



PO Box 134  
South Melbourne  
Victoria 3205

Phone (+61-3) 9684 0500  
Fax (+61-3) 9684 0555  
Internet: [www.ma.org.au](http://www.ma.org.au)  
Email: [rules@ma.org.au](mailto:rules@ma.org.au)

## Motocross and Supercross Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 24th & 25th March, 2018

PRESENT: Graeme Baynes (Chair), Mark Hancock, Bec Lipsett, Shannon Reimann  
APOLOGY: NIL  
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 24th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation
MX1234		Welcome / apologies	Chair welcomes those present and opens the meeting.		
MX1235		Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2017 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.		

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation
MX1236	MQ MX Subcommittee	12.1, 12.2, 12.5	12.1 MX1 122cc and Over 12.2 SX1 122 to 450cc 12.5 MX1 122cc and Over	<p><u>Rule Change</u></p> <p>12.1 MX1 <b>255cc</b> and Over 12.2 SX1 <b>255</b> to 450cc 12.5 MX1 <b>255cc</b> and Over SX1 <b>255cc</b> to 450cc</p> <p><u>Rationale:</u> The MQ MX Subcommittee sent in a request to change this rule back last year. The MX Commission minutes dismissed this request without an explanation. There is no logical reason to try to kill the open class (255cc &amp; over) by doing this. Why should one class have the opportunity to race twice when the other (450 &amp; over) doesn't? If clubs want this they can just run an Unlimited class instead. Some do but they run it as an extra class, so both capacities get to do two classes. We are requesting that the rule is at least changed back for 12.5</p>	<p>MXC refer MQMX to minutes of 12-13/3/2016. Rationale put forward by MA and Lynne Long adopted being - given declining rider numbers in MX at all levels this was a good way of encouraging participation rather than precluding it - women have the option to ride any capacity bike in an event, an open class is indeed open to all capacities. Riders should be able to maximise use of their motorcycles for value for money and combat competition from black events/ride parks. MXC agreed with this and enacted the recommendations. MXC added that classes can be limited by organisers using Supplementary Regulations thereby giving flexibility to all. R &amp; T supported and adopted this recommendation. The resulting resurgence of participation by 250cc 2 strokes in both classes and bikes with greater than 450CC capacity in the Open Class has resulted. MXC believe that benefits of allowing more participation rather than less far outweighs any perceived advantage of racing twice. The rider pays additional entry fees which is good for clubs and riders have more people to race against increasing enjoyment in the sport. It could indeed be argued that riding in 2 classes is a disadvantage as most do not have the fitness to compete and can then choose which class they prefer.</p> <p>MXC do not recommend a change to the existing rules 11.1, 11.2 and 11.5</p>

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation
MX1237	Chris Helder	11.27.6.2	<p>11.27.6.2 Machine Requirements:</p> <p>a) Engine capacity must not exceed 50cc,  b) The gearbox must have one gear,  c) External gearing may be altered,  d) The clutch must be of centrifugal type, and of OEM type,  e) Wheels as per GCR 11.27.2 must be fitted,  f) All machines must remain standard to the OEM specifications for the model. Only the following items may be modified: i) Colour, ii) Seat, iii) Mudguards, iv) Handlebars, v) Grips, vi) Levers, vii) Cables, viii) Chains, ix) Tyre brand and tread pattern, x) Carburettor jets  g) The frame of a machine may be gusseted and strengthened but not so as to alter the geometry of the frame, h) Throttle limiting devices may be removed, i) A separate kill switch may be installed in place of the standard, j) Steel serrated foot pegs may replace standard rubber pegs.</p>	<p><u>Rule Change:</u></p> <p>We all just run Demo class rules. 11.27.5.1 Machine Requirements: a) Engine capacity must not exceed 50cc, b) The clutch must be of centrifugal type, c) Wheels as per GCR 11.27.2 must be fitted.</p> <p><u>Rationale:</u></p> <p>1) With the introduction of the Cobra FWE all other bikes are at a disadvantage as the Cobra runs advanced suspension and cylinder porting, the kicker is that the bike is \$7,500 and this is just not affordable to all families, with minimal work to the KTM50/Husky50 etc. it can be complete for a fraction of the cost.  2) OEM parts from KTM etc. are far more expensive than aftermarket parts that are of a higher quality this drives up the price of racing.  3) Suspension cannot cater to such a wider variety of kids at different riding levels and weights it is a danger to the rider and to the other kids to not have modified suspension to suit the riders.</p>	<p>It has long been regarded that the rules are necessary to prevent modification of motorcycles for very young competitors and nothing has changed. MXC believe that over the years many brands have had the market advantage over other brands. Generally the market catches up to the leader (&amp; in this case it has been the KTM65) and then the market leading brand responds by developing the bike further as part of its development cycle. MA Technical division received detailed information regarding the Cobra FWE and deemed the motor is basically identical to the previous CX50 model. MA's Technical opinion was porting on it's own would provide little advantage to the performance. MXC do not approve of any changes to 11.27.6.2.</p>

