

## Remarks on World Cup 2016

The numbers/letter in brackets refer to the respective sections in the questionnaire.

### Information and communication with organiser (A + 1)

---

- FRA Information was late and lacking of important parts.  
Late and incomplete.  
Crucial meeting times were changed in last minute. A bulletin 4 - final version was put online, but nothing said about it or been given out on arrival.  
No bulletins on time. Little informative info. Bulletins 2, 3 and 4 were basically the same.  
Bulletins late and English bulletin much less info than French version and far too late. Staff at event centre not well briefed with info.  
Bulletin no 4 was made twice; there wasn't all information (plans of arena, specifications, etc).  
The first information was published very late. Also the answers to the mails were not punctual.  
Very little information available and when the bulletin 4 came it was missing a lot of information resulting in a new version of bulletin 4 and a final version and so on very confusing. Times and places changes and sometimes double information was available. Slow or no answers to e-mails in the months before the race.  
Bulletin much too late! All info was good, easy to understand, but too late.  
There was a clear lack in communication and in explanation.  
Bulletins came too late  
The final bulletin was late.  
Bulletins were published too late and incomplete. Bulletin 4 was only a copy of previous versions, including the sentence that "this will be clarified in bulletin 4". During the event it was sometimes hard to find if the published info is on event website or in eventor.  
Start times of long distance were not published at 21:00 the day before. How should an athlete prepare seriously for a competition under such circumstances?  
Bulletin and additional information was mostly a bit late.  
Bulletins too late on the Website + Information from the Team Leaders Meeting online  
The English versions of the Bulletins were woefully inadequate, lacking critical information about venues, start locations. The website was equally poor, was not updated in a timely manner. Whilst the gaps in information were probably filled at Elite level team meetings no consideration was given to the needs of international masters racers. It transpired that full details were available on the French versions of the Bulletins, which reinforced my view that despite offering a World Masters Series competition no thought was given to the athletes.  
It was not clear where to find the information: on eventor or on the website of the organiser  
Bulletins were late and incomplete. Link of the website changed; there was more information in French than in English on the website.  
Especially the mess with different bulletin editions was confusing and the troubles about getting answers to e-mails.  
I got no answer from event office concerning an entry topic written by e-mail.
- 
- POR Information concerning open classes was given too late.  
Several different channels for information. Some is only published at Facebook, some only on webpage. Start lists and team leaders meeting notes were not published for all distances  
Bulletins, Maps and Live were clearly visible, startlists sometimes not  
Info only really updated on FB  
The website was not organised in good way. In the beginning of the competition it was a little bit
-

---

hard to find live information. Later it was solved.

Not great at responding to e-mails

Website not updated often. Had to rely on FB page for information and updates. Jorge S very helpful prior to event.

They even gave reminders for late teams and helped.

---

- LTU There were some problems with the user-friendliness of the website. For example even now, I cannot see a link to the results and splits from the main page of the website. For participants 4 main items are a must to be easily accessible from the website: 1- A concise program of the event (day and time) 2- The Bulletins 3- Start times 4- Results 5- Photos if possible
- The bulletins were very good and provided all of the information required.
- Website navigation not easy
- Bulletins were late, incomplete (e.g. no climb was mentioned in B4) and contained some wrong information. The organiser's website didn't exist one year before the event. Once it was finally created it wasn't very informative.
- The results were not easy to find.
- Information was hard to find. The website looked flashy, but was hard to navigate, especially on a phone.
- No information on climbing for master classes. Insufficient, non-existent or wrong directions to course locations. Time of ceremonies altered without prior notice.
- Bulletins were on time, but were lacking information e.g. map size, map change.
- Please there should be no pop up at websites
- Website was not that easy to navigate or to find things like results / splits.
- Bulletins were late. Didn't understand how to work the website until some days before the races - didn't know to click the World Cup logo...
- Many changes in the information (Bulletins, competition information). No information of climbing in the bulletins.
- The event director was very helpful and I got prompt answers to my e-mails.
- I didn't ask any personal questions, but I heard from teams that they didn't hear from the organisers for days when they asked a question.
- Official results were very late online.
- As stated before, being a bit clearer and quicker with responses would make perfect!
- 

## **Event Programme (2.)**

---

- FRA Not ok that the open competitors' start time was postponed an hour on the last day, those with WiFi could see the race online, before going to forest, but no map to those without wifi. In general lack of information for public race.
- Public races after W Cup is ok...but in this case the W Cup Long race starts at 8.00! It was too early, it would have been better 1 hour later!
- I think the programme itself was good, the problem was just how things were run.
- If the long distance is at the beginning of 3 days full of competitions, it shouldn't be that long. I would also swap middle & long. Open races were during the medal-ceremonies, so there weren't many spectators.
- Technically, races were good and the courses were interesting.
- Why was the long distance before the middle? I would have preferred it the other way round.
- It should also be considered to make such a tough long distance event at the end of a World Cup Round.
-

---

POR Two rest days was perfect.

The team leader and the team staff could participate only in the sprint race because for middle and long distance races for master classes etc were before the World Championship, and so it was impossible to follow the athletes as well as participate in competitions. Too bad - I paid for the middle at all.

Unofficial mass start was not necessary. All athletes were in "rest day" or "recovery"

It was very good that the open races were finished before the first Elite rider (m/w) started

Best timing of the Junior/youth/elite/spectator races ever! No tourists in the forest during the elite races like in other events before. I think it is a very good idea to have all other categories starting first and the elite afterwards. For the elite riders conditions were the same for everybody if you start at lunchtime. If you would start in the morning you might get different conditions for different riders (temperature). Just the not WOC mass start race was probably not optimally timed because nobody really wants to do a just for fun race the day before a WOC race. That should have taken place before the rest day then there would have been more competitors.

---

LTU Sprint should be the first distance.

The idea of getting the masters out of the forest before the elite start does not always work so well. This means one group have to wait for hours in a quarantine, whether at the start or at the finish. We were very fortunate with the weather this time, but what if it had been cold and rainy? Can you keep people in tents for 3-4 hours? Regarding the fact that elite men are stronger and faster than elite women, can we not say that M40-45 may be at least as strong as elite women? I don't approve the total separation of the masters from the elite. We have tried overlapping the starts in Hungary and I believe it worked fine. There were no severe accidents.

It would have been nice to have a day off and to have had an unofficial mixed sprint relay considering it was a WMMTBOC.

The competitions for the WCup and the WMMTBOC were well combined. The long finish quarantines were acceptable (at least in dry weather) as they allowed the Masters to ride in the same terrain as the elite. However, the days became very long for the Masters as we had to wait until the evening for the prize giving.

The prizegiving should be near the event center at around 18 in the evenings before dinner so many people can join it.

Good except that the prize ceremonies were very late for the Masters. Would have been better to have it when the quarantine was opened.

For elite athletes it was perfect.

Very good for elite riders.

