



PO Box 134
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205

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

Road Race Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 12th to the 13th March, 2016

PRESENT: Derek Rumble (Chair), Julie Waters, Tim Hewitt
APOLOGY: NIL
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 12th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
RR1255		Welcome / apologies	Chair welcomes those present and opens the meeting.	-	-	-	-	-
RR1256		Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2015 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.	-	Confirmed	-	-	-
RR1257	Jake Skate	Moto3 Class	10.22	Amend Rules Refer to proposal for guidelines on updating GCR's. Attached at the end of the minutes. Proposal should also include a regulation on "one machine only"	RRC suggests that the regulations are currently aligned with FIM and must remain that way.		R&T advise that direction needs to taken within moto3 towards a more cost effective alternative to current GCR's.	Proposal approved. Moto3 Spanish rules to be adopted from 1st January 2017 (with minor alterations i.e. one bike rule) as per the submission from Jake Skate
RR1258	Jake Skate	10.11.2.1	Number plate colours for senior and junior competition must be as follows: ... 751cc and Over : Mail Box Red : White Australian Superbike : White : Black ... 751cc and Over : Mail Box Red : White Australian Superbike : White : Black	Delete Rule Number plate colours for senior and junior competition must be as follows: ... 751cc and Over : Mail Box Red : White Australian Superbike - White - Black Due to a large number of competitors competing in not just the National Superbike championship, as well as other events, the number plate colours must be changed, to maintain eligibility in between events. It is inconvenient and comes at a cost to competitors, it also creates difficulty in Scrutineering in state & club championships, as riders cannot maintain their white Australian Superbike backgrounds and vice versa, when club level competitors want to step up to race Australian Superbike rounds, they must change to their number plates to suit.	The RRC question the need for specific coloured backgrounds - and fonts - in the modern era. The RR Commission strongly endorse the use of current FIM number plate regulations. Refer to supporting documentation from FIM Regulations for Superbike and Supersport classes at the end of these minutes for details.		R&T support a move to align Road Race regulations with FIM rules on number plate colours and fonts.	Proposal approved. With the exception of: * no serif on the number 1 * number position will remain as per GCR's (10.11.2) Fonts listed in Supp Regs are an alternative (MANT)

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
RR1259 & HRR	David Morrissey	10.17.1.10	The only liquid coolant allowed is water. No additives are permitted.	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>The only coolants allowed are water and non-glycol coolants. No glycol or coolants manufactured with glycol are permitted.</p> <p>Glycol spills on road race tracks are more slippery and harder to clean than water, hence the prohibition on additives, but water alone leaves machines exposed to corrosion, scaling and reduced lifespan, as well as losing the benefits of increased heat transfer.</p> <p>Several non-glycol racing coolants are now on the market and are used in racing internationally. All feature low concentrations of non-slippery additives other than glycol. Motul has Mocoool https Penrite has Ten Tenths Race Coolant Redline has Water Wetter Supercoolant Nulon sell Ultra Cool 45, Belray has Moto Chill Racing Coolant, and Engine Ice is allowed in, and sponsors, national USA motorcycle road racing (websites outlined on original proposal)</p> <p>Manufacturers such as Redline can cite research that shows their products increase cooling by up to 15%, decrease scale deposits and corrosion, and reduce cavitation in the cooling system. In fact they say their additives, typically at 5-10%, can increase water's capacity to pick up and transfer heat where glycol would actually reduce it. All these benefits are even more important for older engines in the Historic category.</p> <p>Non-glycol additives may be detected by colour (usually red or purple), by product-based test strips or by Specific Gravity (e.g. 1.02 - 1.06 Kg/l), and can be immediately differentiated from glycol products by evident slipperiness. A definitive reagent test in 4-6 minutes is available from Hach.</p> <p>The onus on the racer is of course to demonstrate to a scrutineer's satisfaction that the rule is being followed, not on the scrutineer to prove it is not.</p>	RRC opinion remains unchanged from 2015. No rule change is recommended. FIM specifies water as the only coolant acceptable, which RRC endorse .		<p>R&T would like to recommend a look at world regulations from different sporting bodies:</p> <p>FIM: 2.7.7 The only liquid engine coolants permitted other than lubricating oil shall be water or water mixed with ethel alcohol.</p> <p>AMA: No Rules</p> <p>BSB: No Rules</p>	Proposal approved. Rule changed to enable the use of all "non-glycol" engine coolants.
RR1260	Rajiv Kumar Tarafdar	10.17.1.10	The only liquid coolant allowed is water. No additives are permitted.	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>The only liquid coolant allowed is water, or non-glycol. No additives are permitted.</p>	Refer RR1259		Refer RR1259	See RR1259

