ISSOM20XX

*Mapping Committee Recommendations for*

Orienteering New Zealand Submission on the Draft Sprint Specification

*Comments have been received from Selwyn Palmer, Paul Ireland and Linley Earnshaw. Edited by Michael Wood 10 Apr 18. Text in red italic is explanation for ONZ and NOT intended to be part of the submission.*

*Note – this is about the ISSOM (the sprint specification) but we refer to recent experience revising the ISOM (the standard specification). One extra “S”. Take care when reading😊*

1. Consultation Process

We appear to have received a “Final Draft” of a revision without any early drafts or invitation to suggest areas of concern. Experience shows that hasty changes are bad changes, and we ask that you treat this as a “First Draft”, with opportunity for more consideration by all countries.

*The revision of the standard specification completed last year was a long and tortuous process, mostly because the IOF Mapping Committee appeared to be out of step with much of the world in several important matters. It almost seems that they don’t WANT serious submissions on this one.*

*Consideration of the “nitty gritty” needs testing on actual maps right through to ink on paper. This is not something we can expect mappers to do at short notice. We’ve confined ourselves to a few “big picture” issues. We have to hope that other countries can deal with the detail.*

1. Scope of The Specification

The ISSOM is nominally for the “sprint” discipline. The current specification suffers from attempting to cater for both urban and natural terrain, and legibility in natural terrain has suffered. In fact the revision goes further towards an urban emphasis.

We submit that this specification is best written for “Urban Orienteering”, rather than “Sprint Orienteering”. Accordingly, restrictions on scale and contour interval should be relegated to the rules for international events.

While a map for the IOF sprint discipline as currently run (12-15min) might need to be at a scale of 1:4000, urban maps in general do not need to be thus constrained. There may be ***longer*** urban events, or ***shorter*** urban events. While a map for the IOF sprint discipline may possibly need relatively flat terrain for which 2/2.5m contours might be appropriate, other urban events may include steeper land and a larger interval.

Alternatively, the specification needs much more work to make the path network legible in natural terrain. The pale brown infills and fine sidelines make paths near-invisible against a background of yellows and greens. It is made worse on steep slopes where the browns of excessive contours come into play. We refer to this below.

Not all sprints take place among buildings in city centres.

1. Track Symbols

The 20% brown track infill is very difficult to see against a background of open and rough open. (Compare the CMYK values for 20% brown 0/11/20/3.5 vs 50% yellow 0/13.5/39.5/0 – they are not very different).

The brown infill must be allowed to vary, and “seeing tracks at all” is more valuable than knowing whether traffic is heavy or light. This is a problematic judgement, even worse than the (discarded) urban/rural distinction. We suggest it be chosen by the mapper on a whole-of-map basis. A thicker border line may also be called for such as the previous 0.14mm value.

This is the prime example of an urban bias in the specification, please see item 2.

Thank you for enlarging the small track symbol 507. Should you not agree that this is a purely urban specification, then we ask that you include the large path symbol 506 black at 150% of its ISOM size. We accept that its use should be restricted to places where the dashes cannot be confused with impassable walls.

1. Symbol Numbers

Though we argued against it, you made substantial changes to ISOM symbol numbers in 2017. If you implement the symbol numbers used in this draft ISSOM there will be many discrepancies between ISSOM and ISOM.

Maintenance of symbol tables in files created over the years and by different mappers is quite a headache, and we are currently dealing with the conversion of ISOM maps. The last thing we need is a set of ISSOM symbol numbers which are different from their ISOM counterparts.

Now that the damage has been done, we ask that ISSOM symbol numbers follow the ISOM numbers where possible. And that in the future you make only vital changes to these symbol numbers.

*To put it bluntly this area is a disaster. IOF changed ISOM (standard maps) symbol numbers in a small way in 2000 and repercussions continue. IOF changed ISOM symbol numbers in a* ***massive*** *way in 2017, this makes the upgrade of older maps much harder. At its worst, distinctive trees may become stumps and stumps something else, etc.*

*While top competition sprint maps might be drawn from scratch, out in club life standard maps may be turned into sprint maps. Fieldworkers use these numbers in their recording. We need to have consistent symbol numbers which don’t change every few years.*

1. Conclusion

Thank you for the detailed improvements. We have some observations but not enough to be comprehensive, and there is not enough time to test right through to the printing stage.

We want to see all our maps on the international norms. Short forms of orienteering have become popular, providing both for sprint competition and beginner introduction. We hope you can resolve the urban-natural conundrum.