

Comments on ONZ Rules Revision

Michael Wood 1 Mar 20

For the ONZ Mapping Committee

15.1 Maps, course markings and additional overprinting shall be drawn and printed according to the IOF *International Specification for Orienteering Maps* or the *IOF International Specification for Sprint Orienteering Maps*. Deviations need approval by the ONZ Technical committee.

[MJW The NZ-specific symbol use I have moved further down to go with other similar stuff, see 15.8.]

15.2 The map scales. The IOF specifications call for mapping as if for 1:15,000, and for sprints 1:4000. They specify that enlargements for any reason shall be proportional, that is symbol sizes increase with the scale.

Elite classes will normally use 1:15,000 for the long distance, 1:10,000 for middle distance and relays, and 1:4000 for the sprint.

[MJW – We have deliberately included the word “normally” to allow discretion – there are signs that the IOF is softening its hard line on this – and NZ has varied this too with general acceptance, eg the rock area at Oceania. Lets normalise it. The controller is in charge.

MJW comment continues... Now comes the interesting bit. Sweden has gone to huge enlargements for aged eyes in the forest, but only modest enlargements for sprints. Maybe their old people don't do sprints. Tiny gaps are a big issue for sprints, as is the need to distinguish three thicknesses of line – edge, crossable obstacle like a fence, and not-to-be-crossed barrier. Here is our recommended set of enlargements and wording. We have started enlargement at M/W40 because we often don't have a 45. If you are 48 your eyes are beginning to suffer yet you're possibly running M/W40. And at Sprintthebay 90-year-olds would have been running on M/W60 😊 Wording begins...]

Other classes will use an enlargement to at least 133% for juniors to 18, and masters from 40; and at least 150% for juniors to 14, and masters from 60. Further enlargement to a round scale number is suggested. There's no objection to greater enlargements for juniors and masters, if the courses fit on practical paper sizes.

Example of application of scale enlargement for juniors and masters.		
Elite scale incl M/W-20E	M/W-18 and M/W40-	M/W-14 and M/W60-
	Note: these scales are rounded	
1:15,000	1:11,000	1:10,000
1:10,000	1:7500	1:6,500
1:4000	1:3000	1:2500

15.3 [MJW -This is redundant surely! Any really last-minute change is catered for by 15.9]

15.4, 15.5 and 15.6 [MJW – Fine]

15.7 [MJW This is a meaningless statement. Of course they are all “a bit” larger, but how much is too much? We think it is redundant.]

15.8 [MJW – looks like a suitable place to collect NZ-specific stuff – I guess we are trying to maintain numbering compatibility with the IOF rules. Note that I foresee us writing something more comprehensive on NZ mapping practice in due course, so what is here would be the minimum for an event trying to comply strictly.]

[MJW – Include existing wording about fences and power lines. Add the following about symbol use...]

The following general symbols have a specific meaning in New Zealand

Blue asterisk * The “prominent water feature” is used for a Water Trough

[Blue square – doesn’t need to appear here as the mapping spec defines it. An unfortunate thing is that the sprint spec is worded slightly differently but we can’t do anything about that.]

Green cross X The “prominent vegetation feature” is used for a distinctive stump or log

Black cross X The “prominent man-made feature (cross)” is used for various man-made features.

The following general symbols have no specific meaning in New Zealand

Brown triangle X The “prominent landform feature” has no specific use in New Zealand

Black hollow circle O The “prominent man-made feature (ring)” is not used in New Zealand. It may be confused with earlier maps which used it for a water tank.

The specification requires that the above features if used (and some others) be defined on the map

[MJW – Aside – the other symbol that requires definition ON THE MAP is the prominent line feature, and its impassable variant. But I would be loth to write any more than strictly necessary in our rules, we make a maintenance burden for ourselves.]

15.9 OK

17.2

[MJW: The IOF has got its knickers in a twist with an argument between the council and the mapping committee. So somewhere in here it may be advisable to insert something like...]

This list takes priority over the wording of the mapping specifications, in which the word “impassable” is used in numerous places. The list in these rules is definitive.

19.4

[MJW - This rule uses the map scale to determine minimum control spacing. But the scale though

dependant on the same mapping (degree of detail) may be different for various classes. Shouldn't these distances be defined in terms of whether the map is an ISOM or an ISSprOM one? Yes it may be that the wording comes from the IOF (I see it in the principles for course planning") but there's no need to perpetuate an ambiguity.]

Appendix 6

[MJW – This has map scales which come from elsewhere. Should be consistent with 15.2. In fact it hasn't caught up with the move to only 1:4000 for sprint mapping. And the wording is old-style hard-line IOF as far as ISOM scales is concerned whereas we are seeing a softening of the stance on this. (Let alone pragmatic NZ decisions on non-IOF events.) The stance seems to be purely elite with no concessions to the rest of orienteering.]

Appendix 8

[MJW We note inclusion elsewhere of the special map symbols so agree App 8 can go. Just to be clear, the Mapping Committee has not had an involvement with control descriptions and doesn't want to. So I trust that those special description symbols which we use have all made their way into the relevant IOF publication.]