

# Events Committee

## Minutes

### 8 November 2008



---

## Minutes

### 1 Attendance, apologies and Chairman's opening remarks

Lyn West (LW)	Chairman
Barry Elkington (BE)	Chairman, Rules Group
Peter Guillaume (PG)	Chairman, Fixtures Group
Sue Marsden (SM)	Chairman, Junior Competitions Group
John Palmer (JP)	Chairman, Elite Competitions Group
Mike Forrest (MF)	Chairman, Major Events Group
Colin Spears (CS)	Chairman, Mapping Group
Ranald Macdonald (RM)	Representative, Senior Competitions Group
Laura Young (LY)	Minute taker

LW explained that Mike Hamilton had sent his apologies and Events Committee thanked Laura Young (LY) for attending on his behalf. LY would be the minute-taker for the meeting

LW welcomed Ranald Macdonald (RM) to the meeting as the nominated representative from the newly re-formed Senior Competitions Group. LW explained that RM was a previous Chairman of Events Committee and he was a welcome addition to group.

### 2 Declarations of Interest

There were no further declarations of interest.

#### Minutes of Meeting of 14 June 2008

The minutes were confirmed as a true record of the meeting.

### 3 Notification of any other business

LW noted issues regarding BOC and BEOC raised by Arthur Vince. This item was to be taken under the Major Events Group report.

A further AOB item discussing the Compass Sport Cup final was to be addressed within the Senior Competitions Group report.

There were no further notifications of additional business.

### 4 Review the action list from the previous meeting

Other than the currently outstanding action regarding Rules Group, who had not met since the previous Events Committee meeting, there were no outstanding actions. Rules Group were meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2008.

### 5 Whole Sport Plan Update

LW gave Events Committee an update of the Whole Sport Plan for Orienteering and the Sport England funding submission. LW explained that the funding

submission had been submitted to Sport England on 24<sup>th</sup> October. Events Committee wished to thank MH for his work in producing the document. LW explained that the submission included numerous targets that Events Committee would help British Orienteering achieve.

The two key targets for Events Committee assistance would be increasing participation and increasing member satisfaction.

LW explained that Sport England would measure member satisfaction by commissioning a 3<sup>rd</sup> party company to conduct a survey of a sample of members. This would question a cross-section of members and the results would be used to judge overall levels of satisfaction in orienteering. A baseline measure would be produced and targets agreed accordingly. At the end of the four year period (to 2013) a further satisfaction survey would be completed and this would determine whether or not British Orienteering had met its targets in relation to satisfaction.

RM enquired as to the validity of the sampling. LW explained that this would all be organised by the 3<sup>rd</sup> party company. RM explained the importance of ensuring the 3<sup>rd</sup> party were well briefed prior to conducting the survey to ensure valid results.

LW explained that having previously conducted the Events Structure Review this put British Orienteering in a positive position with regard to amending event structures to improve satisfaction.

PG asked if LW could circulate the funding submission to Event Committee members. PG explained that ultimately Events Committee members would be at the delivery end of the submission and should therefore be aware of what it includes.

**Action 1:** LW to circulate via email the Sport England funding submission to Events Committee. (LW, by 21<sup>st</sup> November 2008)

## **6 LOC National Event 2009 at Graythwaite**

LW noted that she was disappointed that Events Committee were having to discuss this issue and that LOC and Map Group were not able to come to a satisfactory conclusion.

LW explained that Events Committee needed to come to a decision that provided LOC with answers but they also needed to discuss the way forward in the future.

Events Committee discussed the options for map scales for the LOC 2009 National Event at Graythwaite. CS noted that as a National Event it needed to represent a top-class event on the best terrain using the best quality maps. CS went on to explain that the readability of the map, regardless of scale, would be improved by better quality printing. CS suggested that 1:7500 laser print would have no readable benefits over 1:10000 offset litho.

Events Committee members noted that the mappers concerns were regarding those running on the elite map.

