



MINUTES OF THE XIVth IOF CONGRESS  
held on Friday 1 July 1988  
in Torbole, Italy

1. The IOF President, Professor Bengt Saltin, opened the XIVth Congress. In his opening remarks, Bengt Saltin focussed on those developments which had been particularly promoted during the 1986-88 Congress period with the purpose of forming a solid basis for future IOF work:

Opening  
of  
Congress

(a) The establishment of a new committee, The Public Relations and Marketing Committee (PRMC), the objectives of which are to find ways and means for Orienteering to achieve recognition by the sports world and by the general public as well as to suggest methods which will yield hard (monetary) benefits for the IOF. The latter objective includes heavy involvement in sponsorship matters which are of growing importance to the IOF; (b) The establishment of a full-time Secretariat intended to render a professional service to the IOF Member Federations; (c) The establishment of reasonably stable finances for the IOF to operate on; this has been achieved thanks to loyal contributions from the IOF Member countries and early success in obtaining sponsorship money; (d) The establishment of a new organisational structure, involving a division of the IOF membership into regions, which will, hopefully, strengthen within-region co-operation for the benefit of IOF work at large; (e) The amendment of the present Statutes which will be proposed to Congress for endorsement. A major new item relates to the financial rights and obligations of the IOF in connection with events "fully supported" by the IOF; (f) The establishment of new basic rules upon which rules for all kinds of IOF events will be based; (g) The establishment of the new IOF orienteering magazine, The IOF Bulletin, which will facilitate future communication within the IOF membership. The IOF has reason to be proud of its new publication, said the President.

Heinz Tschudin, Switzerland

President: Bengt Saltin, Otto Mönstedes Gade 1, DK-1571 Copenhagen ☎ 009-45 137 70 00, 132 92 53

Secretary General: Lennart Levin, Box 76, S-191 21 Sollentuna, Sweden ☎ (46) 8-35 34 55 Telex 13652 S 8126240 S

Bank account: PK-Banken 3269-77-00382

Postal giro account: 8 42 63-3



2. A roll call of the delegates was taken. Present were:

Roll Call  
of Dele-  
gates

AUS	Hugh Cameron
AUT	Wolf Eberle, Erich Simkovics, Friedrich Woitsch
BEL	Paul Chauveheid, John Pearson
BUL	Ivan Kraevski, Evgeni Uzunov
CAN	Jack Forsyth, Colin Kirk
CUB	Angel Lenis Gual Salfran
DEN	Ove Gasbjerg, Birthe Helms, Flemming Nørgaard
ESP	Miguel Borrero Alvarez
FIN	Lasse Nimelä, Seppo Siirilä, Kalevi Tarvainen
FRA	Alain Frangeul, Didier Haberkorn, Edmond Szechenyi
FRG	Andreas Dresen, Ernst Gruhn, Wilhelm Holz
GBR	Clive Allen, Sue Harvey*), Brian Watkins
GDR	Rolf Heinemann, Erich Krauss
HUN	Sarolta Monspart*), Ernő Szarka
IRL	Faith White
ISR	Giora Cohen, Michael Friedlander
ITA	Hedy Cavini, Alfredo Sartori, Carlo Alberto Valer
KOR	Jung-Hwan Oh
NOR	Kåre Holt-Hansen, Tore Kristiansen, Geir Tveit
POL	Lech Trzpił
SUI	Thomas Brogli, Yvonne Caspari, Thomas Scholl
SWE	Ake Jacobson, Lillvor Johansson, Lars-Ake Larsson
TCH	Pavel Kasal, Josef Krch*), Ivana Ulehlova
URS	Boris Ogorodnikov
USA	Per Stensby*), Bruce Wolfe

(i.e. 23 Federations and 2 Associate Federations - CUB, ESP - were represented)

#### Honorary Members

Lasse Heideman	FIN
Inga Löwdin	SWE

#### Council Members

Herbert Hartmann	FRG
Poul-Erik Birk-Jakobsen	DEN
Leif A Karlsen	NOR
Bengt Saltin	SWE
Heinz Tschudin	SUI

\*) see delegates above

#### Committee Members

Gunnar Jonsson	SWE	(Ski-O)
Arne Krog	DEN	(TC)

