



1. Event programme


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




The rest day was scheduled according to the competitors' needs.



Open/public races were held in conjunction with the main event in a suitable manner.




It was no problem for me that World Cup participants and Masters were in the same terrain at the same time.




## 2. Event centre

All necessary infrastructure (including free internet access) was available.



The staff was competent and helpful.



## Explanations

### Events and responses

Event 1: 67 responses  
EOC Poland  
May 2013  
(including 2 feedbacks from teams)

Event 2: 50 responses  
WOC Estonia  
August 2013  
(including 2 feedbacks from teams)


Event 3: 42 responses  
World Cup / Masters  
October 2013  
(including 2 feedbacks from teams)

### Competitions (see 5. Feedbacks on different competitions)


Event 1:	Event 2:	Event 3:
Sprint (Sp)	Sprint (Sp)	Sprint (Sp),
Middle (Mi)	Middle (Mi)	only for Masters
Long (Lo)	Long (Lo)	Middle (Mi)
Relay (Re)	Relay (Re)	Long (Lo)
Mixed Sprint Relay (MSR)		Relay (Re)

### 3. Accommodation and food


How would you rate the accommodation?




How would you rate the food?



Prices for accommodation and food were reasonable.




There was secure bike storage at the accommodation.




#### 4. 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.




The times indicated to get to the finish arenas were correct.




## 5. Feedback on different competitions

**Terrain:** suitable, interesting, challenging, dense network of tracks


Event 1



Event 2




Event 3




**Maps:** see also separate point 6


Event 1



Event 2




Event 3




## 5. Feedback on different competitions

**Courses:** interesting, challenging, appropriate for discipline


Event 1



Event 2




Event 3




**Safety:** traffic, dangerous places in terrain, marshals


Event 1



Event 2




Event 3




## 5. Feedback on different competitions

**Fairness:** start, shortcuts, marshals in terrain, quarantine zones


Event 1



Event 2




Event 3




**Refreshments:** at start, during race, at finish


Event 1



Event 2




Event 3




## 5. Feedback on different competitions

### Quarantine zones (warm up, cool-down):


Event 1



Event 2




Event 3




### Start: fair, quiet, hand-over of maps, shelter


Event 1



Event 2



Event 3







## 5. Feedback on different competitions

**Finish arena:** safe ride-in, display of results, spectator-friendly, atmosphere, speaker, shelter, refreshments


Event 1



Event 2




Event 3




**Technical organization:** controls in correct place, etc.


Event 1



Event 2




Event 3




## 6. Maps


The scale was appropriate on all maps.




It was clear for the competitors where you could pass and where not.



The maps were accurate and showed the latest changes.




The precise location of the controls was clearly visible on the map.




## 6. Maps


The printing quality was good and the maps could be read well while riding.



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




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




## 7. Time-keeping and results


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




Results were prompt and correct.



Correct results were published on the internet on the day of the event.




Split times were available on the day of the event.




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


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




The start lists were correct and published in time.



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




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




## 9. Publicity, media, press


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, ect.)




The organisers made every effort to maximise media coverage without jeopardizing the fairness of the competitions.



Media and press people found adequate facilities and working conditions at the event centre and the finish arenas.




Interviewers and photographers did their work in a way so as not to disturb the competitors.




### 10. General organisation


How would you rate bike mechanic services provided by the organizer (mechanic at start or bike repair shop at the event centre or nearby)?




How would you rate the quality of the open/public races?



Bike-wash was well organised (possibilities at finish arenas, event centre, accommodation; enough stations, etc.).




Information (e.g. regarding locations) was also easily accessible to people who did not take part in the elite classes (masters, spectators or participants at open races).




## 11. Ceremonies and banquet


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




How would you rate the food at the banquet (quality, quantity)?



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




The price for the banquet was reasonable.





## 12. Overall rating of the event

How would you rate the overall quality?



How would you rate the atmosphere of the event?