JP explained that the decision regarding the elite map scales had already been discussed with Elite Competitions Group and they recommended 1:15000. Substituting a Middle Distance Race would upset the planned balance of the UK Cup in 2009.

MF noted the implications to juniors running on different scales. Juniors are used to running on 1:10000 scale maps and therefore get used to judging distances on these scales. Changing the consistency could cause them to under/over shoot

controls. As juniors were trained to run on certain scales it would be detrimental to their development to change them ad hoc.

Events Committee agreed with the comments and agreed that juniors at the National Event at Graythwaite should have 1: 10000 scaled maps that are litho printed.

Events Committee agreed to support the recommendations of Map Group and therefore the map scales for the LOC National Event at Graythwaite in 2009 would be as follows:

Elite	1:15000
W/M35 and W/M40, M/W18	1:15000
W/M45 and older	1: 10000
Juniors M/W16 and below	1: 10000

All courses should be offset litho printed. Any implications to cost of litho printing should be factored into the entry fees.

**Action 2:** LW to inform LOC of decision made regarding map scales for Graythwaite 2009. (LW, by 14<sup>th</sup> November 2008)

Events Committee wished to note that LOC could choose what map scales to use for the colour-coded courses.

Events Committee discussed how to avoid this being an issue with future National events. When clubs offer to hold National standard events, Fixtures Group must highlight that the required map scales are as listed above and any variations need to be requested at the time of the original bid. Prior to the event being accepted into the fixtures list, Map Group would have to agree any changes to the proposed map scales. If clubs were, at this point, not happy to produce maps on the agreed scales, the offer of the fixture could be withdrawn.

MF suggested commissioning a survey of those running at Graythwaite to assess the impact of the map scales on their enjoyment of the event. Events Committee supported this idea but also asked to view the questions prior to the survey.

BE suggested also questioning those who did not run at Graythwaite. This would be to ascertain whether or not the chosen map scales had impacted on their decision not to attend the event.

**Action 3:** MF and Major Events Group to look into taking an exit survey of competitors at Graythwaite to look into the impacts of chosen map scales. Questions would be drafted and circulated to Events Committee prior to the next Events Committee meeting. (MF and Major Events Group, by 17<sup>th</sup> January 2009)

## **7 MW16 running in FCC**

Events Committee considered a request from International Committee to increase the remit of the FCC to allow M/W16s to score. SM explained that having discussed the issue with Regional Squad Co-ordinators, they didn't feel it was a suitable addition and would not benefit long-term athlete development.

BE explained that the FCC Long courses in 2008 were M20E length and hence longer than in previous years. It would not be suitable for all M/W18, and therefore was even less likely to be suitable for M/W 16.

JP explained that if the issue was M/W16 being selected for squads then it was an issue to be discussed with selectors and in all likelihood a solution could be reached. JP also noted that first year M/W18 rarely do well at the FCC long final and therefore it is unlikely the M/W16 would. They could find the experience demotivating.

PG noted that M/W 16s can currently enter the FCC events including the final they just do not score. This already provides an opportunity to enter if coaches felt it appropriate.

LW commented that the issue could have safeguarding implications. For example, it could encourage over-running and over-training in young people. Similarly, it opened the FCC final up to 'over-zealous' parents who put pressure on youngsters to compete. LW suggested that the Start squad coaches and managers could identify any youngsters who would benefit from competing. They could still compete and not score.

Events Committee agreed not to expand the FCC to include M/W16s. M/W16s can enter, if they/their coaches see fit, but not score.

JP noted that Gareth Candy was developing programmes of annual planning with the junior athletes.

SM suggested communicating the message of long-term athlete development with regional squad co-ordinators. JP offered to deliver a presentation at the next Regional Squad co-ordinator meeting.

**Action 4:** LW to inform International Committee of decision regarding not expanding FCC to include M/W16s. (LW, by 21<sup>st</sup> November 2008)

## **8 Host/BOF Major Events Agreement**

LW explained that the Board were happy with the drafted Major Events Agreement. Events Committee had also approved the draft at a previous meeting.