**Observers**

Anne Braggins	GBR	
Peter Gehrman	GFR	(Editor IOF Bulletin)
Asbjörn Gjerret	NOR	
Gunnel Heidemann	FIN	
Christine Kennedy	CAN	
Agneta Krog	DEN	
Carol McNeill	GBR	
Torgny Ottosson	SWE	
Vladimir Pacl	ITA	
Tom Renfrew	GBR	
Mark Smith	CAN	
Einar Undstad	NOR	

**Secretary-General**

Lennart Levin SWE

3. The Secretary General announced the voting rights, viz: resolutions require a simple majority, i.e. 12 votes out of 23; amendments to the Statutes require a two-thirds majority, i.e. 16 votes in favour. **Voting rights**
  4. The Congress Presidium was elected as follows: Bengt Saltin, Josef Krch, Heinz Tschudin, Herbert Hartmann, Sue Harvey, Benito Cavini, Lennart Levin. **Congress Presidium**
  5. Friedrich Woitsch, AUT, and Bruce Wolfe, USA, were elected to certify the minutes. **Minutes Witnesses**
  6. The Agenda was approved, with the following amendments: Item No. 19 (Election of tellers) to follow immediately upon the present item (as new No. 7); Item No. 13.3 (The Long-Term Plan) to be moved to 13.7 (under the new denomination 14.7). **Approval of Agenda**
- Wolf Eberle, AUT, raised the issue of name change of the Eurocup in Ski-O as an urgent matter. The proposal did not obtain the necessary two-thirds majority and was dropped.
7. Poul-Erik Birk-Jakobsen, DEN, Colin Kirk, CAN, and Ernő Szarka, HUN, were elected tellers. **Election of tellers**



8. It was agreed that the session should be open and observers admitted. Open sessions/  
/Observers
9. The auditors for the previous financial period were: Auditors  
Roy Sinclair, GBR  
Lars-Eric Engberg, SWE  
Claudio Cavazzani, ITA
10. The minutes of the previous Congress (DEN, 1986) were Minutes of  
approved with the following amendment, proposed by Per previous  
Stensby, USA: Item 14.1 a), page 3, the second para- Congress  
graph, the sentence beginning "It was proposed"....  
should be replaced by the following sentence: "It was  
requested that the Council, on behalf of the Congress,  
decide on regions in preparation for election of the  
Council during the 1988 Congress and publish the deci-  
sion prior to the next Congress."
11. The Council Report for the period 1986-1987 was unani- Council  
mously approved by the Congress. The report being report  
presented under a new format ("the blue book" contain-  
ing, beside Council and Committee reports, also other  
Congress material), the President asked Congress whether  
this might be an appropriate model for the future. The  
question was answered in the affirmative, and apprecia-  
tive comments were made on the material distributed to  
the delegates before Congress.
12. The Committee Reports for the period 1986-1987 were Committee  
unanimously approved. reports
13. The Congress confirmed the associate membership of Associate  
Portugal, as previously proposed by Council. It was member  
noted that Romania, while having submitted an appli-  
cation for associate membership, was not quite pre-  
pared to join the IOF.
14. Proposals to Congress
- 14.1 Council proposal: Amendments to Statutes Amendments  
of Statutes  
The amended versions (English and German) had been dis-  
tributed to all Member Federations before Congress. It  
was pointed out to the delegates that (a) the English  
version had undergone a substantial linguistic revision,  
though without any change of the contents; (b) the deci-

sions by the previous Congress (Ry, DEN, 1986) concerning regionalisation and organisational structure had been incorporated into the new Statutes; (c) only one item, 2.4. regarding the financial rights of the IOF at major events, is completely new and should, *ipso facto*, be subject to vote by Congress (2/3 majority required); (d) The second sentence of item 10 of the previous Statutes, stating that the German version of Statutes, rules and decision are decisive, has been deleted. In cases where interpretation might be difficult, a solution should be aimed at by consulting the original draft, notwithstanding the language of the latter.

The new paragraph on finance (2.4), when put to the vote, was unanimously approved.

