

For major events the Course- Class combination needs to be planned prior to course planning in earnest considering the guidelines and the above factors.

An Excel spreadsheet to assist with this process is available from Robin Uppill (oa_technical@netspeed.com.au)

Other Technical Matters

Proposal to Modify Control Descriptions

Proposal to modify the 2004 IOF control descriptions for rock features (previously distributed) - from Adrian Uppill, Chair of Mapping Committee. There has been overall positive feedback, with some discussion regarding the knoll/high point symbol. The proposal was endorsed by the Technical Committee and the proposal will be sent to the IOF once the appropriate method is advised by Mike Dowling.

Details of the proposed change are:

One of the major changes resulting in the IOF Control Descriptions 2004 was to bring control names and descriptions into line with the International Specifications for Orienteering Maps 2000. However it is considered that further unification is warranted to minimize confusion between the control description symbols and the mapping symbols. Although experienced orienteers may have a good knowledge of the mapping and control description symbols, to the new orienteer or those unfamiliar with the international control symbols, some of the control symbols lack easy recognition as to their meaning or are inconsistent in shape when compared to the mapping symbols ie a small dot symbol represents a knoll for the control description but represents a boulder on the map! Changes to some control description symbols are therefore required.

Changes to four control descriptions symbols are proposed as follows:

(1) Knoll. To free up the dot symbol (to be used to represent a Boulder) which is currently used to represent a knoll on the control description, it is proposed that the dot symbol be replaced with an elongate dot. Hence the mapping features for a knoll (represented as a brown dot) and an elongate

knoll (brown elongate dot) would then be graphically represented by an elongate dot for the control description.




















Alternatively, a solid semi circle (representing the cross section shape of a mound or knoll) could be used if preferred over the elongate dot.

(2) Boulder. Replace the solid equilateral triangle with a dot which is the same graphical shape as used for the mapping symbol of a boulder.

(3) Boulder field. Replace the five small solid equilateral triangles with three randomly oriented solid triangles of similar proportion as the shape (side ratio of 8:6:5) of the area mapping symbol for boulder field.

(4) Boulder cluster. Replace the two overlapping equilateral solid triangles with a single solid equilateral triangle and being the same shape as used in the mapping symbols for a Boulder cluster.

The graphical representation of the four control description symbols with the corresponding map symbols for the feature described and how these are suggested for use are set out below:

Control Descriptions 2004 (all black)			Mapping Symbols (ISOM2000, ISSOM2006)	
number & control description	(1) IOF symbol	(2) Proposed symbol	number & mapping description	
1.10 Knoll		 ()	112 Small knoll (brown)	
2.4 Boulder			113 Elongated knoll (brown)	
2.5 Boulder field			206 Boulder	
2.6 Boulder cluster			207 Large boulder	
Others symbols remain the same ie				
1.9 Hill			208 Boulder field	
6.2 Special item			209 Boulder cluster	
			111 Knoll (contour symbols)	
			539 Special man-made feature (as defined)	

Summary

In conclusion it is proposed that four control symbols used in the Control Descriptions 2004 be changed as follows:

- 1.10 Knoll**  to 
- 2.4 Boulder**  to 
- 2.5 Boulder field**  to 
- 2.6 Boulder cluster**  to 

Technical Guidelines

The ASC Funding Grant includes a budget line to cover the preparation of Event Guidelines. The Technical Committee prioritised the following:



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

1. procedural manuals for management of relays using OCAD/OS
2. Map printing guidelines (including different formats, overprinting, digital printing).
3. Major Event Management Guidelines

In addition updates on the MTBO Rules and Guidelines needs also to be considered.

The updated funding submission to the ASC in May 2011 contained \$500 for each of Items 1 and 2 only, and funding for Item 3 in 2012. Eric Andrews has however done significant work on the Major Event Guidelines.

Mapping Committee Meeting Minutes and Mapping News

The minutes from this meeting are posted on the OA Web Site at

<http://www.orienteering.asn.au/technical/mapping/mappers/>

Some items of interest are

1. Request for a Map deviation at the Prologue at the recent Australian Three Days. Note that event organisers need to request permission for deviations from the OA Rules with respect to maps used from the Chair of the OA Mapping Committee (e.g. scale variations from those specified in the rules, deviations from Mapping Specifications). These deviations need to be planned for and requested well in advance and not left until maps are completed and courses planned.
2. Plan to hold a half day mapping workshop in Canberra on the Thursday of the Australian-Oceania Championships week

Other recommendations of the mapping committee meeting were

- Overprinting of course and map to be considered further noting that overprinting is a requirement for WREs
- the creation of the 'Australian Orienteering Mapping Group' (Google Groups) as a forum for mappers and others to share news and knowledge
- Committee recommendation that street and park maps be printed in colour
- Committee recommendation that organisers and course planners be reminded of IOF sprint specifications requiring that traffic must be kept out of sprint orienteering areas and by implication should also be considered in respect to street & park events

IT Committee Meeting

This committee also meet at the Australian Three Days where Tim McIntyre offered to take on the role of Chairperson. Items discussed were:

1. Need to get more useful reports on Event Participation from the OA Results system
2. 2010 versions of Sport Software not yet widely used. The options for licensing based on the number of entries make the choice of which licence to purchase difficult. Result export is a slightly different format than OE 2003. Norm Johnston in the ACT has developed a macro to update the OE 2010 export to a format compatible for import into the OA Results system
3. Online entry systems – major events have successfully used Transition Zone in recent years, this has the advantage of providing reports in OE import format. However other options are available for minor and major events, these may or may not include integrated payment systems.

Some more information on systems in use where forms based on 3rd Party Providers is included here:

1. RegisterNow is being used by OANSW for QBIII, WA is also using this for online entry. This system has integrate payment (see www.registernow.com.au)
2. Simple online forms can be constructed for both online entries and membership using www.emailmeform.com (used in SA).

Using these systems requires less overhead and does not depend on the knowledge of a “home grown” system residing with a small number of people