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation
MX1238	CQ Demo Parents	6.2.0.3	6.2 RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES 6.2.0.1 Recreational activity must not: 6.2.0.3 Involve starts or finishes as defined in discipline chapters	<p><u>Rule Change:</u></p> <p>That DEMO riders although non competitive be allowed to start from race starting drop gates.</p> <p><u>Rationale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is inherent danger when starting riders of different capabilities with no apparent system, if a faster rider is late to the staging area and is mid pack or last for example this could cause a crash where a faster rider lands on a slower rider or runs into the back of them.</li> <li>• If the faster riders do go first by the time the slower riders leave the faster riders will be coming into lap the slower riders causing risk to both the slower and faster riders.</li> <li>• The last riders to leave will get less time on the track then the first riders to leave by a significant amount, sometime we have 30+ riders.</li> <li>• When all riders leave from the gate at the same time the riders all find there spot and there is very little interaction between the riders, when it is single start in any order you will have faster kids interacting with slower kids, this brings in more risk.</li> <li>• We often travel 3-4 hours each way for a 2 day race and for a DEMO rider there are 4 6min races over the 3 days equal to 24min total riding, this becomes an expensive weekend when you add in licence, nominations, camping, food, fuel and all the other costs and now there is more value taken from the kids and parents with this rule.</li> <li>• Picking a peg for the first race and starting from the gate like the big kids is all a part of the experience for the little races, often they have older siblings or parents that may race and they want to be able to race the way they do and the way their heroes do on TV.</li> <li>• Starting from the gate is integral to moving up to competitive racing, we aren't allowed to drop gates at practice so more or less it will be a DEMO rider moving up the first time he will come out of a gate will be his first race, that makes no sense.</li> </ul>	<p style="color: red;">MX do not approve of change to 6.2.0.1 or 6.2.0.3 The Demo riders are non competitive and by exposing them to Drop Gates under racing protocols adds further pressure. The drop gates also add further risk to the rider running into the gates trying to get a good start. The rationale refers to these Demo Rides as "Races" which indicates that it is recognised and regarded by officials &amp; parents a race which is a concern. MXC believe there is ample opportunity on practice days etc for demo riders to practice using Drop gates but this should not be encouraged at events. MXC believes that the officials of the day could complete a basic ranking of riders, riders could be assembled on the start pad as per usual but the with the gates already down. The session would be commenced with the display of a green flag indicating that the course is clear and riders can leave the start pad in whatever manner they wish. MXC also wishes to advise that it is MA's intention to remove Recreational Riding completely from the MoMs and a seperate manual will be developed specifically to cover this type of activity in the future</p>