MF explained that the agreement would be used with British Orienteering events e.g. BOC Long, JK, BEOC Middle and Sprint, British Age Class Middle and British Age Class Sprint in the first instance and extended to include the Area Championships held at National standard if it was felt appropriate.

MF explained that the plans for implementation were to implement the agreement fully for events in 2011. The agreement would be used as far as possible for events in 2010. It was acknowledged that this may not be possible in all respects and the agreement would not be imposed on organisers in 2010.

MF explained that organisers in 2010 would be expected to sign-up to the agreement with any necessary provisos agreed by MF in advance.

MF noted that it would be clear that on signing the agreement the club would agree to the map scales outlined in the Event Guidelines. The agreement would be accompanied by the latest copy of the Event Guidelines. The guidelines for each level of event include what scale a map should be surveyed and mapped at.

**Action 5:** BE to circulate draft event guidelines to Events Committee after Rules Group meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> November. (BE, after 22<sup>nd</sup> November)

**Action 6:** BE to inform MF and Events Committee when guidelines are on website. (BE, when guidelines are on website)

**Action 7:** MF to arrange signing of Major Events agreement with organisers of British Orienteering events from 2010 onwards. **(MF and Major Events Group, by 17<sup>th</sup> January 2009)**

## **9 Competition Structure Implementation**

### **Event Registration Procedure**

LW asked PG for his opinion on current developments with the web-based Event Registration Process. PG explained that the process was nearing being 'fit for purpose'. Events Committee discussed how changing the levels of event in 2009 and the phasing process would work in relation to registration.

BE explained that the current draft 2009 Event guideline, that included all cross-country events, that had recently been published on the website, had been criticised and therefore two separate guidelines were now in draft form. He also felt the colour-coded structure in the new guideline was overly complicated and was causing confusion. The rest of the committee agreed. BE proposed returning to the existing colour-coded structure.

BE noted that the transition to colour-coded courses at regional events would have implications on the ranking list. Currently results were submitted in age-class format and rankings were worked out based upon age classes. Currently the age-class courses would need mapping onto the colour-coded courses. The Ranking Workgroup recommendations would have an impact on this issue moving forward.

Events Committee discussed the entry system requirements that would be needed to map age classes onto colour-coded courses. LW noted that age class comparisons were acceptable in the short time but long-term the idea was to move away from references to age courses. MF noted that in the transition phase it was important to keep in mind where the new competition structure was going, what the structure would look like long-term and where any other changes e.g. entry systems fit into this.

### **Competition Framework**

Events Committee went onto discuss the proposals for changes to the current colour-coded event system. BE suggested staying with the current colour-coded system but allowing for example, two blue courses short and long. LW noted that this would mean accurately predicting entry level which should be possible.

Events Committee went on to discuss the paper circulated by MH regarding Competition Framework and possible changes to the colour-coded framework. The essence of the proposal was to assign a colour to a technical difficulty e.g. have 5 colour from TD1-TD5 and then differing length e.g. XS, S, M, L, XL.

The aim of the proposal is to simplify the progression for both newcomers and established orienteers. BE noted that changing the course framework would mean modifying current literature. LW suggested that other sports readily changed their rules and literature and therefore this did not constitute a good enough reason alone to stay with the current system.

PG noted that with 2009 being a transition year it presented an opportunity to make all the changes in one year if Events Committee decided they supported the proposed changes.

BE explained to Events Committee that Rules Group had been tasked with investigating changing the colour-coded system. Rules Group had reported back

that currently there was no need to change the basic current colour coded framework.

RM noted that even the proposed changes to the colour-coded system did not allow for how physically difficult the courses were and how long a competitor would be running for.

BE expressed his opinion that in the proposed changes would mean that competitors following the colour-coded badge scheme would stall once they reached the colour with the highest technical difficulty. In the current system they had choices with regards courses above green. BE noted that the proposed changes did not recognise the difference between short and long TD5 courses, e.g. long route choice legs. LW therefore suggested modifications to the proposed changes to allow for 6 levels of technical difficulty e.g. to allow for long route choice legs.