The prize giving ceremonies could've been had later at night, at the event centre. I believe that would've helped participation.

When changes in the program are only on facebook, a lot of the participants don't get the information. It should have been on the website.

Masters events were compromised to favour the elites. The masters had all of the quarantines and had to have a mass start to make way for the elites which should not happen for what was supposed to be a world championship.

I didn't like finish quarantine for masters. It was too long, 2014 and 2015 was better.

I would have preferred the long at the end.

I think it is much better that the order of competition is from Sprint to Long... from sports scientist and physiology point of view.

Short quarantines for elite were great. Prize giving too long after the final riders had finished - every day I waited for 90 mins to 2 hours. No chance to recover properly, or eat well after the race, so this affected my next races.

Too long time in quarantine area after the finish for masters, no beer in cafe. Too long time for masters to wait till award ceremony.

---

## Event Centre (B + 3)

---

- FRA Bibs and other stuff were not ready in time. Staff could only communicate in French.  
Very hard to communicate in English.  
No wifi so everyone could see all the changes that was made in last minute etc. Language barrier.  
Event Center not ready for 2 hours after advertised opening times. No one spoke good English to inform riders and teams what was happening/what the problem was or when it would be fixed.  
Some problems about timetables (changes of time, in particular on Friday), easy to park, no good signal in the event centre (where to go?), it was like a "popular race", not a world cup.  
The facilities were lacking; there was no bike wash after the model event and even showers - too bad for a sports center so great. Nor was sufficient rain cover. The staff did not speak English - only one person. However they were all very kind and helpful.  
Very limited opening hours, staff who didn't speak English, confusing and difficult to get information.  
A little small and tight on the arrival, always friendly and helpful.  
One of the worst event centers I've ever seen in a World Cup Event. It's not acceptable at all for an event like this. A WCup is not only the technical orienteering component.  
Negative: - no shower, - no shelter, - little English speaking staff; positive: + bike wash at some events + car parking near the center  
It worked somehow.  
Too many language barriers, no wifi.  
Hardly anybody spoke passable English. It wasn't a real EC, just a house where some material was given before the event. It was difficult to find the room of the Open MTBO Forum for people who hadn't attended the teamleaders' meetings before: There was no sign, flag or anything to mark the room.  
Staff tried to be helpful, but no one spoke good English so it was impossible to ask questions and get answers.  
Rider that had to give up in long distance did not get any assistance in event center.
- 
- POR Due to the geographic dispersion, I believe there was not really an "event centre", but more "secretarial services". The staff was, however, very helpful.  
I haven't been there.  
Staff was OK, the only problem was the price of the hotel near the Event center that has forced us to look for a different arrangement and further away (Luso), resulting in difficulty for meetings etc.  
Poor parking. Hot musty room for meetings.  
Too much distance between event center and accommodations  
Lack of shadows for competitors in hot days.  
Did only use the bike-wash. However, it was missing some afternoons/evenings and it wasn't possible to wash the bike.  
The Internet didn't always work, but that's not really fatal.
- 
- LTU The staff of restaurant at the dinner was not adequate ...  
The first days it was a bit hectic but the event office in the competition areas were fine.  
Only saw it once when registering.  
The two tables in a corner on the upper floor of the Hotel Kaunas, where the material was handed out, can't really be called an event centre. There was no flag or anything else outside the hotel to indicate that there was a major event taking place. Having a visible EC is also a way to promote an event!  
Everyone did the best they could. Some misunderstandings, mainly with the quarantine, where the lady who managed the start quarantine entry did not seem to understand the fact that before the
-

---

quarantine is closed, everyone should be allowed to move freely in and out of the start area.  
Very small area for the participants to register. The welcome bags could have been packed before we arrived.  
Only used once but it was quick and east to register.  
helpful staff  
The staff of the entrance of start quarantine zones was incompetent all the 3 days. It was impossible to go out and back before the quarantine began.  
The place in the hotel Kaunas wasn't a real event centre.  
A little thing about SIAC: it would be nice to have a twist to fix the SIAC on the finger, the hand or a ski-clip...

---

### **Accommodation and food (C + 4)**

---

- FRA The only accommodation near event centre was quite costly, but good  
We did not use organizers accommodation and food because it was terribly expensive compared to what else was available quite near the event centre.  
For me who is a vegetarian the food were not the best to compete on, before the long distance I got some vegetables.  
The accommodation in the camp Le Florival was good. The problem was, that organizer provided only the link to camp website.  
Because of the price we didn't use.
- 
- POR I think the food packages had everything. In hotel there were a bit problems with bikes, the hotel wasn't prepared for so many people. At first they wanted us to have bicycle outside, but we got some hall to store all our bikes - Hotel Inatel Luso. And - as usual - the wifi coverage and speed was really bad  
Lunches were awful.  
very nice hotel with swimming pool. (Estalagem da Pateira)  
Accommodation was really good. Food could have been more variable, but was good and the amount more than enough.  
Not possible to lock bike storage  
we used the catering service for the food only three times.  
Although a good place to stay, quite a long way from EC. Very little accommodation close to EC so not easy with only one vehicle (as our team had).  
Estalagem da Pateira  
We had the bikes in the cars which was ok for that region. But I wouldn't say it was a safe bike storage.
- 
- LTU It was a very good deal for us (Radisson Park Inn).  
not used  
Considering the problems encountered with the accommodation booking, the Park Inn was an excellent alternative.  
Okay hotel with good food and superb breakfast. Too much noise at nights. Hotel Kaunas.  
Booking of the rooms from the Swiss Team was lost... - excellent breakfast  
Accommodation good, breakfast excellent, dinner good but not enough food.  
Had good accommodation and food - although small portions, at the Park Inn hotel.  
Kaunas Hotel: excellent breakfast; poor dinner and good rooms.  
There was a mix up with our Hotel booking, this was solved by using a different hotel but it was a last minute change. Food at the events was okay but seemed pricey compared to the rest of Kaunas and they could have done with some milk and an extra coffee machine.
-

---

The accommodation was great (Hotel Kaunas) but there was far not enough food for dinner!  
I didn't like food in the competition's areas. There was only one main food and some sausages. It is not what most athletes want to eat after a race. And I missed some vegetarian food. But dinner in \*\*\*\*hotel (where event centre was) was delicious. But for boys it wasn't enough big.

The event centre hotel we had booked at the start of the year with the organisers, unfortunately was never actually booked for us. We ended up at the Park Inn which proved to be good - very friendly staff and excellent breakfasts.

The food was fine, but the restaurant should have been more ready for the number of competitors and the amount of food required, especially with extra servings of carbohydrates before the long distance. We had to go fill up at a nearby Italian restaurant after dinner.

Apart from the lost accommodation order all was excellent.

Don't know what we paid, but as an athlete, it worked fine.

There was not enough food at the dinner - everything else was great!

We had our bikes on corridor...

