


## Event Evaluation MTBO World Cup 2017

### Explanations


Event 1	Event 2	Event 3	Event 4
World Cup	EMTBOC/EJMTBOC/ EYMTBOC	WMMTBOC	WMTBOC/JWMTBOC
Austria	France	France	Lithuania
June 2017	July/August 2017	July/August 2017	August 2017
<i>Responses:</i> Total: 25 (34 people) ME: 13 WE: 7	<i>Responses:</i> Total: 14 (29 people) ME: 4 WE: 2 M20: 2 M17: 1	<i>Responses:</i> Total: 27  M40: 1 M45: 1 M55: 2 / W55: 2 M60: 3 / W60: 4 M65: 4 / W65: 5 M70: 3 / W70: 1 (M35: 1)	<i>Responses:</i> Total: 23  ME: 9 WE: 7 M20: 3 W20: 2
coll. feedback: 2 (repr. 11 athletes) officials: 3	coll. feedback: 3 (repr. 18 athletes) officials: 2		coll. feedback: 0  officials: 2
<i>Competitions:</i> Middle Sprint Long	<i>Competitions:</i> Sprint Middle Long Sprint Relay Relay	<i>Competitions:</i> Sprint Middle Long Sprint Relay * Relay * * unofficial	<i>Competitions:</i> Middle Mass start Relay Long Sprint

### 1. Information before the event and communication with organiser

All information about the event was easy to find and understand and was given in time. The organiser’s website was user-friendly and contained all necessary information.




The organiser answered inquiries promptly and competently.



## 2. Event programme


It was well-balanced and the order of the competitions was fine.



Events 1 and 2: Open/public races or other events were held in conjunction with the main event in a suitable manner.


Event 3: The WMMTBOC were held in conjunction with the European Championships in a suitable manner.

No public races at event 4.



### 3. Event Centre

How would you rate the Event Centre (infrastructure, staff)?



### 4. Accommodation and food

Here are only answers from participants who used the organiser's accommodation.


Event 1: 89 % (23 respondents) used the organiser's accommodation.

Event 2: 15 % (2 respondents) used the organiser's accommodation.


Event 3: 4 % (1 respondent) used the organiser's accommodation.

Event 4: 78 % (18 respondents) used the organiser's accommodation.


How would you rate the accommodation (suitable for your needs, secure bike storage, etc.)?



How would you rate the food?




Prices for accommodation and food were reasonable.




## 5. Transport to the competitions / finish arenas

It was easy to find the way to the competitions (signposts, maps etc.).



Parking at the finish arenas was well-organised.




## 6. Feedback on different competitions

Sp = Sprint, Mi = Middle, Lo = Long, Ma = Mass Start, Re = Relay, SR = Sprint Relay


The feedback includes:

- terrain (suitable, interesting, challenging, dense network of tracks)
- courses (interesting, challenging, appropriate for format)
- safety (traffic, dangerous places in terrain, marshals, course setting)
- fairness (possible shortcuts, marshals in terrain, quarantine zones)
- refreshments (at start, during race, at finish)
- quarantine zones (competitor-friendly, shelter, space, toilets, refreshments)
- start (fair, quiet, hand-over of maps, shelter)
- finish arena (safe ride-in, display of results, spectator-friendly, atmosphere, speaker, shelter)
- technical organisation (controls in correct place, etc.)


### Event 1




### Event 2



Event 3




Event 4






## 7. Maps


The scale was appropriate on all maps.




The maps were accurate and showed the latest changes.




The maps could be read well while riding.



Overprinting didn't cover any important features such as tracks or junctions.




The print on the maps was good and resistant to handling and moisture.




### 8. Timekeeping and results

Results were prompt and correct.



Good display of results at finish arena (big screen, wooden board with name plates, etc.)




### 9. Team officials' meetings and information during event

At event 3 (WMMTBOC) there was an information session but no team officials' meeting. 12 out of 27 respondents (44 %) attended this information session.


Team officials' meetings were well organised and the information given was easy to understand.

Event 3: The information session was well organised and the information given was helpful.




All the necessary information was given at the team officials' meetings.

Event 3: All the information necessary for Master competitors was easily available.




The start lists were correct and published in time.




The latest information (e.g. start lists) was available on-line.

Event 3: No question for the WMMTBOC as the start lists were published before the event.




### 10. Questions for non-competitors


Information (e.g. regarding locations) was also easily accessible to non-competitors.




It was easy for spectators at the finish arena to follow the competitors (well-informed speaker, start bibs according to starting order, display of results, GPS tracking, etc.).



How would you rate the open/public races?




Question for media and press people: Adequate facilities and working conditions were available at the event centre and the finish arenas.




### 11. General organisation

How would you rate the general organisation?




### 12. Ceremonies and banquet

Place and time of ceremonies fitted well into the competitors' schedule.






The prize-giving ceremonies were dignified and worthy of the event and of adequate duration.




How would you rate the banquet (quality and quantity of food, organisation, atmosphere, etc.)?



### 13. Overall rating of the event

How would you rate the overall quality?



How would you rate the atmosphere of the event?

