

# MTBO MAPPING

Proposed changes to, or standard ways of using, the IOF MTBO Mapping Specifications for New Zealand;

*[This is “Draft 2A. As modified by MTBO committee while in Australia.]*

## INTRODUCTION

We have a relatively new IOF specification (2010) that is only slowly getting rid of references to running! Differing approaches by different countries to off-track travel has created anomalies. It can hardly be regarded as the final word!

The Otago MTBO Carnival is a good incentive to work out whether we want to propose any changes to the specification, and to work out standard ways of working within it.

In evaluating them we should aim for something that works for all venues. We should try to work within the specification if we can. Decisions for Otago will be made by the NZOF MTBO Committee during the Oz trip. Then after Otago we would review and formalise them.

Prepared by Michael Wood

MTBO Convenor

26 Sep 11, updated 12 Oct 11

### 1 Off Track Travel

Note: a major fairness issue. It should be possible to judge the speed of any route choice from the map. Some countries allow off-track travel, but don't give any speed information. Some countries don't allow off-track, and you can deliberately or inadvertently travel off-track. And its un-policeable. Always there is the difficulty of whether very faint tracks are shown – affects both the mapper and the competitor. Read Appendix 1 in the spec for some proposals that have been advanced – some of them ridiculous, none of them a complete solution.

#### **1.1 Riders may travel on open land shown as full yellow (symbol 401) It will be imply ridability of 25-50%**

*[Ridability percentage reduced from first draft to suit the more usual off-track situation. There may be some areas faster or slower than this but we wish to give an indication of speed on the same scale as for tracks.]*

Note: The IOF rules say tracks only **unless otherwise specified**, which lets anyone make a rule for one event. But far better if we establish a standard for New Zealand. Australia has “ride on full yellow” in their rules. That’s also one of the suggestions in the provisional Appendix in the IOF spec, except that we would **not** use it for forest, see below. Do not assume that all smooth open land will be full yellow, if its not allowable it would be something else, probably pale yellow 403. Get away from thinking like foot-orienteers!

## 1.2 Riders may travel on forested land shown as white. It will imply ridability of 25-50%.

***[Ridability percentage reduced from first draft to suit the more usual off-track situation. There may be some areas faster or slower than this but we wish to give an indication of speed on the same scale as for tracks.]***

Note: I think we would agree that the map has to tell us whether an area is open land or forest, so the yellow (and other colours) proposed in the IOF Appendix is unsuitable for off-track in forest. We have adopted the white/light green colours already in the spec. At present white/light green is used for high/low visibility forest but this is hardly needed and less important than defining where you can and cannot go. Do not assume that all “nice” forest will be white, if its not allowable **or if it has not been fieldworked for ridability** it would be light green 406.

## 1.3 Riders may travel on green equivalents of the wide track symbols. The dash length will indicate ridability just as for tracks.

***[Not quite so necessary following adoption of 1.1 and 1.2 but still useful for links on otherwise not-allowed terrain, or lengthy links on allowable terrain that are faster than 25-50%.]***

Note: it is not sensible to attempt to map **all** off-track areas for ridability, and we don’t have enough colours. But there are often faint tracks and routes which can add to the riding possibilities, reduce uncertainty, and prevent **inadvertent** cheating. This symbol shows (a) routes that have been checked out by the mapper and (b) their ridability. They should follow clear terrain features such as forest edges, ridges, gullies. The world champs 2011 used solid orange lines which shows that others are thinking “along these lines”.

## 1.5 In allowable areas all fences (and stone walls) are shown including on the edge of the area; but otherwise they need not be shown. Crossable fences and stone walls are shown with symbols 522 and 519, forbidden to cross fences and stone walls by symbols 524 and 521.

***[Changed since first draft to allow fences/stone walls to be shown in not-allowed terrain. For example a fence across allowed terrain might be continued across adjacent not-allowed terrain.]***

Note: the crossable fence/wall symbols are not currently in the MTBO spec, and they aren’t needed **across** tracks because we have the obstacle symbol. But the obstacle symbol can’t be used for a continuous obstacle like a fence so we might as well show the fence. The definitions in the MTBO spec for stone wall and high fence are contradictory and are replaced by this.

### 3. Colour for Rough Open

**Allow down to 25% yellow for 403 rough open where the area is mainly open**

Note: at the discretion of the mapper or planner. It blurs the distinction with white forest, but could get around this with artificial use of full yellow for pale, and light green for white.

### 4. Control Code Format

**Show the control code in brackets after the control number, Arial font, height 2.5mm. Example  
1(33)**

Note: there is no specification for this. The intention is to standardise it, and provide a visual distinction from the control number. Other options round the world include same size font, and separation with a hyphen. *At Oceania 2011 the code was sometimes below the control number, so the word “after” is deliberate.*

### 5. Obstacle Symbol

**Reduce the size by about a third to 1.5mm X 0.5mm and drop the implication of “danger”.**

Note: Danger to riders is a completely different issue; if there is an obstacle which presents a hazard it must be addressed in the field with warning signs or tapes. The much more common “need to dismount” is often hard to fit on the map and doesn’t need to be as large as in the speci.

### 6. Track Symbols

Note: the result of experimentation and use mostly by MAPsport Services. The main aim is instant recognition of the track type when seen in isolation.

**6.1 Increase the difference between long and short dash length, by using 1.2mm for short (instead of 1.5, symbols 835, 836)**

Note: We have experimented with a longer long and instead arrived at a shorter short. Efforts to distinguish lines are stymied by the need for a whole number of dashes between junctions and other dash points, so the nominal dash length may be bigger or smaller in reality. This effect is less with a shorter dash.

**6.2 Increase the difference between thick and thin line, by reducing the thin tracks to 0.3mm (instead of 0.4mm, symbols 832, 834, 836, 838).**

Note: In the past MAPsport has widely used 0.5/0.25mm lines for greater detail in complex areas;

and to reduce the dominance of 831 (black) over 503 (choc sandwich) which is usually the wrong way round. This proposal reverts to 0.6/0.3mm in order to reduce the change to the existing spec.

**6.3 Reduce the gaps to a maximum of 0.5mm (symbols 833, 834, 835, 836)**

Note: In tight bends the larger gaps reduce the impression of shape.