---

### Transport to the competitions (5)

---

- FRA It was difficult to find out where the finish arena was for the participants of the 3 Days (open competitions). These people couldn't attend the teamleaders' meetings, the information given there was never published on the internet and there wasn't any information in the bulletin either. Would have been hard without own GPS-navigators in the cars.
- Everything was thought not for a World Cup, but I think this is not only an organizer's fault but also a failure of the IOF Advisor. He should have known everything in advance and he should have told the organizer that they needed to change and provide a suitable arena.
- 
- POR Not always very clear, but good in general
- 
- LTU At first there was not enough information on how to get there by bike. However, this was later put right by the organizers. If the bulletin states all arenas are accessible by bike, then routes should also be provided. There was excellent reception of WiFi at all competition sites which was really a treat!
- SATNAV was a must as the signs were quite hard to see around Kaunas.
- For the Masters it was difficult to know how to get to the competitions as this information could only be found in the presentation of the teamleaders' meeting. There was no information at all for people who went by bike to the Long distance.
- Not really hard to find the way using google maps, but there were no signs, suggested routes etc, apart from to the model event, and sprint.
- There was only one organised parking.
- All days went by bike to competitions. Short distance from event center to competition centers was good thing.
- I think maps or routes from the main hotels would have been useful, cycling to the events given the weather was a good option and I did for the middle and wish I had for the long.
- I didn't use parking because competitions was close to city center. I went to start with my bike.
- Better signing all the way from event center would have been good.
-

## Competitions (D + 6)

---

### FRA **GENERAL:**

Nice terrain and good courses. The map could be improved

Too many loose ends and problems had to be addressed. Seemed like some things hadn't been thought thru, and some things weren't up to standard, like no water in quarantine etc. Seemed like the standard answer to our questions was NO.

Issues around fairness. Long terrain used extensively before - most recently 1 year before event. Issues around shortcutting, mapping and fairness in the middle. Women's long course was not very exciting, and far below the standard of the very interesting men's course.

Very good competitions. The issue of video presentation of maps before Masters racing needs a solution. There is a feeling amongst Masters that they are second class citizens regarding info and attention despite being major financial and organizational contributors. Very evident at Relays with lack of info around Masters starts delay and poor announcements about this issue.

Competitions were good; some problems in the start area for the first athletes.

The courses were good; only the race times were not respected.

I got the impression that the competition was organized like a small local event. On every single part there was something missing or not made good enough. If at least the maps and courses would have been great some other things could have been forgiven, but it was only the relay which was almost ok regarding maps and courses. I don't think there actually were so big things missing, but unfortunately it was always the most important small details. Probably the same amount of people (if it really was 80 people involved in the organisation) could have made it to a good competition if they just had had a few people telling them how to do and what's most important.

Very long but cool Long distance, good middle, excellent relay!

Technically speaking, all races were demanding and interesting. I have a bad remark only to the last control of the Long distance.

The controls in the vineyards were placed near path crossings which made it hard to see on which path the control exactly was. This made the orienteering annoying and took away the speed that the athletes love.

From the start to the finish it was good. The rest (arena, results etc.) was below W Cup standard.

I think for a fair competition some more tapes in the vineyards would have been needed to mark forbidden passages next to the passable one. Controls in the vineyards should be done and disqualifications made.

Competitions were so far well organized (from start to finish). Exception: mass start of the mixed relay (wasn't clear when it was allowed to turn the maps).

### **LONG:**

Maybe the organizers should have reduced the distance because of the weather conditions.

The passages in the vineyards (orange) were difficult to read on the long distance map.

Problems with marking from pre-start, quarantine area wasn't up to standard, issues around the long distance between start and finish was to be sorted out by the teams themselves, no marshals in vineyards, use of unsuitable controls numbers for example 66 and 99.

Terrain was great. Women Elite course was not as interesting as the men's race. Not many interesting route choices for the women. Course also didn't have much climb. This was a great area that wasn't used well - more climbing please!

Terrain: ok, Courses: interesting, real long event. Safety: ok, Fairness: ok, Refreshments: only at finish...but with this weather was ok! Quarantine: not good, not bad, Start: problems with the first starts (go, no go back, go, no stop, ...), Finish: not a finish arena for world cup! bad turn between last control and finish. Hard to find the street to the last control. Technical organisation: ok

Finally a proper long distance race with long route choice sections. I would have rated it excellent

---

---

if it hadn't been for the vineyards which destroyed everything. Those made the race to a gamble of guessing the legal route or taking the chance to just go anywhere and hoping for not being caught for illegal short cutting. Same with map. Why ruin a fantastic course and great map by putting controls in the undefined vineyard areas. Or why couldn't the organizers mark clearly in the terrain which were the legal routes/paths. Then it was the troubles with the quarantine zone and distance between start and finish. Nothing was planned so athletes were meant to be waiting for hours in the rain. It's ok with separate start and finish but then organizers need to have a good system to transport clothing, how to get back to cars etc. In such a long race it would have been nice to have at least one refreshment point where competitors could have sent their own bottles.

Too long, but nice route choice & terrain.

The route from the pre start to the start could have been marked better. I got lost.

Vineyards not very suited for long distance and 1:15'000 scale. Very shallow passages on map. Course a bit too long? Even with dry conditions it seemed a bit long. Otherwise very good and challenging race.

good route choices, but too many long controls, not enough navigation between short controls. Generally too long race.

Long race was boring, the course could have been much more interesting.

#### **MIDDLE:**

No marshals to assure the security when we crossed a public road.

Mostly the same issues as for the long distance.

Basically very interesting, but it wasn't always clear in the vineyards which passages (orange on the map) were the ones you were allowed to use.

Interesting terrain and courses. Maps not good enough. Too many unmapped 'passages' between the vines often led to confusion for athletes. The map should first be correct. Forbidden routes should still be on the map.

Again a race that looked great on the map, but once in the terrain gambling among the legal and illegal passages where sometimes the legal one was the most invisible it just turned to an unfair disaster. Fortunately it didn't rain since there were no indoor/covered areas at quarantine and no showers at finish.

Not always clear which paths are allowed or not, many riders took "frenchlines".

Vineyards were unfair. One marshal destroyed my race when she said that I wasn't on the right track (I was!) And I needed to turn and go to other track and I lost over 1,5 minute.

There has been some marking in the terrain which was very helpful. But I think some more would have been needed and some marshals to control that no one is taking forbidden passages.

Therefore I had the feeling that it was not a completely fair competition. The rest was well organized and executed.

The orange paths were not clear and it was very easy to shortcut on forbidden routes. There were not enough marshals.

Interesting terrain, but also a little unfair due to indistinct maps (see below) and terrain - it was sometimes almost impossible to hit the correct (allowed) passages at race speed.

Fair competitions in vineyards are very hard to manage. When half of the top ten have taken an illegal route (I guess mostly this happened accidentally) it's not good for the promotion of MTBO.

