

# Major Events Group

## *Minutes of meeting*



held on Saturday 17<sup>th</sup> April 2010  
at Anglers Arms, Haverthwaite  
commencing at 16.30.

### **Present:**

Mike Forrest (MF)  
David May (DM)  
Sue Birkinshaw (SB)  
Nev Myers (NM)  
David Peel (DP) – Events Manager

### **In attendance:**

Barry Speake (BS) – observer

### **Apologies:**

Steve McKinley (SM)  
Scott Fraser (SF)  
Helen Errington (HE) -Events Manager

### **The minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed and actions reported:**

- The recommended format of a combined Elite and Age Class sprint had been adopted and would be implemented at the 2011 event being staged by South Downs Orienteers.
- Middle distance map scales. MF had made a request to Map Group that there should be dual scales (1:10,000 and an enlargement to 1:7,500 for older competitors) at the 2010 British Middle Distance championships at Haverthwaite and that there should be a change to the rules so that there are dual scales for all middle distance events. Map Group had given an exception to the rules for Haverthwaite but rejected the request for the rules to be changes. Concern was expressed that this decision had not been communicated in a formal way to MEG and that the eventual reply was unsatisfactory.
- Monitoring of Major events: The Event Manager's paper on this was welcomed and it should be taken further

There was a general debate about how the EMs should report and how often. The consensus was that they should attend MEG meetings and also produce interim reports. With MEG meetings every 6 months and interim reporting this would give feedback every 3 months.

There was a discussion on the monitoring of any protests and their outcomes and what criteria should be used for the voiding of courses.

**Action:** MF to request to Events Committee that Appendix G needs to contain the criteria which are in Appendix I. MF to inform Barry Elkington as Chair of Rules Group of this action

**MF reported on the recent Events Committee meeting:**

- Rules, Appendices and Guidelines will have a document numbering system so that the EMs can keep organisers up to date with any changes and ensure that they are following the right version of rules.
- Appendix H. EMs were tasked with assisting Map Group rewrite Appendix H
- There was concern over the poor geographic spread of the BOC/JK in 2013 and 2014. There were ongoing negotiations to try and improve this by switching the organisers/years around. SB suggested that NW may be prepared to swap the year that they organise BOC. *Post meeting note. SB had spoken to the Chair of NWOA who was happy in principle and would raise the matter at the next NWOA executive meeting.*
- Peter Guillaume and Pat Martin had resigned as Chair and Secretary of Fixtures Group to be replaced by Mike Cope and Paul Caban respectively.
- A request had been made via the EMs to change the date of BOC 2011 to 16 May as the proposed date of 9 May clashes with the Nordic Championships. DP reported that this was ongoing.

**Major event conference:** SB asked why the venue had been changed. The EMs had produced a report on the whole process. The main reason was the need for a venue which had suitable 'break out' rooms available.

**Grade 1 controllers:** EMs had produced an audit of the existing Grade 1 controllers. There were some errors to the list which individual group members would report to the EM. There was a debate about the criteria used to determine if one could remain as a Grade 1 controller and also the need to recruit new people. DM requested that IOF EA experience and that any future commitments should be included.

**Action:** DM to produce a request for nominations for new Grade 1 controllers. This would be sent to regional controllers of Controllers, Rules Group regional reps and regional association chairs. The audit list of Grade 1 controllers should be included so that regions could notify of any errors/omissions etc.

**Action:** EMs. The recommendations made in the Grade 1 controller audit report should adopted.

The meeting noted the untimely death of Dave Stubbs and that there was a need to find a replacement controller for the 2011 Middle Distance Championships.

**Action:** MF will control the 2011 Middle Distance Championships

**Rules ambiguities:** EMs had carried out an audit of the 2011 Competition Rules and noted a number of irregularities. These were mainly consistency of event titles etc. but there were a couple regarding trophies and medals which required further work.

**Action:** EMs to pass on audit for adoption and make proposals on all points noted as 'Area of Concern' in time for the Rules Group meeting on 22 May.

**Terms of Reference:** MF gave background to this and raised 3 areas which require consideration:

- Allocation of major events to organising bodies: There was a general debate about the pros and cons of the existing system and possible alternative methods. It was noted that an event strategy would give greater clarity to this.  
**Action:** MF and EMs to write a number of solutions for the group to discuss.
- Membership of the group. MF detailed the membership criteria and there was a general debate about this, which moved onto possible candidates and how to find them.  
**Action:** NM to approach two possible candidates about joining the group. MF to write to associations asking for possible candidates and correspondent members.
- Evaluation of events: DP gave a background to an EM paper about the evaluation of events from an organisational perspective. This had been produced using the same topics that would be used in the proposed Partnership Agreement. The debate around this moved onto a proposed questionnaire of competitors and officials of our major event by the EMs. This was welcomed and it was suggested that it could be done for all major events.  
**Action:** EMs to press ahead with questionnaire on JK.

**Partnership Agreement:** DP briefly explained a development of the Partnership Agreement, which would detail exactly what both the Organising body and British Orienteering are responsible for. The detail of who was responsible for what would be agreed between both parties in advance and set out in the agreement giving a tailored agreement for each event. This presented a slight problem over the Board's acceptance but it was felt that approval should be sought for the new format in principle by the Board.

**Action:** EM to develop Partnership Agreement further as a priority

**Organisational structure of future major events:** DP very briefly introduced some ideas that the EMs were working on. These related to the formation of specific groups/boards to oversee and develop the key major events, i.e. a JK group would develop this event in line with definitions of the events aims and objectives. The EMs had produce draft definitions for some of the major events.

**Next Meeting:** NM to propose possible midweek dates in October at a venue in London.