JP asked about the junior and developmental implications of the current and proposed systems. JP suggested a survey of juniors and newcomers to ask how the proposals or current system would motivate them to move through the competition framework. JP also asked about the marketing implications of the two systems and the opinion of the Marketing Manager, Caroline Povey, about the proposed changes.

LW expressed the importance of allowing clubs the flexibility to run courses that suited their target market.

LY asked Events Committee how a newcomer would know how difficult a colour-coded course was e.g. what did TD1 and white course mean. PG explained that it was largely down to the clubs to explain to newcomers what the courses entailed. Events Committee went on to discuss the possibility of accompanying colour-coded courses with short descriptors to allow newcomers to decode what the courses entailed.

Events Committee suggested that it was important to explore the developmental implications of the competition framework proposals. Largely Events Committee were happy with the colours allocated for TD1-4 and it was TD5 and above that required further consultation e.g. should TD5 be one colour (Brown) or numerous different colours.

BE noted that having XS, S, M, L, XL courses in the same colour could be confusing at the start and end up with individuals picking up the wrong maps and therefore running the wrong courses.

Events Committee concluded the discussion regarding the competition framework by suggesting that BE should continue to draft the event guidelines based on the current colour-coded structure. Overall Events Committee were happy with using colour names for TD 1-5. Questions remain as to whether TD 5 should be one colour (e.g. brown) or whether TD 5 should have the current four colours. The motivational issues of both should be discussed with Development Committee.

## **Controllers**

Events Committee were happy to publish the FAQs Version 2 on the British Orienteering website.

Events Committee discussed the requirements for controllers to view risk assessments for all levels of event. BE noted that every event should have controller input appropriate to the level of event. JP asked if there would be sufficient 2 controllers to cope with the increased demand. BE responded by

explaining that some Grade 3 controllers with the relevant experience could apply to be Grade 2 controllers. Events Committee also noted that more training courses for controllers are necessary.

PG noted that there was unlikely to be a vast increase in Level 2 events in 2009 and the increase would more likely be in 2010 when clubs had become accustomed to the new event structure. It would be in 2010 that more Grade 2 controllers were needed.

MF explained that for Major Events it was more important to have a Grade 1 controller from out of region. Events Committee agreed to sanction the eventual appointment of Grade 1 controllers from within a region for Major Events if an out-of-region Grade 1 controller was not practical. Mike Forrest would allocate Grade 1 controllers and satisfy himself that any inter-region controller would be genuinely independent.

Events Committee discussed the possibility of Level 2 events using Grade 2 controllers from inside the club. It was felt that this was not acceptable. Out-of-club Grade 2 controllers were needed to ensure independence and quality events at Level 2. This would continue to be reviewed.

### **Embargos**

Events Committee agreed that all Level 1 events would have a 24 months embargo period.

Events Committee went on to discuss embargo periods for Level 2 events. Events Committee agreed that the embargo period for Level 2 events would remain at 12 months. Those wishing to use the areas within this embargo period would need to declare themselves non-competitive.

## **10 Board Meeting Reports**

LW noted that it would be beneficial to have a specific Events Committee agenda item on the Board agenda. Currently issues were normally taken as AOB and then, due to meeting time pressures, sometimes insufficient time was allocated to them.

**Action 8:** LW to request Event Committee matters as item on agenda for Board meetings (LW, by 17<sup>th</sup> December 2008)

No further issues were raised.

## **11 Operational Group reports**

**Home Internationals, Competition (Elite, Senior & Junior), Rules, Fixtures, Map, Major Events**

**Reports from all groups had been circulated prior to the meeting**

### **Senior Competitions**

PG enquired as to whether there would be a change to the format of the Compass Sport Cup in 2009. RM explained that due to lack of time there would not be any changes for next year.

Events Committee discussed the possibility of raising the profile of the Masters Cup and possibly staging a Master Cup Final. Senior Competitions Group would discuss this prior to the next Events Committee meeting.

