

TRANSIT Online Registration System (TORS)

Orienteering Victoria Board Meeting – December 2011

ACTIONS/DECISIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

- Work with other states to implement a National system
- Begin work on English agreement with SOF

OVERALL STATUS

Behind schedule

1. BACKGROUND

Decision paper was presented to OV at the November meeting recommending the implementation of Eventor. Board agreed that Eventor was the most comprehensive system on offer however there was concern that there wouldn't be sufficient adoption of the system (in the early years) and as a result the cost of using the system would be uneconomical.

OV board agreed that the recommendation paper be present at the Orienteering Australia conference in December with the aim of getting other states involved to increase usage and therefore make it economically viable.

2. ACTIVITIES AND PLANS

A presentation was given at the Orienteering Australia (OA) conference held at the Australian Institute of Sport in Canberra on the weekend of 10-11 December 2011. A copy of the presentation can be found at <http://prezi.com/yyfpbet68s5b/online-entry-membership/>.

The presentation demonstrate the research that OV had undertaken regarding an online event entry and membership system for orienteering by talking (at a high level) of the need for a single, centralised system which would provide benefits to states and OA.

All the states had been looking at various online entry (not membership) solutions. All but one of the states was interested in adopting Eventor pending a review of the research undertaken by OV. QLD has just recently implemented a new web site and have had a custom online entry system developed.

Victoria offered to contribute the development costs (estimated to be around \$20,000) as a sweetener for other states to come on board. Each of the other states may have to contribute some money to additional development if they want other membership structures implemented (for instance).

Subsequent to the presentation both the "Request for Proposal" and "System Summary for Decision" papers were sent to the interested states. Understanding there would be no formal state board meetings until the New Year, each of the states were asked to confirm their interest in Eventor by providing formal, but non-binding response before Christmas. A binding decision would be made by each state at their first board meeting in 2012.

I personally spoke with all the state delegates and there was genuine interest in adopting a single system and many of them had forwarded the documentation on to their technology literate board members for review. There was also support from other delegates present at the conference.

3. ISSUES, CONCERNS & RISKS

The system was scheduled to be implemented at the beginning of 2012 and this is the largest concern at present. The decision to present the options at the OA conference has (and will continue to) impacted the implementation timeline. However, the potential benefits of doing so far out-weigh any delay in implementation.

The interest in Eventor from other states does introduce some additional risks including;

- Structure of an agreement with the Swedish Orienteering Federation
- "Ownership" of the system
- Who is responsible for coordinating development and maintenance of the system
- Who is responsible for setting the prices and reconciling payments
- etc

Some thought has been put into each of these risks however, until we have binding decision from (at least one of) the states it doesn't warrant too much effort.

4. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The Swedish Orienteering Federation (SOF) were informed that Victoria was taking the system to the OA conference. They will be provided with an update of the decision at the conference.

The SOF will also be asked about the form of the agreement we would be entering into and specifically whether they can provide an English version of their existing agreement with Norway. The other alternative is that we have an agreement developed and provide it to them for review. Either way there will be some legal costs involved which will be drawn from the project budget.

5. BUDGET

To date none of the project budget has been spent. Craig Feuerherdt has completed all research in kind.

The \$17,100 budgeted to be spent on an appropriate system in 2011 has not occurred (as explained above). Pending a decision by the other states, it would be envisaged that appropriate customisation of the selected system would take place in the Jan-Mar quarter of 2012 and be invoiced and paid in the Apr-Jun quarter.