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
				<p>Water has extreme corrosive affect on the motorcycle's internal cooling parts. I, like all the others, have used water for number of years in my motorcycle as per the racing regulations and it has caused irreversible damage to the internals. It causes heavy oxidization and rusting of parts that are not designed for use with water. Water also does not have the recommended lubrication required for the rubber and sealing parts in the cooling system of the motorcycle thus causes serious degradation. After race meets when I have changed the coolant, I have always found heavy oxidization and rust particle in the water used. This has causes clogging of channels in the Radiator and reduce the cooling affect. In hotter climates like Darwin, Water reaches its boiling point very quickly and is not able to cool the engine as required. On delayed starts on multiple occasions, the bike has reached Warning temp and had to be shutdown.</p> <p>Non Glycol coolants have been used for a number of year by leading racing teams and in multiple racing events. E.g. Penrite an Australian company makes Type 'B' Coolants for racing that is Non Glycol Based. This avoids slippery conditions on the tracks when coolant is spilled from crashes and accidents. Penrite Honda Racing team has been using these for years. Glycol test kits can be used by Race Inspectors / Marshals to ensure that race coolants being used do not have Glycol.</p>				
RR1261	Jon Falzon	13.18.7.1 c)	<p>10.18.7 Permitted Additions 10.18.7.1 The following may be added: a) Steering damper, b) Ride height adjuster, c) MA approved and official series timing devices, d) MA approved fuel metering devices, e) Frame protective sliders, f) Electronic gear shifters</p>	<p>Add Rule 10.18.7.1 The following may be added: --- g) Data acquisition/Lap timers (Note: Telemetry devices are prohibited),</p> <p>These are now becoming widely available and cost effective for all competitors/teams.</p>	RRC does not endorse this proposal.		R&T recommend a proposal being submitted to the current ASBK teams to gauge interest.	<p>R&T advise that in principal Data acquisition will be eligible in Superbike / Supersport.</p> <p>Air/Fuel sensor should be allowed.</p> <p>Formalise proposal.</p> <p>Data acquisition is already a standard feature on some current OEM machinery</p>
RR1262	Phoenix MCC	Support Classes	N/A	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>Allowance of "Street or Bracket Class" into "Club", "Interclub" & "State" Events</p> <p>Rule allows for: a) Exemption from requiring Engine protection covers. b) Exemption from Fairing dam requirements. c) Glass not easily removed to be fully taped. d) Exemption from wiring of brake callipers e) Exemption from wiring of drain plugs and filler caps</p> <p>Race meeting entry numbers continue to drop due to increased cost and compliance to compete in road racing. This is a way to increase participation for "grass roots" entries with reduced costs as an introductory class which is critical for future growth.</p>	RRC do not endorse this submission . We should be more concerned with the increased risk, compromised safety and potential for meeting delays, brought about by not complying with existing regulations.		R&T support the RRC recommendation	No change