### **Elite Competitions**

JP was questioned regarding the M/W 18/20 Junior Elite class and whether they would run together at BEOC. JP explained that the M/W 18/20 would run together.

Events Committee went on to discuss the British Orienteering Championships and how BEOC and BOC should be together in the same event unless there was very good reason otherwise. LW noted that BOC needed a fixed date in order to allow Caroline Povey, the Marketing Manager, to sell the event to sponsors. MF suggested choosing a specific date in the year and saying that only areas available at this date would be considered for the fixtures. PG pointed out that this would dilute the number of associations who could actually hold BOC.

PG went on to explain that associations are currently told that BOC should be held on May Bank holiday weekend but individual association issues sometimes cause it to move dates.

Events Committee asked MF to consult with Major Events Group and look at the practicalities of implementing a set weekend for BOC. MF to also consult with PG and Fixtures Group.

**Action 9:** MF to consult with Major Events Group and Fixtures regarding practicalities of setting a fixed date for BOC. **(MF, by 17<sup>th</sup> January 2009)**

### **Rules Group**

BE proposed to change the JK Relay guidelines for the men's open class to include 3 people per team. This would be a change from 2010. Events Committee agreed.

## **12 Any Other Business**

There were no AOB items discussed.

## **13 Dates and Venues of Meetings**

Events Committee agreed that future meetings would be held at the Comfort Inn, Birmingham commencing at 12:00

Dates for 2009:

17 Jan, 13 June, 14 November

### **Chairman's closing remarks and close**

LW thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 17.00

---

## **Events Committee November 2008**

### **Action List**

**Action 1:** LW to circulate via email the Sport England funding submission to Events Committee. **(LW, by 21<sup>st</sup> November 2008)**

**Action 2:** LW to inform LOC of decision made regarding map scales for Graythwaite 2009. **(LW, by 14<sup>th</sup> November 2008)**

**Action 3:** MF and Major Events Group to look into taking an exit survey of competitors at Graythwaite to look into the impacts of chosen map scales. Questions would be drafted and circulated to Events Committee prior to the next Events Committee meeting. **(MF and Major Events Group, by 17<sup>th</sup> January 2009)**



**Action 4:** LW to inform International Committee of decision regarding not expanding FCC to include M/W16s. **(LW, by 21<sup>st</sup> November 2008)**

**Action 5:** Barry Elkington to circulate draft event guidelines to Events Committee after Rules Group meeting on 22<sup>nd</sup> November. **(BE, after 22<sup>nd</sup> November)**

Action 6: **BE to inform MF and Events Committee when guidelines are on website.** (BE, when guidelines are on website)

**Action 7:** MF to arrange signing of Major Events agreement with organisers of British Orienteering events from 2010 onwards. **(MF and Major Events Group, by 17<sup>th</sup> January 2009)**

**Action 8:** LW to request Event Committee matters as item on agenda for Board meetings **(LW, by 17<sup>th</sup> December 2008)**

**Action 9:** MF to consult with Major Events Group and Fixtures regarding practicalities of setting a fixed date for BOC. **(MF, by 17<sup>th</sup> January 2009)**

### **ACTIONS from previous meetings**

Arising or continuing from previous meetings of Event Operations Committee.

Once PG had confirmed the new Area Championships, a web article would be published;	PG/Office	Post-confirmation of new Area Championships
Rules Group, members are busy modifying the Rules, Appendices and Guidelines and should be in a position to publish the updated version by their next meeting <b>Guidelines drafted</b>	Rules Group	→ By next Rules Group meeting
MG: Mapping forms MR1 & MR2 to be updated and formatted – Still requiring implementation; awaiting confirmation as to the cost of changing the database <b>New map database operational; work remains on registration system</b>	CS	→
MEG: Procedures for the removal of controllers from the list to be developed – This is now within the remit of Rules Group	Rules Group	→

✓ Completed

→ On-going

**A** Agenda item