Concerning the new edition(s) of the Statutes, Per Stensby, USA, pointed out that still another linguistic scrutiny is required before printing them (PS exemplified by referring to item 12.11.12 where the words "stage" and "state" might cause confusion). Congress approved that Council publish the new Statutes, English and German versions, when the remaining necessary linguistic corrections had been made.

#### 14.2 Council proposal: Basic Rules for Orienteering

#### Basic Rules for Orienteering

The new Basic Rules, together with a graph displaying the hierarchy of rules (the level within the IOF where a decision concerning rules is taken) had been distributed to Member Federations before Congress. Heinz Tschudin briefly introduced the topic and Rolf Heinemann made some comments on behalf of the Technical Committee, which had been responsible for drafting the rules.

During the ensuing discussion the following points were made clear: (a) The new Basic Rules will come into effect on 1 January 1989; (b) They do not imply an immediate change of all existing rules, for instance the World Cup rules; (c) Ongoing work on more "applied" (as opposed to basic) rules is a continuous task for the Technical Committee. Thus to-day no exact date could be given when, for instance, the new World Championship rules will be published.

Two amendments to the Basic Rules were suggested: Ake Jacobson, SWE, proposed that item 14.1 should read: "Except in cases of accident or education, outside assistance....." (addition in italics); Hugh Cameron, AUS, proposed that item 13 should read: ".....in minutes and seconds".



With these two amendments Congress approved the new Basic Rules for Orienteering, including the graph illustrating the proper levels for decisions regarding the rules.

14.3 Council proposal: B-final at the World Championship

B-final  
at the WOC

Heinz Tschudin, having introduced the topic, asked SWE, organisers of next year's WOC, to comment on the possibility of staging a B-final. Lars-Åke Larsson testified to the preparedness of the organisers to do so. If commissioned by the IOF to stage the event, SWE would do it on the same map as the qualification race, the day before the WOC final, in connection with a public race; medals would be awarded to the winners.

The ensuing debate frequently touched on another item on the agenda, namely (14.5) the proposal from FIN regarding a Sprint event to be added to the WOC. Thus, several participants (F. Woitsch, AUT, K. Tarvainen, FIN, W. Holz, FRG, C. Allen, GBR, R. Heinemann, GDR), although giving somewhat different reasons, claimed that a sprint event, rather than a B-final, would be preferable. Others (J. Pearson, BEL, F. White, IRL) held that a sprint event would not change anything for the weaker nations and therefore supported the B-final. G. Tveit, NOR, was opposed to the form of the proposal which, in his opinion, allowed too long an experimental period for the B-final (1989-1991); this view gained support from several delegates. B. Saltin commented that no Council member is against the introduction of new disciplines on the WOC programme, but further experience is needed until such a decision is taken. According to B. Saltin "we are searching for something which can solve the problems of the weaker nations". Several questions were asked concerning the rules implications of a B-final, were it introduced.

At this stage Herbert Hartmann, chairing the discussion, suggested that Congress adjourn in order to allow the Presidium to work out a modified proposal, taking into account views expressed by an apparent majority of delegates. The proposal was accepted. After a break the following proposal was presented to Congress:





- \* A B-final will be tried out at the 1989 WOC
- \* The winners of the B-final will receive no title, nor any medals
- \* The WOC rules will remain unchanged
- \* In 1991, providing technical preparations are sufficiently advanced, an additional discipline will be introduced
- \* An appropriate proposal will be presented at the 1990 Congress, to include the experience from the World Cup in the sprint events and to define the characteristics of the sprint event.

Some discussion followed upon the new proposal. E. Szechenyi, FRA, wanted the status of the B-final winner to be specified in the proposal; C. Allen, GBR, asked if a single representative from a certain Member Federation should start in the A- or B-final; K. Tarvainen, FIN, declared that FIN would not support the modified proposal because it was felt that a B-final would dilute the Championship. P. Stensby, USA, urged support for the new modified Council proposal and asked the Technical Committee to specify the sprint event, the nature of which, in his opinion, remained unclear.