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation
MX1239	Cameron Scheuber	MX1230	Commission Recommendation/Rule Change Feedback	<p>With MX1230 being raised by the MX Commission themselves and not stakeholders I would like to ask the following questions.</p> <p>The reason it was raised by the commission?</p> <p>What classes or age groups do they have they in mind to review/change?</p> <p>If there is changes, when would the likely implementation date be?</p> <p>Will the commission also be looking at the criteria for clubs to hold the AJMX as well and how the event is actually run?</p> <p>Does the commission do a detailed assessment (kpi) of each AJMX after it has been run to showcase the strongpoints or where the event is below par or has lacked in a certain area?</p> <p>Will the stakeholders be made aware of this review in other than these minutes? so that the commission can get a proper response from all possible stakeholders.</p>	<p>MXC thanks Cameron for his submission however it does not incorporate any recommendations for change. But for clarity MXC advise they continually review all rules for currency, relevance and trends given changes occurring worldwide. In 2017 a submission was received to change the age group classes for Girls for 2018 which was rejected. Given no review of Junior Championship classes has taken place for some time, a greater investigation was proposed for 2018 meeting. This year MXC propose changes to the 65cc class (refer at MX 1243) for 2019 to harmonise with FIM Championship classes. Selection of clubs for AJMX has been taken over by MA with the implementation of a state rostering system. Questions regarding KPI's and criteria are being developed by the MX Commission and will be circulated at MA's discretion.</p>

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation
MX1240	Cameron Scheuber	MX1221	Commission Recommendation/Rule Change Feedback	<p>I note that the MX Commission have raised and want to "review the current rule for body armour in Australia for senior riders and consider an alignment to FIM standards," with "potential implementation in 2019 or 2020".</p> <p>I would like to bring to the commission's attention that the AMA, (the biggest FMN within the F/M) on/y"recommends that riders use available protective equipment" AMA Amateur rule book 2018 Page 24 E.4. There is very little mention of it on page 18 and 19 of the AMA Pro Racing rule book 2017.</p> <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the FIM, MA, MAIL or MX Commission have statistical recorded evidence that body armour does improve rider safety and has reduced injuries?</li> <li>2. If it does improve safety will insurance be less expensive for MA members, passed on as cheaper licence fees?</li> <li>3. If implemented for safety, will it be for all off road disciplines? , safety is safety after all.</li> <li>4. Will it make it easier for new riders to get involved, participate and ensure the healthy future of motorcycle sport? Or is it just another hurdle/cost for these new senior riders?</li> <li>5. Do you consider that this is a greater safety problem than MX1218 - MA Concussion Policy? Which has been on the table since 2013, according to your 2017 minutes.</li> <li>6. If implemented will the armour have to comply with and be branded with EN 1621-2 and EN1621-3, (FIM page 34 - 65.01 clothing and protectors).</li> <li>7. Does the armour that currently is imported into Australia have this certification?</li> <li>8. Why hasn't there been a media release asking for members submissions before the 2018 commissioners meeting?Most don't know about the minutes or have a clue how to find them.</li> </ol> <p>Feedback</p> <p>If it isn't broken why fix it, or is it to just align with the FIM? One ex MA president used to give the advice," think very hard about it before you consider change to a current rule". Also how about asking the riders?, look what happened with the tear offs.</p>	<p>Again MXC would like to thank Cameron for his submission however it contains no recommendations for change. MXC discount AMA recommendation due in particular to different legal and insurance systems. Addressing in # form 1. MXC is gathering information currently from FIM and Australia.</p> <p>Anecdotal evidence indicates that body armour lessens the risk of serious injury to internal vital organs, particular in first corner incidents, when riders are likely to be run over by other competitors and machines. 2. Cost of insurance is not one for consideration by MXC but is an MA matter. 3. MXC concerns itself with MX and SX but other disciplines are involved 4. All costs are barriers to entry however safety is paramount. Armour is relatively cheap especially for Seniors who have stopped growing 5. No 6. This will be considered once investigations are completed 7. As per 6 8. As per 6.</p>
MX1241	Ross Edwards	Cameras	All Disciplines, General Rules, Cameras Cameras may be fitted to the motorcycle provided they are securely mounted. Camera mounts are subject to approval by the Chief Scrutineer. Helmet cameras are not permitted unless the camera is integrated into the helmet, by design of the manufacturer.	<p><b>Rule Change:</b></p> <p>All Disciplines, General Rules, Cameras Cameras may be fitted to the motorcycle provided they are securely mounted. Camera mounts are subject to approval by the Chief Scrutineer. Helmet cameras are not permitted unless the camera is integrated into the helmet, by design of the manufacturer. <b>Cameras mounted to any part of the body are not permitted.</b></p> <p><b>Rationale:</b></p> <p>After the banning of helmet cameras I have noticed a trend towards and have been asked if chest mounted cameras are permitted. Although not banned specifically, it is of great concern from a safety point should a rider crash and land face first on any track surface. A ban on body mounted cameras to go along with the ban on helmet cameras would remove the safety concern.</p>	<p>MXC share concerns with other disciplines with body mounted cameras particularly on the torso and the risk of internal injuries to vital organs. We request that MA provide further statistical information relating to injuries from wearing of cameras on the body. FIM have a total ban on their use other than fixed to the machine, or, at the request of the World Championship promoter for use in promotional video experiences to increase exposure to the sport.</p>