Middle race was good, but in the vineyards not fair at all, because the orange was always different and sometimes hard to see!

#### **MIXED RELAY:**

Some splits were not equal (first split).

No tents for shelter in case of rain !

Great arena. Great map. Great courses.

After two days of unfair racing the relay was clearly the fairest terrain. Some lately fallen trees

---

---

created some slightly dangerous situations when not marked on the maps and made some route choices slower than they looked on the map, but generally clearly the best competition in this world cup round.

Fun terrain, good course, awesome arena. Only the terrain around the 1st control with the steep 'hole' wasn't really readable how steep it is.

It was good but we need to have clear rules for mixed Relays deciding a priori the order and not letting the teams decide where to put the girl. It's a matter of fairness.

Good course.

I think there was an issue with the start: starting too early or sth, but I have not seen it. The competition was really challenging. I would like to have a bit fairer forkings especially in the end. I think you cannot fork the 2nd last control even if they are that close to each other. The forking at the 4th last was quite different and could decide about the podium places.

Clearly the most interesting terrain. Very good courses. In my opinion, the middle distance should have been carried out here instead.

Relay was very good.

---

**POR GENERAL:**

Everything went smooth for me. I would appreciate showers in the finish / finish quarantine. I think there were just at middle distance.

Sprint terrain was not so suitable.

Good competitions and well organized.

Good terrain, maps and organisation!

Courses sometimes have been a bit easy.

**SPRINT:**

Simple courses, but the fast pace caused many mistakes.

The course was not very specific for a sprint event. Many controls were "along a line".

Few route choices

a little too easy

Too easy for a sprint. Quarantine zone too small

Quite easy from the view of elite athlete. I expected more route choices and more challenging orienteering. Now it was too easy course, and basically without any route choices.

Terrain not very complex. Many public roads so not very safe riding

Much too easy course for a WOC race! It does not happen very often to me that I can mentally go through the race before 1,5 times in the minute before the start! Map quality and everything else was OK.

It was a bit too easy. Personally I'd like more difficult sprint orienteering. Otherwise good!

Terrain was awesome to race in, the courses were good. It would have been more demanding in a complete urban area, but I liked the race with big parts in the forest/open area. The finish quarantine was a chaos: I was told to stay there until all the competitors of the category are in the finish (for doping-controls I suppose). Most of the riders didn't respect that and left the quarantine with the ones from the youth (I competed in M20). The finish and start area were good.

Terrain was too easy and courses as well.

**MASS START (unofficial):**

Finnish riders did not participate.

Gate immediately after start too narrow and there could have been an accident.

Not much of a problem because it was a just for fun race but a WOC race could not be done like that!! Dangerous exit from sports ground (too narrow gate). Long downhill in the beginning is not ideal. Uphill is much better to spread the field. A mass start race must be arranged as a 1 man relay. Butterflies, especially, if it is only 1 like on the women's course are not suitable to spread the

---

---

field sufficiently. Terrain was not really suitable for that kind of race.

Didn't participate.

Did as a training in the early afternoon...

did not take part - used as a rest day

**MIDDLE DISTANCE:**

One track drawn incorrectly but it was a major route choice option that affected many competitors' final result. Drawn as fast, and should have been slow.

Some failures at the map along ideal route, which was not caused by new forestations.

Quarantine too small

The football field as start quarantine was perfect for warming up (you could pedal the whole round including corners because there was enough space for wide cornering) + the course was physically and technically demanding

Good finish for spectators. Good area for a middle. Interesting route choice and terrain became more complex after spectator control.

All well organised, excellent finish arena!

Not too technical course, could have been more difficult but else well. Finish arenas have been better in earlier years.

**LONG DISTANCE:**

Great route choices. Would have been better if longer in distance and time. 90 minutes too short. More climb would also have made it tougher.

Quarantine too small

Spectating at finish difficult. Fantastic area. Great route choice. Changing types of terrain and route choices. Urban areas were difficult to read (i.e. bitumen roads)

Good organisation. The course wasn't really long-distance-like (no really long legs for M20). The terrain was cool.

Challenging courses. No real finish arena.

**RELAY:**

Great to see close competition between the countries!

Quarantine too small

Getting around assembly area a bit tricky. No easy access to toilets for non elites while quarantine was in operation. Good spectator points. Fairly basic area through vineyards but park at the end great.

Situation around the start control in the field was quite unclear. Lots of confusion there. Some more forking and a few more controls would have been nice.

Nice with the final part in the park!

Some spectators helped the competitors on the last leg in the park. Apart from that a good competition.

Good courses. For spectators in the arena difficult to understand and follow what is happening.

---

**LTU GENERAL:**

Long: Although I understand the need to use areas for events I didn't see the need to have controls in the area by the start flag. The scale was wrong for this type of path network. There were no long legs to actually plan ahead and it felt like you never got going. Middle: Excellent area and great map. Sprint: Excellent area.

It was very good that the Masters were also given challenging courses. Thanks!

The courses were too long, much longer winning times than expected. They must remember to cut the control lines and rings when they cover paths! Otherwise it was great and fun.

Very good apart from the AIR SI system and the late prize ceremonies for Masters.

---

---

very interesting terrain and courses

Very interesting competitions

Good maps, good courses. The last map on the ME long could've been an A3 in 1:10000, would've improved the last, very tricky part.

In the middle distance all classes could have had 2 sided maps. It was difficult to read when the course crosses itself several times and it makes the control number difficult to read.

Poor terrain choice and course planning for long and medium. Both areas had controls in what was essentially sprint type terrain on totally unsuitable map scales. Mass starts are not appropriate for what is supposed to be a world championship. Sprint however was excellent in both area and courses as the map scale was correct for the terrain.

Middle and Long Distance planned mostly as sprint courses with far too many controls, too close to one another. IOF rules on long and middle distance courses were not respected.

Courses were great, but too long.

It was difficult to see the paths and control points in the area just before the map change and in the same area in the second lap. The scale of 1:15000 is too small in my age, better to use 1:10000 or best is 1:7500.

Courses were good and technical, Long was a bit long but still very good. I would have preferred the long at the end of the weekend as I had done a hard race on the Sunday in the UK.

Results in finish areas often didn't work.

The Long distance could be shorted (cutting last little round before the bridge to the finish).

Great maps, great courses, nice arenas with good food.

Very interesting courses, that's the main thing in high level competitions.

- Very good terrain for all 3 competitions - Interesting courses - Long was much too long

**LONG DISTANCE:**

The character of the Long distance was a long middle distance - high density of paths, too difficult to orientate.

Too long, otherwise very good. Challenging in all ways.

Scale and area did not match. Three middle events combined to make a long is not a long race. I felt that I never really had a chance to plan ahead on a long leg.

It was an excellent competition but I'm rating it only 'good' because it didn't have the characteristics of a Long distance. It was a long Middle distance.

Too big scale and too long courses.