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
RR1263	Marco Bortolussi	Appendix A : Protective Clothing & Equipment	Footwear: b) At least overlap the suit or trousers when the rider is in the normal riding position.	Change Rule Footwear: b) That the suit and boot must overlap and be secure when the rider is in the normal riding position. The suit and boot must overlap, but it should not matter which way they do as long as they arrangement is secure. International riders have been allowed to use the suit overlapping the boot system for over 10 years in Australia and this feature of safety clothing has been proven effective at the highest level of road racing.	RRC endorse this change of wording.		R&T support the RRC recommendation	Proposal approved.
RR1264	MA	10.17.3.3	10.17.3.3 Motorcycles may be equipped with commercially available brake lever protection. Intended to protect the handlebar brake lever(s) from being accidentally activated in the case of a collision with another machine. Acceptable protection includes the fairing extending sufficiently to cover the brake level, as viewed from the front. Such devices must be strong enough to function effectively and designed so that there is no risk for the rider to be injured or trapped by it, and must not present a danger to other competitors. In case the brake lever is attached to any part of the braking system (e.g. brake master cylinder), then the brake system manufacturer must officially confirm in writing to MA that the device does not interfere with proper brake operation.	Amend Rule for clarification Current Rule allows the use of a brake lever protector, however the wording is ambiguous and needs to be made simple. It also mentions that it must not "present a danger to other riders". The scrutineer has the authority and can make the call on bark busters, but they are not suitable for road racing and this should be made clear.	RRC opinion is that whilst the current rule is long, it is clear in its intent. No change is recommended.		R&T recommend to change the rule. This ensures clarity and consistency: 10.17.3.3 Motorcycles may be equipped with commercially available brake lever protection. Intended to protect the handlebar brake lever(s) from being accidentally activated in the case of a collision with another machine. Acceptable protection includes the fairing extending sufficiently to cover the brake level, as viewed from the front. Such devices must be strong enough to function effectively and designed so that there is no risk for the rider to be injured or trapped by it, and must not present a danger to other competitors. In case the brake lever is attached to any part of the braking system (e.g. brake master cylinder), then the brake system manufacturer must officially confirm in writing to MA that the device does not interfere with proper brake operation.	Rule change approved: 10.17.3.3 Motorcycles may be equipped with commercially available brake lever protection, intended to protect the handlebar brake lever from being accidentally activated in case of collision with another motorcycle.
RR1265	Chris Cameron	10.21.4.1 g)	Front and rear suspension springs and internal damping parts may be modified or replaced, but the external appearance of the forks and rear shock must not be changed	Amend Rule Can understand the rationale but not allowing a replacement rear shock is impractical. (1) cost is similar to have a rear shock fully modified as a (lower end) aftermarket shock, (2) there are only limited (reliable) sources of such work compared to generally available sources of aftermarket (and time delays in getting work done of purchase over the counter), (3) aftermarket rear shocks are fairly ubiquitous in the industry (though not common, per se), (4) this is not line with other series (however much that may be irrelevant it will influence some riders and hence entries), (5) there is limited difference in performance between fully modified and aftermarket, its more about rider confidence and perception, (6) I could go on but the phrase "deaf ears" comes to mind.	Rule has already changed. Refer to MA Rule Bulletin # 1604, (10th March 2016)			