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation
MX1242	MA	11.27.4, 11.27.6	Junior Trail Bikes	<p><b>Delete Rule:</b></p> <p>Delete the list of bikes and just list the requirements so every bike that is eligible may compete without needing to be listed in the MoMS.</p>	MXC agree to deleting this rule as all bikes must comply with GCR Machine requirements and noting those models provides no useful purpose.
MX1243	MXC	11.3	Junior Australian Motocross Championships Age Range for 65cc 7 to under 9 9 to under 11 11 years	<p><b>Rule Change:</b> 7 to under 10 10 to under 12</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> After review over the past 6 years the lower age and upper age groups have been largely undersubscribed whilst the middle age group is well oversubscribed. By combining 3 classes into 2. This will provide the following benefits. More balance entry lists, less events required to be run over the event week, make World team selection easier as new class represents World Cup age groups</p>	MXC agree to adopt subject to ratification by R & T
MX1244	MA	11.3	Junior Australian Motocross Championships allocations of events to clubs and future development of Championship	MXC will consider after discussions with stakeholders including inviting submissions to consider a redesign of the current AJMX structure. These discussions will include but not limited to - Requirements and responsibility of applying clubs, Introduction of KPI's to be met by organisers and promoters, structure of running of the event to maintain consistency and aid constant improvement/professionalism to the Championship brand, sponsorships, Championship classes for older age riders and Support classes for lower age riders, rider qualification to compete in the AJMX, AJMX to be run over multiple rounds rather than 1 week of competition	MXC will look to ongoing consultations with stakeholders etc. over the next 12 months with a view to putting forward a proposal late in 2018. This will be formalised at 2019 and any recommendations put forward for comment and implementation will not be before 2021 pending applications for hosts based upon any proposed criteria
MX1245	WEM	11.8 and 11.8.0.1	11.8 ELIGIBILITY: AUSTRALIAN MOTOCROSS CHAMPIONSHIP 11.8.0.1 The MXD Australian Motocross Championship will be for riders from 16 to under 19 years. Riders who turn 16 before the first round of the MXD Australian Motocross Championship may place an entry for the series provided they meet the following criteria. a) Satisfy their State Controlling Body of their competence, b) State legislation will override these rules where applicable.	<p><b>Rule Change</b> Delete Rule</p> <p><b>Rationale:</b> Rule is no longer relevant and will be covered by using Supplementary Regulations.</p>	MXC agree with this removal