Courses had too many controls, more like middle distance. Especially near the map changing area where it was very difficult for masters to read the 1:15000 scale. Good terrain and finish area very interesting terrain and course, but map scale 1:10'000 would have been better (especially in the last part of the course)

No possibility to come in and out of the quarantine zone before beginning of the quarantine (suits for all races)

Why not have a butterfly for pack separation? Marked route after map change badly marked. A lot of riders took a short cut there after 2nd map change.

Different scale for M 50.

The very complex terrain near the start should not have been used with a 1:15000 map. This is especially for the masters. In foot O the older age groups always get larger scale maps. This should be the same in MTBO.

It was too technical and not so physical.

Unsuitably planned (almost a sprint format), unsuitable map/scale (illegible). My map was stapled in the wrong order. Inaccurate map. Foot-O feeling.

---

Great terrain and course. The last part was hard to read in 1:15000. Maybe should've been 1:10000 instead.

Courses was great with forkings and terrain. Race was too long for masters. Map scale was wrong for masters. No refreshments during race, there should be table for own bottles on map change. Some minor mistakes on the maps, see women's elite gps tracking controls 4->5.

It was difficult to see the the paths and control points in the area just before the map change and in the same area in the second lap. The scale of 1:15000 is to small in my age, better to use 1:10000 or best is 1:7500.

Good courses but a bit long, I thought the change over control 102 on top of a sandy knoll was a bit cruel. The map scale for the complexity was a bit small and I took or tried to take some routes marked on the map e.g the easterly route into 63 and had to turn back as did others.

The terrain and map was great, but the long distance character was lost by far too many controls! I think the competition should have different characters - in long distance there should be a difference to sprint and middle...

The Long distance could be shorted (cutting last little round before the bridge to the finish).

Terrain had some very complex areas of tracks that were hard to read at the !:15000 scale including the finish loop.

Technical courses and map meant riders caught each other and then the slower rider would follow. Needed some forking such as a phi loop.

Too long time in quarantine after finish. No results in finish area, no information about what's happening. No beer in cafe, poor choice of food. Sport products shop outside quarantine zone.

The map was excellent. The courses were very intreresting, but a bit too long. The map in start zone was difficult to read due to scale used.

#### **MIDDLE DISTANCE:**

Maybe it should be given map exchange not only in the ME class.

Courses were again little bit too long.

Great area and the mapping scale was far better suited. It was a surprise to be told that the map was on two sides at the start. The organisation at the start was not good and when you add the map exchange as well it was chaotic and not very clear on what you were supposed to do.

The mandatory route from control 57 - 58 wasn't clearly marked in the terrain in the beginning. If a spectator control had been placed near the finish arena between 57 and 58, no mandatory route would have been necessary. Without a spectator's control hardly anybody watched the competitors on this mandatory route. So why was it mandatory? The start wasn't well situated: For example, control 85 was too close to the start and in the men's elite race a good route between 2 controls would have lead through the start...

Too big scale for so many paths.

Very good terrain and courses. Some small tracks very hard to see in the terrain. Very good finish arena.

very interesting terrain and course, but map scale 1:7'500 would have been better (especially in the last part of the course)

Start interval in this forest should better be 3 minutes.

Issue with possible route through start. Fence not mapped after map change. Again pack building.

Terrain fantastic.

Same as for the long. The very complex area near the start was uninterpretable at the map scale supplied. The courses crossed so much that many misspunches were inevitable.

Unsuitably planned (almost a sprint format), unsuitable map/scale (illegible). Inaccurate map.

Foot-O feeling.

Great course and map.

---

---

Great course again with great terrain. Map scale was wrong for masters. Race was too long for masters.

it was difficult to see the paths and control points in some area. Perhaps the scale should have been 1:7500.

Brilliant course , could have been improved with a double sided map as the M40's had it was hard to read the course near the start finish with all that pink.

Would have benefited from course being printed on two maps

Very challenging for the top elites. Possibly too technical for most riders? Big issues with following - map too technical for many riders, so much easier to follow a better orienteer (who catches you) than take your own route choice ... Needed some phi loops, or 3 min start interval.

Too long time till award ceremony. No beer in cafe, poor choice of food.

The map was excellent. The courses were interesting, but a bit too long again...

**SPRINT:**

Excellent area and excellent maps. The route was a challenge, though point 28 was not great planning.

I don't understand why the Masters had to have a start interval of only 1 minute. It doesn't take longer if you combine two classes so that within one class there's an interval of 2 minutes.

You should have white background on the codes. It was hard to see. Very fun course but 5 minutes too long.

Very good terrain and courses.

very interesting terrain and course

Start intervall should be 2minutes

A lot of marshals which showed that free to go around curve. 2 min intervals desired.

Terrain fantastic.

Good area at an appropriate scale.

Great fun and great course!

So much fun! Great area.

Great course again with great terrain. Race was too long masters.

It should have been a map change instead of the difficulties to see the controls and number.

Brilliant course, only issue was the extra 'elephant tracks' next to the North west grass tracks making path choice a bit of pot luck.

A mistake in the quarantine of the sprint. Quarantine had to start at 12.00!!! People in the arena had the possibility to see the big screen...so parts of the competition and sometimes also the map. The GPS system on the screen had to start after 13.00, but for TV and spectator it would be better from the beginning of the TV service. All could be ok, only changing the quarantine time. The start list wasn't ok. It was correct to have red Group in the end, but orange? It was strange to see top athletes starting at minute 03, 04, 05...

Should be 2 minute start intervals for sprint - in our class we nearly had a medallist who would only have been there simply by following other athletes. The finish / time keeping official was brilliant when I discovered my dibber had not registered at one of the controls I had gone to. He took the time to listen and to look at the splits of the other competitor who had been following me. He believed that there had been a few unexplainable mispunches and thought this was one of them. Whilst disappointing, his thoroughness made it easier to accept the inevitable outcome.

Big issues with following - map too technical for many riders, so much easier to follow a better orienteer (who catches you) than take your own route choice ... Needed some phi loops, or 3 min start interval.

Very sandy finish arena.

Perfect map, perfect course, perfect place.

