IOF

Attn.: Ove Gasbjerg

Copy:
National controller Suzy Larsson
Race director Mats Jodal
SEA Simon Errington

Final Report, JWOC 2008, Gothenburg

General

The organisers succeeded to hold good and fair competitions, in a very fine "jwoc atmosphere". There were no written complaints during the week to the organisers.

Courses

The runners seemed to be very satisfied. All courses were described as "technical demanding".

Spectators would have appreciated spectator controls. There were no spectator control in any of the competitions.

A lot of mails between me and the organisers made a little "mess" in my head: had I got their last course-proposal – is it really a final proposal with the control description on and all circles and line cut etc – do I have the last version of the map??? I now realise that I should have been more explicit, setting a date for a final proposal (may be even send to me on paper and not as an Ocad-file). There where several small adjustments I would have seen if I had made it that way.

Maps

We had discussions until last moment whether to offset-print or not. At last all maps were offset-printed. The sprint-map looked some weak/strange in its colours, and paved/dirt paths in the forest were drawn as paved paths in open areas (not with the darker brown), which was bad.

Despite my fairly hard pressure from an early stage in the process on the mappers to skip a lot of the help-contours at the relay map, nothing was done. It seems hard to "move" professional mappers.

Event centre

The Event centre was very well organised. The Swedish and Finnish teams entered too late to get their wish to have double rooms, and chose to stay outside the event centre. All other teams stayed at the event centre.

It was offered four levels of accommodation. Interesting to register that none of the teams wanted the cheapest offer (dormitory in a hall).

Technical matters

SportIdent system (SiTimec) was used on all JWOC-race. Two specialists from SportIdent supported the organisers all competition days.

The punching control was made by the SI-card (with which we supplied all competitors). The time was kept by a photocell. The numberbibs had a little chip that was read by the timekeeping system a few meters ahead of the finishing line. If the runner was alone the last few meters, the system matched the time from the photocell and numberbibs automatically together. If it was more than one runner passing the finishing line nearly at same time, the time and bibnumber were manually matched. This system seemed to work fine the whole week.

There were two separated timekeeping systems and video as a second backup.

The software used (SiTimec) had only been through one bigger test before JWOC, "10-mila"-relay, and it was tested on the JWOC-tests for Sweden and Denmark in May. The final version was delivered very late which left very little time to test the last functions. SiTimec even made some bugchanges during the week. I'm not able to say whether the comments below are due to weaknesses in the system or due to lack of knowledge on the new system, but I don't think it is the last…

- It was not possible to indicate in which starting group the competitor should be (early, middle or late) when the start lists should be drawn for the middle qualification distance. To go around this problem, first a class for each group was set up. After the "group classes" had been drawn and a check of the join between the groups had been done, the class was changed from the "group class" to the real class. This change of class had to be done manually for each runner.

  Another lack in the functionality of the system appeared during the start draw for the middle distance when it was not possible to have a random order of the runners starting at the same minute. (Their heat allocation should be kept secret.) The organisers spent a lot time, mainly with Excel, and had to do a lot manual punching into the SiTimec system.

  The start draw was done in SiTimec, but the system provided none facilities to change the runners' position (for example if runners from the same nation had consecutive start times). The starting lists had to be exported (this applies to all individual competitions) to Excel, changes according to the rules had to be done and then all starting times had to be punched manually into SiTimec system! There were none (known) import function.

  Also the start draw for the middle distance finals took some time. A function doing this more automatically is requested!

  The conclusion is that the start draw procedures demanded quite a lot concentration and took a long time even when the persons operating the system had a lot experience with earlier versions of SiTimec.

- The teams (and combination of teams) were handed in after the longdistance. The competitors names were taken from the database, but it had to be done by the SportIdent experts through a rather tricky procedure, and the result was not 100% OK. (Some special characters disappeared).

- SportIdent had promised their new functions in SiTimec on speaker and internet support finished in time to JWOC. They didn't finish it in time, and the organisers had to use the older OS2000. This lead to some (smaller) problems.

Rules – mistake by a team-leader

A team-leader was seen using her mobile telephone on her way to the start-area. It was announced at the team officials meeting that mobile telephones should not be used at the start area. There were no written protests after this incident, and the only reaction was that the Event director talked to her / gave her a warning.

What could/should the organisers/jury have done if there had been a complaint/protest on the issue? I had the same kind of challenge at WC2005 when some team leaders made what I would call a minor mistake against the rules. It should be possible to react in some other way than disqualifying the whole team. Do we have any examples on this? Could we for instance exclude the team-leader from the rest of the event?

Rules – start interval

> 12.16 The start interval in the Long distance competition is 2 minutes, unless there are more than 180 competitors in a class, in which case the start interval may be 1.5 minutes. For an interval start other than finals of qualification race competitions, the starting order shall be drawn at random. The start draw shall be made normally in three starting groups (early, middle and late).

