

Submission from the ONZ Mapping Committee

To ONZ Technical Committee

26 Feb 21

Revision of Competition Rules for New Zealand Foot Orienteering Events

Thank you for the changes that you have made to the Draft ONZ Rules so far.

First something quite minor in clause 17.2 There is no 520.002 in the IOF specification. This is an OCAD label, and quite possibly the symbol could be numbered differently in other software. We suggest calling the black stripe symbol "520 Alternative area that shall not be entered."

The Mapping Committee submits that the latest draft does not ensure legible maps for all orienteers. In our view:

- The enlargements in the "normal scale" start 10 years too late, and don't provide any additional enlargement for those over 60.
- The enlargements in the "alternative scale" start 10 years too late, and are subject to the discretion of the planner and controller.

We have presented evidence to show that 133% from age 40 and 150% from age 60 are a bare minimum to give older orienteers a good visual experience. The Swedish paper even suggests "our veteran maps should actually have 3-4 times the line width and font size for that veterans should have the opportunity to achieve the same enjoyment and readability at all as an elite under 30 years". (Google translation has some grammatical oddities.)

While we have every respect for the good intentions of planners and controllers to provide legible maps, they operate under the following handicaps:

1. The key one is that planners and controllers cannot possibly see the map through the eyes of those with less good vision than themselves. If controllers have ever had maps assessed by representatives of all age groups, it would be very rare.
2. Almost all planning and controlling is carried out at a walk, or on a desk. The orienteer needs to be able to read the map on the run.
3. Controllers pay most attention to the map around the controls, and they work from the terrain back to the map. It is easy to conclude that "yes the map agrees". But the orienteer has to work from the map forward to the leg and the next control, and to a mental terrain picture before getting there. This puts greater demands on map clarity.

Accordingly we cannot leave it to controllers “to ensure the scale is appropriate for each class”. That is a hope which will not be borne out in reality. It has clearly not been borne out in the past. We must lay down the enlargements based on the evidence.

We suggest only one column, with minimum enlargements from the elite scale according to our percentages. We think that the “alternative” column, with its mixture of smaller scales and larger scales, does not help at all. In fact we doubt that 1:15,000 will ever be used for a non-IOF event in this country, and we think that as a result, readers will not take this column seriously.

Finally, we point out that there is no “cost” to larger scales. There is only increased fairness and enjoyment.

Thank you for your consideration