---

## Maps (E + 7)

---

FRA The passage on the vineyards (orange) are difficult to read on the long distance map. The representation of the vineyards was sometimes unclear/inaccurate. Not all 'passages' were mapped in the middle. Athletes expected to find the mapped one amongst unmapped ones. Huge variability in what was and was not mapped. Only remark is the vineyard path differentiation. Some problems on Sunday (orange passages weren't easy to find). The maps were quite good. Maybe in the middle it had to be better marked orange on the ground, perhaps with the webbing at crossroads less obvious. In some parts of the map I did not like the interpretation of the tracks, in particular the symbol 837 and 838 which should mean very slow track, while in some places it was only less visible but with good practicability. The maps were actually quite good, despite the vineyard areas. The heavy rain changed the standard of some paths, but we can't do anything about the weather, but the vineyard areas should have been mapped and used in a different way. At normal race speed it was impossible to see the difference between where it was legal to ride and where it wasn't. Usually good, some small paths which were really bad and steep (had to climb with the bike, wouldn't have drawn them) especially in the long. Very good maps, apart from the orange in the wine yards which were a bit hard to see. Good but a lot of times it was not clear where it was possible to go in the vineyards. Vineyards should have been marked somehow - it was impossible to know every time if you were on the right track. The orange in the wine yards could have been unmapped because many athletes didn't know if they were riding on black trail, orange or forbidden yellow. There was absolutely no difference between these three colours in the terrain! I think the middle distance map is the poorest map I have been riding in MTBO. There were some complaints about readability of orange paths in the vineyards, but no serious map mistakes. Not well readable the yellow signature for passable fields. I suggest another colour. For better readability there should be wider minimal distances where a passage is not possible. - The maps were generally of a high standard. - The middle distance map was of a lower quality, with small inaccuracies or things that were not mapped distinctly which led to people inevitably riding routes that were not intended (off track). - The distinction between open dark yellow areas (riding not allowed) and orange (riding allowed) was sometimes hard to make. So far good. In the vineyards not every time clear which is a track that is on the map... No disqualifications for cheating consciously... Long and relay good, middle unclear with the orange. The Long event map was 1:15,000 scale which was inadequate for the intricate nature of the final section of the course through the vineyards. The very fine 'orange' paths were difficult to see on the map for those of us that wear glasses and with colour perception problems (the latter affecting 8% of the male population of Northern Europeans according to the UK National Eye Institute). Again no consideration had been given to the potential difficulties faced by older athletes. The problems with mapping during the Middle event in the vineyards was highlighted, in detail, on the MTBO Facebook page. Massive storm aside, the maps for the long were good. The middle was not clear for competitors in the terrain where it could be passed or not as there were lots of extra distinct passages that were not mapped. On Sunday: not easy to find the correct orange passages. The maps were actually quite good despite the vineyard disaster and missing first aid points (marked on maps but nothing in the terrain) and that nobody had updated the largest fallen trees

---

---

	on the relay map.
--	-------------------

---

POR	<p>Not all trails on the maps were mapped correctly. Occasionally the rideability was wrong which affected the results.</p> <p>I think that if there's possibility of riding in the forest, the vegetation should be very precise. E.g. on sprint distance. And the classification of all the paths also wasn't anyhow constant. And I think it was overrated. (the classification was better than it should be)</p> <p>Minor misclassification of paths in the middle map</p> <p>Some errors in the map and a few ridability issues apart from the ones due to rapid vegetation growth, that we got informed about before. At least one made a huge time difference and was in my eyes not related to rapid vegetation growth.</p> <p>Junctions were not correctly joined on the maps - it's time consuming, but easy to do, and makes the map easier to read.</p> <p>The symbols 407 and 409 of Foot Orienteering should be used if off track riding is allowed. The difference of the green and the white of maps were not clear sometimes in the forest.</p> <p>Maps were quite difficult to fold.</p> <p>Central point could have been used to precise the location of the control.</p> <p>Map quality was really good!</p>
-----	--

---

LTU	<p>No plastic maps! Take pretext.</p> <p>The density of tracks made the map unreadable in some occasions, especially the middle distance. The symbols denoting rideability were fine but the width of the tracks was not always correctly represented. The parallel asphalt road in the middle distance represented with a single black line was extremely confusing and caused many riders to think they were still on the asphalt road to the east whereas they were on the one to the east.</p> <p>I did not like map paper. It's not possible to bend it. But map quality was excellent.</p> <p>Long: scale could have been larger for the Masters race given the path network. No long legs to actually plan. It was three middle races back to back. Middle: Multiple legs with starlight lines (M45 point 3-4-5) was hard to read. No info in the bulletin about a two sided map. Sprint: Not great around point 28 on M45. The use of white around the numbers didn't work very well and actually made it harder to read the points when racing. Bad placing of point numbers around the play area (north part).</p> <p>Very very good maps, overprint of courses difficult to read and not enough circle cutting</p> <p>Too big scale for old people it should be 1:7500 or bigger. We can have more maps or change side. Too many small paths were on the map.</p> <p>Too many small tracks hardly visible on the map. If they are on the map it must be possible to see them in nature.</p> <p>Long: 1:10'000 would have been easier to read. Middle: 1:7'500 would have been better. Rest of the map was ok (some asphalt roads were drawn as black lines instead of the right signature) Control numbers were sometimes hardly readable (should have been thicker).</p> <p>Scale not appropriate in long and middle distance (long distance should be 1:10000, middle distance 1:7500; or even parts of the map) The asphalted bicycle roads should be like asphalted roads on the map! (Not like forest roads, black lines) The control numbers were too thin, you could hardly see them.</p> <p>Map difficult to read in long and middle. Other scale / blow up section? Issue with fence just after mapchange (middle). Control numbers difficult to read.</p> <p>Maps were excellent. But I think that a long distance map in the old classes should be 1:10000 and not 1:15000. It was very difficult to read.</p> <p>Also courses were too complex resulting in numerous course crossings and resulting misspunches. Course lines and control circles had not been cut or moved to avoid covering features.</p> <p>Big problem to read the maps in King and middle dist.</p>
-----	---

---

---

Save for the sprint map, the maps were almost illegible in certain locations (too confusing, control circles concealing paths) and also often inaccurate (for instance: junctions, crossings, tarmac/no tarmac, path width).

Map scales in masters were wrong, long 1:15 000 -> 1:10 000, middle 1:10 000 -> 1:7 500 should be better. Look at womens elite 4->5 there was big mistake on the map.

Some problems with the paths since I think it was inconsistent. It was difficult to see the paths and control points in the area just before the map change and in the same area in the second lap. The scale of 1:15000 is too small in my age, better to use 1:10000 or best is 1:7500.

Underlying map legibility was good but pink overprinting could have done with some cut circles as they obscured some key details. I found the Out of bounds zig zag confused the map readability on the long near the start.

Great maps! Good to read and precise! For the long distance the scale was not appropriate.

Perfect work about many paths. Sometimes semi-open area was rideable and sometimes it wasn't possible even go through it. Also they weren't difference between green and yellow. If it is possible to ride everywhere, you should precisely map offroads areas. I liked the "stairs" symbol! On middle distance between controls 43 and 83 was a one more fence.

The maps were good although there were places where circles and lines obscured needed information. The middle race would have benefited with two maps.

The maps were good in detail, but should have been drawn for more legibility in junctions and crossings in order to make clear to the reader what to expect. Additionally, asphalt paths were often drawn in black instead of brown.

The map for long distance was not good! Tracks that was drawn the same way on the map, was not at all the same out in the forest. Excellent maps for sprint and middle.