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation
MX1246	MXC	11.16.14.2 and 11.16.14.3	<p>11.16.14.2 MX2/SX2 and MX1/SX1 numbers after Number 1 will be allocated as career numbers by the MX Commission to a maximum of 20 riders using the following method:</p> <p>a) A competitor's overall Championship results from the previous year's Motocross &amp; Supercross Championships will be used to decide the order in which they pick their career number, which is determined by:</p> <p>i) Aggregated Championship points awarded in both competitions and,</p> <p>ii) Aggregating them as a percentage as calculated by the Motocross Commission of MA.</p> <p>b) Numbers 2 to 10 can only be chosen as career numbers by competitors who finished in the top ten of either MX2 or MX1 Championships. The first three from the MXD Championship may also choose a 2 to 10 number if available.</p> <p>c) Competitors who do not fit the above criteria may make an application to the Motocross Commission of MA for special consideration for a career number. The criteria for this would be recognised International riders, previous Champions, etc.</p>	<p>Rule Change 11.16.14.2 The National Numbering System will be managed by the Series Co-Ordinator for the first National Series of the year as per their regulations for the National Numbering as approved by MA</p> <p>Rationale: For many years now the allocations of career numbers and national competition numbers have been managed by the first series promoter/co-ordinator and not the MXC. This change will now reflect the current process for number allocations that has been in place for many years</p>	MXC agree with this change
MX1247	MXC	Chapter 11 Chapter Contents	11.4 Categories for Senior Australian Supercross Championships	<p><b>Rule Change</b> 11.4 Categories for Junior Australian Supercross Championships</p> <p><b>Rationale</b> Contains error. What was printed is not the same as the electronic version supplied to MXC for proof reading</p>	MXC agree with this change
MX 1248	MA	MA Policy on Concussion		Discussion amongst all Commissions upon progress of a Concussion Policy. MA now includes policy documents on their website with links to SCAT 5 concussions testing and assessment. MA will now implement an education process to elevate the use of these tools and increase awareness of the seriousness of Concussion Injuries/treatment and reporting of these going forward with alterations to be made to Medical Reports by medical personnel and officials reporting to better gather information.	MXC congratulate MA on progress being made and encourage MA to make further improvements planned in the future
MX 1249	MXC	7.1.2.1	7.1.2.1 In any event during the course of a meeting, a Steward or Clerk of Course may fine, exclude, impose penalty or time points on, or relegate, any competitor, if:	This still requires amendment as agreed by MXC and R & T as per MX 1233 of the 2017 Commission Meeting Minutes	MXC requests this be amended ASAP



Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation
MX 1250	MXC	2.4.2.3	2.4.2.3 A licence for a key official must not be issued to person under 18 years of age. A licence for an operational official must not be issued to a person under the age of 16 years.	MXC Refer to MX 1227 of the 2017 Final Minutes - approved by R&T - recommend that GCR 2.4.2.3 is amended, with wording provided by the NOC, to include Junior Officials (as per the Junior Officials Policy that was released in 2017)	MXC requests this be updated in the MoMS to reflect the decision in 2017
MX1251	MXC	2.4.1.2.c.iv	2.4.1.2 For these purposes the Controlling Bodies may license any one or more of the following officials ... c) Other licensed officials: i) Coaches ii) Announcers iii) Track Inspectors	Refer to MX1228 of the 2017 Final Minutes - if amending as per above for promotion of the Junior Official Policy - this area should also be amended. <b>Add Rule</b> 2.4.1.2 For these purposes the Controlling Bodies may license any one or more of the following officials ... c) Other licensed officials: i) Coaches ii) Announcers iii) Track Inspectors <b>iv) Junior Officials</b>	MXC requests this be implemented
MX1252	MXC	2.4.3.2 f)	2.4.3.2 A licenced official: ... f) Must be in attendance no later than (1) hour prior to the official start time of the meeting (including practice) and remain until the completion of their duties at the conclusion of the meeting. This was raised in 2016	Refer to MX1217 of the 2017 Final Minutes - <b>Rule Change</b> 2.4.3.2 A licenced official: ... f) Must be in attendance a minimum of <b>half an hour</b> (1) hour prior to the official start time of the meeting (including practice) and remain until the completion of their duties at the conclusion of the meeting.	MXC requests this be updated in the MoMS to reflect the decision in 2017
MX 1253	MXC	11.16.10.2 b)	b) Where the race is stopped with more than 3 laps and less than 75% of the total distance completed by the race leader, rounded down to the nearest whole number of laps / whether it be .....	Change to 50% for consistency	MXC requests this for consistency with the 50% rule.It contradicts rule 11.16.8.1

MEETING CLOSES: Sunday 25th March