After these comments the discussion was closed and the modified Council proposal as above was put to the vote. There being 11 votes in favour of the proposal, the Chairman did not ask for votes against the proposal but declared it lost (apparently assuming that 12 votes were required for a simple majority). At the time nobody objected to the procedure, and the Congress decision was considered to imply no B-final at the WOC. However, during the intermission following upon the morning session a procedural error was noted in that abstentions were not considered. When Congress reassembled, a revote was therefore proposed, and was accepted by the Chair.

Result of vote: 12 in favour of the modified Council  
proposal (as stated above)  
7 against  
3 abstentions (one delegation absent  
during the afternoon session)



14.4 Proposals on Regionalisation of the IOF Membership  
(Council and GBR):

Regionali-  
sation

Poul-Erik Birk-Jakobsen, introducing the subject, reminded the delegates of the decision taken at the previous Congress after four years of discussion: (a) From now on the IOF membership should be divided into five regions; (b) Development aspects (the strong support the weaker within a region) had been of great importance in deciding on regions; (c) whatever the size of a certain region, it could claim only one member on the IOF Council.

Clive Allen, GBR, described GBR's proposal aimed at re-aligning membership of the Atlantic and Western Europe regions and maintained that all five members of the Atlantic region reject the Council decision (and proposal for the coming Congress period). GBR and IRL, he stressed, belong to the Western Europe region on any criterion. Concerning Council's argument that the Atlantic region will have too few members without GBR and IRL, he opposed it on developmental grounds: that region will expand and count new members in due time. He also stressed that an Atlantic region without GBR and IRL does not imply that co-operation with that region would cease. Finally, CA announced that GBR was withdrawing the the third and fourth parts of her proposal (the Western Europe region to be entitled to have two members on the IOF Council), to allow for further consideration of the issues involved. CA asked Council to consider a criterion-referenced solution to the question of the number of council members per region, and to present it at the next Congress to come into effect immediately.

Per Stensby, USA, opposed the view that development aspects were of major importance in deciding on the Council's proposal for regions. The only reason for regionalising the IOF membership, according to PS, had been representation on the IOF Council. He also commented that the Council vote was a split vote with the President's vote decisive, not a majority vote. He further argued that it is impossible for GBR/IRL to represent USA/CAN in matters related to orienteering, and vice versa. The three countries naturally belonging to the Americas region (CAN, CUB, USA) should be given an opportunity to participate also at Council level, according to PS.

Friedrich Woitsch, AUT, suggested that a sixth region, Southern Europe, be established. This proposal was supported by Erich Krauss, GDR. However, Poul-Erik Birk-Jakobsen, DEN, pointed out that such a proposal could not be put to the vote since the decision on





five regions had already been taken. Clive Allen commented that Council ought seriously to consider the merits of AUT's proposal during the forthcoming Congress period.

Of the two remaining proposals, that from the British Orienteering Federation as amended by Clive Allen and noted above, was approved by Congress. (Votes: 17 for, 4 against). Thus, GBR and IRL move to the Western European region; the Atlantic region consists of CAN, CUB, USA. (A table presenting the regions approved by Congress are attached to these minutes).

14.5 Proposal from FIN: Sprint event to be added to the WOC

**Sprint  
event at  
WOC**

As mentioned previously, the issue of a sprint event had been if not precluded, at least frequently commented on, under item 14.3.

In elaborating on the Finnish proposal Lasse Niemelä, FIN, maintained that a sprint event would contribute to development of orienteering in the not-so-strong Member federations. In addition, a sprint event would make a WOC more interesting and promote great publicity, as proven by the recent Ski-O WOC in Kuopio, FIN (where a sprint event was introduced). Finally, LN argued that more elite runners would be able to participate in the finals (namely 3 + 3) if the Finnish proposal were approved.

Ake Jacobson, SWE, held that many in the audience probably did not know what kind of additional event was aimed at, simply because "sprint" had not been defined in the proposal or during the discussion. He therefore proposed that the character of the additional discipline at future World Championships be defined and the definition distributed among Member federations for them to consider.

Herbert Hartmann, chairing the discussion, suggested that Ake Jacobson's proposal should form the basis of a proposal to be voted against the Finnish proposal. This new proposal, implying that an additional discipline be defined by Council with the purpose of introducing it as soon as possible at the WOC, was approved by 21 votes and 1 abstention; the Finnish proposal was thus dropped.