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
RR1266 & HRR763	Shannon Reimann	Crossing a "live" track	N/A	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>There is no rule in MoMS regarding the crossing or entering of a hot/live track.</p> <p>Peregrine Group who are building the Taillem Bend Motorsport asking where this 'rule is' regarding crossing the track. Hence why we are at this point at the moment.</p> <p>This is assumed in road racing, and I know is pretty much ignored in other disciplines, but I think it is important that we have it put in writing as soon as possible to confirm it. At least in the Road Racing section.</p>	<p>RRC recommend that this should be addressed in Track Guidelines.</p> <p>Speedway Section 9.4.3 could be used as the basis for inclusion into the Track Guidelines - Road Race Module.</p>		<p>R&T recommend that this "rule" is already being catered for by the Officials Briefing prior to events. This is at the discretion of the Steward/Clerk of the Course.</p> <p>No change required.</p>	-
RR1267	MA	Carbon Cowling		<p>Add Rule</p> <p>Should we be regulating against them "unless standard".</p>	RRC recommend that if they are standard fitment they should be permitted.		R&T recommend that if carbon fibre is allowed, then all machines should be eligible to fit carbon cowling. Similar to present rules which allow plastic fairings to be upgraded to fibre-glass.	No change
RR1268	MA	Junior Spec Class (13 to Under 16)			<p>RRC welcome the preliminary discussion regarding the introduction of a Junior Spec Class.</p> <p>MA Rules and Technical Committee to further investigate machinery options and report ASAP.</p>		Emailed to R&T	-
RR1269	MA	Road Race Age grouping for Juniors		Refer to MA (and supplied document)	<p>Age Groups - RRC endorse the proposed Age Grouping and classes as provided (Junior RR Age spreadsheet).</p> <p>Commission would appreciate input from relevant parties regarding the implementation of a "run what you bring class" - minimal machinery requirements apart from capacities / age groups, and GCR machine safety requirements.</p>		Emailed to R&T	-
RR1270 & HRR764	MA	Fibre glass fuel tanks	N/A	<p>Add or Amend Rules</p> <p>There has been an ongoing issue with fibreglass tanks for years. Like anything there are good and bad products, you get what you pay for and products that are designed for general use are in many cases not suitable for racing purpose.</p> <p>MA does not have the resources to look at fibreglass tank standards, record and register products at present. We would be relying on competitors to send in a document that we would accept in good faith, so what happens when it does come apart and explode? Nothing; MA insurance still pays. The idea is to look at how we minimise the risk and while less rules are in most cases better, there are situations where they are necessary when it comes to safety.</p> <p>What rules need to be implemented to moderate the amount of risk?</p>	<p>The use of ADR approved fibreglass / composite tanks in Modern Road Racing is non-existent to best of our knowledge. It must be accepted that OEM tanks of this construction have been fabricated to acceptable standards. Non OEM tanks that are of particular concern are currently subject to further investigation by the HRR Commission.</p>		<p>R&T recommend that the rules should be further aligned with international race standards:</p> <p>AMA :</p> <p>FIM : 2.4.10.10 a) All fuel tanks must be fitted with fire retardant material (i.e. fuel cell foam, Explosafe), or be fitted with a fuel cell bladder.</p> <p>BSB :</p>	<p>HRR are to submit a proposal on how to improve the safety around fibreglass tanks.</p> <p>RR may take advantage of this proposal if it is deemed relevant.</p> <p>For example: All fibreglass tanks must be fitted with fire retardant material; All aftermarket fibreglass fuel tanks must be fitted with a fuel cell bladder</p>