No plastic maps. It is a problem of the accuracy, if off track riding is possible and many masters (or any other classes) start before the Elite class (or generally) - many new paths in terrain and not on the map.

Paper was too hard to fold.

Defects: \* Compulsary route for the middle (not easily visible on the map and depended on the guidance of a marshal - I have heard that the marshal was not there all the time) \* W60 courses involved a lot of control numbers close to each other -> would a map change have been more suitable like for the younger age classes? \* Printing quality was OK but due to tracks being very thick (is the standard right - should be checked) it became a bit of a mess in places and was not easily readable event when the rider stopped and dismounted.

As mentioned before, paper was too thick for me.

There was a lot of tracks hidden on the long especially around the area by the start flag. There could have been more use of broken circles and lines considering the extensive path network. At times it was overly confusing.

Unfortunately the scale was inappropriate on all maps. Even the sprint map would have been better readable at 1:5000. Therefore it wasn't always possible to see the precise location of a control. It's also difficult to say whether the maps were accurate or not. There was one big mistake on the Middle map: a fence that was difficult to cross wasn't mapped. On the middle map the equidistance was indicated as 5 m, but in fact it was 2.5 m. The numbers were sometimes very badly placed and therefore difficult to see. It was confusing that the paved cycling tracks weren't shown as tarmac roads. This plastic paper is highly unsuitable!

Too big scales, too many lines and control lines covered important paths.

1:15000 is very tough for masters when it is as much details and controls as it was in parts of the long distance. The line between controls and the control circles sometimes cover important things. Could have been avoided by gaps.

Map paper not very good, not easy to fold it

The course setter could have used more time to cut the circles, they often covered important

---

---

route choices.

The printing quality was good, but because of scale maps could NOT be read well while riding (long and middle).

Bad paper sheet! Too hard!!!

Paper difficult to fold.

---

## **Time-keeping and results (8)**

---

FRA No split times for the relay.

Didn't have wifi, so couldn't check if things were online on the same day.

I couldn't see the results of the Long distance in the finish arena when I returned from my open course in the afternoon.

---

POR No result monitors in the finish area.

Results were not easy to find on the event website on the day of the event. We had to look for it via facebook to get the correct link. The problem was solved later during the week.

Touchfree System is great for the MTBO-Sport - if it is working -> one should think about a backup system, e.g. two chips per athlete.

Very poor display of results in the finish arena. There was a big screen on which they showed very unnecessary information but not often results. There should at least be a regular printout of results because also those who are not among the top-3 want to know their positions! Or a bigger computer screen where they show all results running through.

There were just a hanging results which weren't updated very often. But the speaker kept us up to date.

For spectators in the arena difficult to understand and follow what is happening. No large result board and only a small screen in a small pavillon tent.

---

LTU - The unfortunate situation with SIAC for the long distance - this was unexpected of course, but should the organizers check each SIAC card before handing them out?

- Using touch-free requires more experience within the community but we should persist otherwise experience will not set in within the community

I can only comment on my results in that they were accurate. I know others were not so and I hope they do comment.

It wasn't quite obvious that the online results were hidden in the dressing tent. It's a pity that split times were available only after the event.

Hard to find them.

Why having Air system when it is not safe? Every competition I have been at using air system there have been problems. Using the punching system is much fairer. Can't see why the air system shall be used. What is the benefit with that?

Official results were shown very seldom (especially of the women).

No split times. Not every day official results on the internet.

Split times and live results have not worked out, display at the arena did not show all classes and competitors. Need a more stable platform for result display.

None of the above applied especially for the masters results.

We have to think about using SI Air... I think it is a great invention and good for our sport, but World Cups and World Champs are not the right events to test it. For athletes there must be a chance to check if everything is working during competition. There must be a better back up system. it is annoying to complete a long and interesting race and suddenly in the finish you get the information that there are controls missing. At long distance the control for map changing was for sure not with a range of 1,5m. I was passing it and there was no signal - I turned back, but a few others didn't...

---

---

Big screen was great, showing tracking and results. Needed some scrolling results and going through full results of both classes every 5-10mins.

Poor information about results in finish arena.

---

### **Team officials' meetings and information during event (9)**

---

FRA As an open competitor (Master) I didn't attend the teamleaders' meetings. There was no information of the meetings published on the internet, and there wasn't any information in the bulletins either about the locations, it was very difficult for the open competitors to find out where the finish arena of the mixed relay was situated.

Information at Team Leaders was ok. Pity the bulletins contained no information.

The meeting were quite a mess since there were too many things that organizers hadn't taken care of in time, like transport of clothing to finish from quarantine, people who weren't entered on start lists .....

I don't know too much about public races. Some information was missing or they gave it in late but this was acceptable. They were also flexible to change some things asked by the Team Leaders (but because they didn't think about those things by themselves)

---

POR Start lists did not appear online

---

LTU An "information session" for the masters should be organized or the information included in the team leaders meeting should either be available in the bulletin or on-line accessible by the masters. It is not fair that the elite get some extra information for the WCup but the masters don't even though this is the World Championship.

Nice meeting room. For Masters it was difficult to find the information.

Start list of sprint race late and not very fair (only best 10 riders of world cup latest, rest randomly)

Because of the website being hard to navigate, it was hard to find information.

Team officials' meetings information should tell which info is for elite and which is for masters. e.g. (middle distance info) map size, map change etc.

The start list for the World Cup Final in Sprint was not appropriate in my opinion. I think if the world cup standing is used, then for the whole start list!

---

### **Publicity, media, press (10)**

---

FRA For me it's not okay to announce how close a potential winner (this time from France) is to first position, when the rider himself can hear it.

The speaker often spoke French, especially when the French athletes were racing. The speaker should be careful not to tell later starters they are leading as this can influence the results.

It seems they never thought about this issue that, I remark, is as important as the technical component.

---

POR Display screens very difficult to read. GPS not easy to follow. Commentary good,

Display of results in the finish was poor, otherwise it was good.

GPS just for Elite, I would really like it if e.g. the best 10 Juniors could also ride with GPS (Like it's in Foot-Orienteering at JWOC).

---

LTU The speaker was not that fluent in English and we had a lot of eerrr hesitations which causes us to lose interest. We should concentrate on developing fluent speakers in the community, as we have for foot-o major events (naturally this costs money but is a valuable contribution to the event).

There were quite a few photographers but where are the photos of the masters? I can only access the photos of the elite.

The finish arena was always beyond the finish itself, which meant no one was watching the riders finish, as they sat around the food tent watching the screen. Moving the two side by side would have made a smaller arena/finish, but more atmosphere.

---

---

Poor information about results. Interviews in Lithuanian. Actually, through three days I heard just one interview. Small attention to masters.