We had planned as there would be more than 180 competitors in the mens class. We planned a butterfly and 1,5 min start interval. Unfortunately "only" 174 competitors entered the mens class and several nations wanted the start interval to be as in the rules and we had 2 min start interval (and a butterfly). 180 runners means 6 hours start depth, and a very long day for both competitors and spectators. Several have proposed that this rule should be changed.

I'm not in favor for changing the rule to shorter start intervals. Several nations agreed to keep it to two minutes in a discussion which was held after one team officials meetings. *If* the start interval is reduced to 1,5 min, it should be followed up with butterfly loops. And when it even is a goal to have a spectator control, I believe that this often will significantly reduce the quality of the courses. A better solution might be to split into A- and B-finals and let the middle qualifier, middle final and may be even the sprint be qualifying according to a scoring system.

Rules – starting groups in qualification races

> 12.5 For an interval start other than finals of qualification race competitions, the starting order shall be drawn at random. The start draw shall be made normally in three starting groups (early, middle and late).

Out of this rule it looks as there shall be three starting groups also in the qualifier. If that is correct, it leads to a very complicated drawing procedure, ref rule 12.7 – so complicated that it is not recommended.

If the meaning is that there shall only be one starting group in each heat in the qualification race, I suggest a new text in 12.5:

> 12.5 For an interval start other than finals of qualification race competitions, the starting order shall be drawn at random. The start draw shall be made normally in three starting groups (early, middle and late). *In qualification race it shall be one starting group in each heat.*

Then 9.14 has to be changed the same way:

> 9.14 In each individual competition *other than qualification race competitions,* each federation shall allocate its competitors to 3 starting groups with a maximum of 2

competitors to each group. Before allocating a second competitor to a group, a Federation shall allocate one competitor to each group. If a Federation fails to allocate its competitors to starting groups, the organiser shall decide the allocation.

(At JWOC we had two starting groups – early and late – in the qualification race. One nation asked if that was according to the rules, which it probably wasn't….)

Rules – heat allocation

12.7 In qualification race competitions, the start draw for the qualification races shall be made so that each of the following requirements is satisfied:
…
- <u>as far as possible, the heats shall be equally strong</u>
- …

12.7 apply to WOC and JWOC. My guess is that the underlined rule never has been nor will be, used. The strength of each heat is taken care of by the rule which states that competitors from the same federation shall be equally spread out. I propose to delete the underlined paragraph.

Rules – replacement of runner

At the middle distance final a Finnish girl was injured and the question arise whether they were allowed to replace her with a new competitor from Finland. According to rule 9.7 and 9.13 we concluded that this was not possible to do.

9.7 say that the whole team for the *event* is final at 12 noon on the day prior to the event. I can't see that 9.13 is giving us much new information – except from being confusing about WCup events: May a Federation do changes in the team after 12 noon on the day prior to the event? I expect that 9.7 is correct and 9.13 is wrong.

To underline that changes shall be within the entered team (applying to WOC, JWOC <u>and</u> WCup), I propose these changes to the rules:

9.7 Each competitor's name and gender and the names of the team officials shall reach the organiser no later than 10 days before the event. Changes may be made to the team until 12 noon on the day before the event. After that all replacements must be within the team.

~~9.13 Replacement of a competitor after 12 noon on the day before the event may only be made from within the entered team.~~

The information in 9.13 will be satisfactory represented in the new 9.7 and today's 9.10 and 9.11.

Rules – middle distance finals

6.12 In the Middle distance competition, the competitors placed number 20 and better in each qualification race heat may run in the A-final; the remaining competitors run in the B-final. Competitors who start, but are not placed, in the qualification race may start before the qualified runners in the lowest ranked final of their class, but shall appear in the result list as not placed.

We were not reading the rules properly and planned for A final 60 runners, B final 60 runners, C final the rest of the runners. When the women's C-final would have been only 4 runners, we skipped that final, which means 64 runners in the B-final. C-final was held in the men's class,

with 51 runners (and 3 who was disqualified in the qualification). I think they also had C-finals at JWOC 2006. Last year (2007) they had A- and B-finals, but only 69 runners in the B-final.

The C-final was good for the competition. Whilst B- and C-finals could be held parallel, the competition got more concentrated and we could offer courses better suited for B- and C-runners. A disadvantage may be that all disqualified runners will be in the C-final and some of them would not appreciate an easier course. However, they are not in the competition, and the advantages are better.

A change in the rules could be like this:

> 6.12 In the Middle distance competition, the competitors placed number 20 and better in each qualification race heat ~~may~~ run in the A-final; *the competitors placed number 21 – 40 run in the B-final; the remaining competitors run in the C-final. If there will be less than 30 runners in the C-final, the C final should be skipped and the competitors put in the B-final.* Competitors who start, but are not placed, in the qualification race may start before the qualified runners in the lowest ranked final of their class, but shall appear in the result list as not placed.

Check list – Control Marshalling

I received from IOF a check list for controlling map making of major IOF events and got the idea to make a check list for marshalling controls. I enclose a proposal (which is based on advices written by Alan Rosen during WC in GB in 2005, and supplemented be my own thoughts and information handed out to the control marshals during JWOC 2008).

Kjell Blomseth