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
RR1271	MA	10.17.10	Drive Train Protection	Change Rule Very wordy. Could benefit from aligning with FIM regulations.	RRC agree that it is a "wordy" Clause. RRC request that MA provide the aforementioned FIM regulation for consideration (see below): 2.4.10.4 Rear fork (Swing-arm) ...		R&T recommend that rules 10.17.10.1 to 10.17.10.3 inclusive are REMOVED from the MoMS. There is no regulation within class specs that allows for the sprocket/drive train protections removal or modification; which means all machines come with them as OEM, and this would be retained.	Rule change approved: 10.17.10.1 10.17.10.2 10.17.10.3 To be removed
RR1272	Jake Skate	Number Plate Font		Discussion Should there be an additional font or two made available for RR; possibly only National Championships?	Refer to RR1258		Refer RR1258	See RR1258
RR1273	MA	10.17.1.4	10.17.1.1 Lap timers with a maximum value retail value of \$799.00 including GST may be used.	Check Rule Does this rule need amending.	RRC recommend the following change to the rule wording: 10.17.1.4 - Lap timers may be fitted. The only electronic or other circuit connection to the machine shall be for the purposes of power supply for the lap timer. No additional sensors are permitted.		R&T support the RRC recommendation	Refer RR1261
RR1274	Bruce Hill	Compulsory Modifications	10.17.1.3 10.17.1.12 10.17.6.1 10.18.4 10.19.4 10.20.4 10.21.3.1	Add Rule Introduce a class of racing known as Bracket Racing, to be a club level only, class that is allowed to have an exemption from the aforementioned compulsory modifications. Specifically, the need to have engine case protection, a fairing dam, removal of stands and removal of all road fittings like lights horn indicators etc. By allowing an exemption from these most difficult of modifications to a bike that is currently also used on the road, we will be able to attract more newcomers to the sport with an easy transition from Track Day riding into an introductory form of racing that is low cost and relatively easy to modify a street bike to comply with the rules. All glass and indicators could be fully covered with tape and stands wired up if they are difficult to remove. These sort of rules are currently used by Terry O'Neil's "race your mates" format which I believe he is planning to extended into other States shortly. By allowing clubs to run these events we can ensure these riders are not lost to a privately owned series instead of the MA family.	RRC do not endorse this submission. We should be more concerned with the increased risk, compromised safety and potential for meeting delays, brought about by not complying with existing regulations.		R&T support the RRC recommendation	No change
RR1275	SA Road Race Sport Manager	10.15.5	Allowed Fuels	Change Rule f) E85 ethanol enhanced fuel To allow the use of E85 fuel which, at present exceeds the published RON limitation. Currently available E85 fuel has a nominal research octane number of 105. E85 fuel use is a known method of reducing heat induced detonation and damage in IC engines in racing conditions. E85 fuel is commercially available in all states. Has been endorsed by V8 Supercars for the past 5 years. Reduces deleterious exhaust emissions. Will augment our environmental credentials.	RRC requests further information on blended fuels (Ethanol) before we can make a recommendation on allowing the use of this fuel in some classes in which it may be appropriate. Such information must include blend composition, availability - on a nationwide basis - of the proposed fuel, and the consistency of blend ratios on a state by state and month by month basis. Upon receipt we will consider the submissions and make our recommendation.		R&T will look into obtaining more information from sporting organisations already using E85 (CAMS). Also a request to motorcycle manufacturers will go out to obtain feedback from companies as to whether they support the use of E85 in their machines.	Proposal approved as potential change for all disciplines 1st January 2018. Bulletin and survey released for feedback in 2016. Including NOC 11.13.5.1 c) E85

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
RR1276	MSA Road Race Committee	10.17.1.10	The only liquid coolant permitted is water. No additives allowed.	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>The only liquid coolant permitted is water or non-ethylene glycol based liquids.</p> <p>There are now a number of commercially available coolants that do not contain or are not based on Ethylene Glycol or its subsidiary compounds. These coolants when spilled do not pose a risk from reduced friction co-efficient on track surfaces. One such brand of coolant (Penrite 10/10ths) has been approved for use in competition by CAMS. Use of such coolants can reduce engine overheating particularly during longer distance or endurance events. There is evidence of cooling system failures when engines are shut down during re-fuelling procedures or whilst idling during starting grid delays, which places riders, pit crew members and start line officials in jeopardy from the sudden release of overheated coolant.</p>	Refer RR1259		Refer RR1259	See RR1259
RR1277	Bruce Hill	Junior Machine Modifications	10.28.3 10.29.3 10.30.2	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>.....</p> <p>h) Wheel size may be altered.</p> <p>i) Brakes may be altered.</p> <p>j) Front mudguard may be altered</p> <p>The current rules exclude the vast majority of bikes currently owned by Juniors from participating in Junior RR. This rule addition would enable all the MX bikes to be fitted with suitable wheels and brakes to enable them to be used for Road Race at minimal cost.</p>	RRC would appreciate input from relevant parties regarding the implementation of a "run what you bring class" - minimal machinery requirements apart from capacities / age groups, and GCR machine safety requirements.		Refer RR1269	See RR1269

MEETING CLOSES: Sunday 13th March



PO Box 134
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205

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

Historic Road Racing Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 12th to the 13th March, 2016

