

Mike's eNews – 16 May 2014

Thanks again for the feedback. In a couple of weeks I'll email the next eNews and then the following Monday publish it on the web for the members. I'll continue then for a couple more editions to email and publish on the web and see what views people have. My concern at publishing it is twofold, one it requires people to go to it to get it – rather than it arriving in your inbox and two if it's published to all the members I may have to spend more time creating it and checking it as our membership is particular about grammar – sorry I meant grammar of course!

Permanent Orienteering Courses (POCs)

Over the summer we plan to do a lot of work with POCs to try to ensure our guidance etc is thorough and up to date. We think POCs could be a bigger part of our pathway into orienteering and want to strengthen the use of POCs.

In the short term however there have been a number of queries about POCs and I think these are worthy of more widespread club distribution.

- a) **Ordnance Survey:** If the map is based on OS then it needs a licence number on it and that will either be British Orienteering or the landowner such as a Local Authority or the National Trust.
If it uses the British Orienteering licence we need from you the number of maps printed and will enter it on a return to OS. We DO NOT need payment of the reproduction licence costs but we do need the number of maps produced. With a couple of clubs we have an arrangement whereby the club tallies the combined number of maps used for POCs and provides us with a total at the year end. I can then add the numbers into the return to OS.
You are not allowed to publish the maps on your club website without paying additional licencing fees to the OS either via us or via a separate OS licence agreement taken out by the club.
If the POC map has a licence number on it that is not British Orienteering, a local authority licence number for example, then we do not need the map numbers.
- b) **Participation numbers:** We would like your participation numbers for your POCs if possible and accept these may be best estimates. Again we would prefer them not to be in dribs and drabs but annually or each 6 months will do. These participation numbers are really important for us due to the Sport England contract but also to inform us about how much orienteering is going on.
- c) **Insurance:** Far more complicated unfortunately! You and your club have public liability cover so that is sorted. However there are a number of legal responsibilities:
 - Who holds the contract for mapping? – there are associated responsibilities
 - Who maintains the map?
 - Who 'sells' the map? Selling is a contract with responsibilities.
 - Who owns the map – they will carry quite a lot of responsibility
 - Who sets out the course?
 - Who maintains it?



- If there is a problem who is responsible?

All of this is not of my doing (or British Orienteering's) but the above all need thinking about at the point of engaging in delivering a POC and realistically there should be some form of simple agreement in place with any third parties that are involved. We'll pick up on all of the above later in the summer.

Clubmark

Clubmark is a nationally recognised accreditation scheme for sports clubs in England. There are similar schemes across the other parts of the UK. Clubmark has helped orienteering clubs to demonstrate they are well organised and governed and prompted clubs to establish development plans. Clubmark is a valued brand not just in orienteering but across a larger group of sports based in England and parents often look for the brand before joining a club. Sport England have consulted with a number of National Governing Bodies, County Sports Partnerships and Clubs and this has influenced Sport England's decision to review Clubmark. All clubs and interested parties have the opportunity to provide their views through an online forum - sportengland.e-luminate.net/

Alongside this generic review, British Orienteering will be conducting our own review of our orienteering version of the Clubmark criteria and procedures and will be using the national feedback to guide our review. As such Craig Anthony, our recently joined Head of Development, encourages clubs to provide their views through the Sport England forum by the end of the month.

Once this national review is completed we will be able to let you know more about what you need to do if your club needs reaccreditation.

JK 2014

We've been collecting your views about the recent JK and will be analysing those views shortly. Once in a respectable shape we will of course be publishing the outcomes for you to have a look at. The JK maps were also the subject of a separate survey and we have around 700 results are also being analysed.

British Orienteering web site

Just a brief warning that in a couple of weeks' time, probably before my next eNews, there will be a few changes to the web site. These changes will predominantly be to try to improve the navigation but we will also be trying to update some of the content at the same time. I think the changes to the navigation will make quite a lot of difference to the 'user experience' but I'm sure you'll let us know what you think when it happens! It will appear to be a big change but in reality there has been little work involved from the developers apart from to use some new technology to improve the navigation. It has cost very little but hopefully will have a positive impact. We'd like to do a lot more work on the site but funds are tight and people's time to improve the content is also limited.

JWOC 2014 Selections

I'm not going to spend too long on this one – there's a few news items that give you the messages. In short we are reviewing the selection made based on the outcome of an appeal that was made. However equally importantly we will be reviewing the Selection Policy to improve and modernise it – hopefully making it easier for athletes to understand!

[Type text]



I'll quickly make two further comments, firstly the decision by our selection panel to only select 3 women may not have been liked by some members but it was a brave decision and there were rational reasons for the decisions that led to that situation. As much as I would like the selection panel to make public that rationale we cannot as it would infringe privacy laws. Secondly I have been disappointed at the response from some members – not those I hasten to add who have legitimately sought to understand the rationale but from a number of members who have either made unnecessary personal comments about some staff/volunteers or who have just sought to condemn the decision without any attempt to understand the rationale. I'm a firm believer that everyone makes good decisions. It's usually that the information they had was poor or people have the benefit of hindsight!

I think both the selection panel and the appeals panel deserve thanks for the hard work they have put in over the last few weeks.