---

### **General organisation (F + 11)**

---

FRA No bike wash at model event or event centre. No information of bike shop/ bike repair.  
Didn't need the use of the mechanic or participated in open race - why I given a middle score  
Nice to have a good bike wash!  
Bike-wash was very good, enough water and near arenas. Could have been a few more washing stations since the queue was quite long with just two stations.  
I think everything was almost good for public races but not for a WCup.  
In international race there must be staff that speak English, marshals that can read a map and showers in the competition centre.

---

POR Really great! Just the banquet was a big disappointment  
A few mishaps now and then, but generally very well organised.  
Don't like them!!  
No washing necessary (washed it at the hotel). Mechanic was excellent! Didn't compete in open races.

---

LTU The organizers tried their best and were always helpful and tried to find solutions to any problems. However there was a problem with the prize-giving ceremony being too late which lost all audience, and the one for the middle distance started 30 minutes early so many places on the podium for the masters were empty.  
The SIAC issue was not handled particularly well and there was confusion at the start of the middle on who was or was not changing maps.  
Prize giving shouldn't be so late after competition or then in the evening at event centre.  
The only remark is contact in advance of the races, it was a bit hard to get response from the organisers.  
The organisers did not seem to know how to use SI air and or had not trained their volunteers in the use of SI air starting procedures.  
Some very long Quarantines and if it had been wet there would not have been enough shelter  
Advance registration and accommodation booking was not straightforward and a few mistakes happened (not possible to register online until quite late, accommodation booking got "lost").  
Showers were a valuable extra at the finish - thanks for that!  
The water pressure of the bike-wash was too high, you damage your bike bearings with such a strong jet. I couldn't find out how to regulate it. It was great that the Masters were also given challenging courses in the same great terrain as the Elite. On the other hand, information for Masters wasn't easily to find and the time of the prize-givings was too late.  
Air system should be tested before.  
It was clear that the elite races had priority and the masters races came a poor second. The programming, choice of areas, map scales, quarantines were all OK for the elites but spoilt the competitions for the masters.  
Courses were great, but information was lacking (map size, map change). Finish quarantine was too long.  
With incredibly long quarantines it did feel as if we were 2nd class citizens to the elite.

---

## Ceremonies (12)

---

- FRA Ceremonies could have been a bit earlier. There was a lot of time to wait after the last finisher. Ceremonies were also late.
- When most of the competitors don't stay in just one big accommodation area it's great to have the prize-giving straight after the events at the arenas. They may not be so dignified and worthy, but in World cup it is very practical instead of having a separate evening activity.
- 
- POR Prize giving at the event worked well. Could have been a earlier. Long time to wait after the women's race was over
- Banquet food - really late, but tasted good. It was the only positive thing (except all the good people) on that banquet, when the food has arrived, it was good.
- Ceremonies were a bit too long. There were not so many categories but the ceremonies took forever. It was very good to have only a prize giving directly in the finish and not 2 ceremonies (flower + prize) like in many events before. The food at the banquet was probably the best we ever had qualitywise. But the rest of the banquet was probably the poorest I ever experienced. No working music, horrible acoustics, serving the food took forever, no nice atmosphere.
- The dinner was too late! The Opening/Closing Ceremony were really short, that's good!
- Prize-giving was same as flower - no extra frame but ok.
- 
- LTU The separation of flowers and prize giving in past was better. But I know it could be more stress for the organizer (time schedule).
- Ceremonies should have been as early as possible.
- I have stated my comments on prize-giving above.
- It would have been better to have both prize-giving for Masters and the Elite in the evening.
- Price giving should be separated from World cup and be in evenings nearby the event centre.
- Competing early in the day and having prize ceremony in the arena late of the day is not good.
- Either have the Masters ceremony directly after the masters competition or at the event centre in the evening.
- The ceremonies were held too late in the day to be held at the arena, however too early to be held at the event centre.
- Why not make the prize giving ceremony for the Masters, when they are waiting in the finish Quarantine zone. Everybody will be there anyway. The ceremony was quick, that was perfect.
- I think the ceremonies would have been better at the event centre , I realise balancing both events timings is hard but Portugal did it well last year using the event centre.
- I think price giving ceremonies should be divided from the finish area. It should be a worthy event.
- A long wait for prize giving ceremonies. Arrived at the middle event at 9.15 and did not leave until after prize giving at nearly 6 pm.
- Prize giving was too late after the races. Waiting 90 - 120 mins after every race for prize giving. Not enough time to go home to eat a proper recovery meal, but too long to stay at the arena. 45-60 mins would be acceptable to wait for BOTH elite classes. Hardly any non podium riders stayed for prize giving. The length of the wait really affected recovery for the next day. With the masters in the morning, it was just too late for the elites with the prize giving after their race. Either an evening 8 - 8.30 prize giving, or less than one hour after the finish of BOTH classes (the women finished nearly one hour before the men in the long and middle).
-

## Overall rating of the event (G)

---

FRA Winning times were way too long. Not ok to postpone the three days with an hour on the last day. The start of the relay was very unprofessional and no way near WCup standard.

Once again, the opportunity to showcase our sport was missed. The organisers didn't do anything to make this event visible. The many open competitors weren't encouraged to watch the World Cup in the morning because there was no information available. The local population didn't seem to know either what was going on.

Too many issues and no information before the event. Both long and middle were unfair - long in terms of familiarity of terrain to French athletes and middle due to mapping and shortcutting.

The arena must have visibility and services if we want our sport with more sponsors and more people!

It's difficult to have a great atmosphere in an event where things don't work and competitors and team leaders get frustrated.

Too much conditioned by the poorness of the finish arena.

I felt that the event failed to cater for, or even consider, Masters athletes, which was very frustrating given that it was supposed to be a round of the World Masters Series. This was especially annoying considering the cost, time and effort that were involved in attending the event. I did not compete in the final event on the third day because I was so disillusioned with the event by this stage! Organisers of Masters events, World Series or World Championships need to recognise that for a growing number of Masters athletes these competitions are a serious undertaking that involve considerable commitment to training prior to an event and a substantial financial and time investment to attend events, especially a number of rounds of the World Series. These athletes are no less serious, or committed, than their Elite counterparts and often compete without the support of any team infrastructure. If events do not reflect the commitment of Masters athletes, then these athletes are less likely to participate in the future.

---

POR Great carnival

We have been lucky to be in the hotel a lot of other teams chose to stay. It is always nice not to have accommodation spread by several km and having a large distance to the EC.

---

LTU Overall a great event. Organisers need to train themselves on SIAC and then provide an idiots guide for competitors on the process for start, no matter its format.

It was a great event - thanks to the organisers! Positive: finish arenas, hot showers, fantastic terrain with challenging courses etc. Potential for improvement: - information (including website) - appropriate scale for maps - start areas - timing of prize-givings

Great people!

In my opinion prize giving should have been better done in the evening or just after the race. Official results were not really shown after the race (especially from the women).

Prize giving should be at event centre later in the evening for more people to attend.

Too much waiting time in arena, if you wanted to stay for prize giving.

---

IOF MTBO Commission, November 2016/uh