



SURVEY RESULTS

ETOC 2018



European Trail
Orienteering
Championships
Slovakia

RESPONDENTS

The survey was opened immediately after ETOC 2018. Information was published on the event WWW and Facebook page.

We had 41 responses and closed the survey in May 2018


- 31 responses were from open class competitors
- 10 responses were from para class competitors, 8 of which use a wheelchair
- 3 responses were from team officials or escorts

From those who left their email address, we can see that respondents cover Czech republic (4), Spain (3), Finland (5), Great Britain (4), Italy (2), Japan (2), Lithuania (1), Poland (1), Portugal (1), Russia (1), Sweden (1) and others (16).


ORGANISATION

First we asked competitors to rate the following aspects on a scale of 1 (worst ever) to 10 (best ever).


Quality of the map




Fairness of the problems - visibility from a seated position, only significant objects mapped



Fairness of the problems - zeros were clear and according to guidance in bulletin




Suitability of the tracks




ORGANISATION

First we asked competitors to rate the following aspects on a scale of 1 (worst ever) to 10 (best ever).


Provision of helpers and escorts



Speed of results calculation




Display of results in arena



ORGANISATION

Overall organisation



Average score 8.85

This was good at ETOC 2018:

- High quality map and fair problems
- Compact competition programme
- Affordable hotel as event centre meant all teams stayed in same place

Problems at ETOC 2018:

- Missing North lines on competition map
- Missing backup plan/solution for late delivery of toilets to quarantine
- Limited spread of responsibilities causes problems when things go wrong – relay was a bit chaotic

ORGANISATION

Any further comments:

- „Clear Zero tolerance“
- „Extraordinary competition“
- „ETOC 2018 was a high quality event. I hope that it will set new standard for course quality and for the use of zero controls.“
- „Arena layout should be explained in Bulletin.“
- „I found the tracks very rough and quite dangerous to turn round on as was needed.“
- „Great competition and great organization. Great PreO1 terrain and also the one of the TempoO. Very fun, although sometimes chaotic, relay. Nice terrain for PreO2, but the course was missing a little diversity on the controls“
- „It was great that the event was packed into 1 model day + 4 competition days, it allowed me to take less days off work than for the usual week-long schedule, and still there was enough time for everything even for people who took part in all competitions and official meetings. Long distance controls during relay were interesting and should appear at more events. Maybe something should be done so that the organizers don't have to map a lot of useless terrain between the main competition terrain and the distant part.“

BEST AND WORST CONTROLS IN PREO

- Best
 - Day 1 CP4 – 5 votes – „Tough but managable, nice illusion, no artifical tricks“
 - Day 2 CP28 – 3 votes – „Solvable with pure map reading but difficult if you have too little time left“
 - ALL – 4 votes
 - There were many responses stating the fact that these were one of the best courses ever, tricky but fair.
 - „These were the finest PreO courses I have ever seen with fair and challenging map reading controls.“
 - „It's impossible to point one control as the best when all PreO competitions were prepared on the highest level I've ever met in main IOF competitions.“
 - Distant cluster (CP3, 10, 11) in Relay – 4 votes + 3 extra votes for C03
 - „Interesting, clear and fair“
- Worst
 - Day 1 CP18 – 8 votes – generally for bad visibility of A flag, different conditions (visibility) during the day
 - Day 1 CP19 – 7 votes – „not fully correct mapping“, „needed some guessing“

BEST AND WORST CONTROLS IN TEMPO

- Best

- Overall winners are clusters nr. 1 and 2 in qualification (8, resp. 7 votes).
 - „Good map reading“
 - „Many objects and good visibility“

- Worst

- Cluster nr. 4 in qualification was considered by 12 respondents as the worst one, generally for the wrong mapping of the right side of the path.
 - „Parallel mistakes, answers too dependent on earlier answers. Either you get all correct or almost all mistakes.“
- Cluster nr. 5 in qualification – 6 votes
 - „Confusing map according the observed situation“


ZERO TOLERANCE GUIDANCE

Do you think that zero tolerance guidance as given in bulletin 4 was helpful to answer correctly?

Were Zero controls set clearly in TempO and the TempO part of the Relay?


Were Zero controls set clearly in PreO and the PreO part of the Relay?

Zero tolerance guidance




■ Yes ■ No ■ Don't know

Zero controls at TempO



■ Yes ■ No ■ Don't know

Zero controls at PreO



■ Yes ■ No ■ Don't know


ELECTRONIC PUNCHING

36 competitors agreed with „Yes, the punching worked well – it was easy to operate and private when punching“.


Some left additional comments:

- not private enough
- letters on SI units were not easily visible (usually from standing position)
- accessibility of some punching systems for wheelchair users complicated (bad path)
- difficult to punch with one hand only (if the other hand is disabled)

Did the electronic punching work well? I.e. was it easy to operate and private when punching?



PARALYMPIC ELIGIBILITY



The majority of WTOC 2017 survey respondents raised concerns about Paralympic eligibility. Here we suggested a number of possible improvements to eligibility criteria or implementation of these and asked which of these participants would support.


- 36/41 agreed to one or several of the suggested improvements to checks/criteria (albeit 2 in addition ticked the no changes necessary box)
- 2/41 had no opinion
- only 3/41 think there is indeed no need for change.

Additional Comments:

- „It's necessary to divide competitors into 2 groups in TempO competitions (Open & Paralympic) because they can't participate on equal terms as they have different opportunities for training.“
- „Further division of paralympic class would make competitions with very few participants“

PARALYMPIC ELIGIBILITY

Supported changes



- 14 votes (9 Open, 5 Para wheelchair and 1 TO or escort)
Wheelchair only class, because limited height is the biggest disadvantage in TrailO
- 14 votes (12 Open, 2 Para wheelchair and 1 TO or escort)
Paralympic competitors should either depend on a wheelchair or walking aids (such as crutches/stick), because it limits their ability to read the map while moving
- 13 votes (10 Open, 3 Para wheelchair and 1 TO or escort)
Introduce medical checks at major competitions to ascertain that competitors with an eligibility certificate indeed meet the criteria, because this is what happens in other Paralympic sports
- 11 votes (8 Open and 3 Para wheelchair)
Different groups of Paralympic competitors should have different time limits to compensate for disadvantages in height, difficulties in handling a map and compass, limited possibilities of reading the map while moving and difficulty of the terrain and track surface
- 10 votes (10 Open, 2 TO or escort)
Only allow competitors who use a wheelchair or cannot walk 100m in less than 3 min to compete in the Paralympic class, because this is the time allocated to competitors for moving and is easy to check on the ground during the competition
- 5 votes (3 Open and 1 Para and 1 Para wheelchair)
No changes should be made because the current system works perfectly
- Only 1 vote (1 Open)
There should only be one class in TrailO as speed over ground is not important for the sport and courses should be planned to not disadvantage those that move slower or in a seated position