PRESENT: John Simms (Chair), Marcus de Caux
APOLOGY: Rick Johnson
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 12th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
HRR755		Welcome / apologies	Chairman welcomes those present and opens the meeting.	-	Apology from Rick Johnson	-	-	-
HRR756		Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2015 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.	-	-	-	-	-
HRR757	HRRC	11.21.3.8	The following machines or their major components: ... c) Suzuki GSX-R 1100 M	We can find no reason why this model should be excluded from eligible Motorcycles in Period 6.	HRRC recommend that this model is not allowed. Some models are identical except paintwork, however in this case there should be "no bracket creep".		R&T support the recommendation of the HRRC	No change
HRR758	HRRC	P4 Front Forks	N/A	The maximum diameter allowed is 38mm.	HRRC support the proposal.		R&T support the recommendation of the HRRC	Proposal approved
HRR759	Mark Faulkner	11.19.1.1	Unless otherwise contained in the machines original specifications, wheel rim dimension of a minimum of 18"(457mm) diameter, and a maximum of WM4 on all wheels.	Unless otherwise contained in the machines original specifications, wheel rim dimension of a minimum of 18" (457mm) diameter, and a maximum of WM6 on all wheels. It is becoming increasingly difficult to access suitable tires for period 4 unlimited class Motorcycles. We have been limited to two tire manufacturers who produce tires to suit a 18" WM4 rim size. With Dunlop ceasing production of the KR124 we are now left with one choice. The Avon AM23 Rear and AM22 front. The last set of these tires I purchased cost \$650, a considerable sum for skinny tires designed in the 80's. We also run the real risk that being the only suitable tire for an entire class the cost will increase or if this tire was discontinued our class would be left without a suitable tire. While I understand the reasoning behind the wheel tire sizing rule I feel that on safety grounds a change to allow more modern and reasonably priced wheel/tire combination should now be considered. It is now possible for motorcycles in our class to produce in excess of 130HP at the rear wheel. The Avon AM22/23 combination was never designed to handle this power output. I am afraid that without these amendments being implemented the loss of competitors to forgotten era will continue and Period 4 will be lost on safety grounds.	HRRC do not recommend change. To fit these oversize rims, both swingarms and frames would have to be modified to fit the width.	Period 4 750 - 1300 Max. 2.5 Front . Period 4 750 - 1300 Max. 3.00 Rear .	R&T support the recommendation of the HRRC	Commission's updated recommendation approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
HRR760	Chris Cameron	11.21.1.1 & 11.21.3.5	Inverted forks are excluded unless originally fitted...	<p>Period 6 Solo – there remains a conflict between 11.21.1.1 Period forks (conventional only) and 11.21.3.5.</p> <p>However much you may disagree this is a conflict it is the type of rule combination that have been used by some to justify what they present for consideration (shame no proper P6 race bike class, but that's another matter...)</p>	<p>HRRC recommend that the rule is rewritten to clarify.</p> <p>Remove 11.21.3.5 and include in 11.21.1.1.</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the HRRC	Proposal approved
HRR761	Dave Pilpots	11.24.1.3	Wheel rim width on Sidecar is 4" (102mm)	<p>Wheel rim width on Sidecar is 4.5" (114mm) Max Tyre width 145mm Non Period Tyre rim to be hidden from view</p> <p>Original 4" Mini Wheels are extremely hard to set and most are rusty and damaged after being used on boat trailers. 4.5" rims are available new as both trailer rims and also as an aftermarket rim. 145mm width tyre is standard mini tyre which is used by everyone. This is basically a safety issue and tyre size will not change.</p>	<p>HRRC support the proposal. HRRC recommend to allow s/car wheel to match rear wheel width.</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the HRRC	Proposal approved
HRR762	Greg Cucskon	11.19.1.1	Unless otherwise contained in the machines original specifications, wheel rim dimension of a minimum of 18" (457mm) diameter, and a maximum of WM4 on all wheels.	<p>Unless otherwise contained in the machines original specifications, wheel rim dimension of a minimum of 18" (457mm) diameter, and a maximum of WM6 on all wheels.</p> <p>As the top sports motorcycles cc grew in the late 60s to early 70s, there was a dilemma with tyres and rims as they both needed to be bigger. This is documented in motorcycle media of the time neither tyre or rim manufacture were willing to take the first step, this put tyre and rim sizes a few years behind the motorcycles of the day. This era is the birth of the first superbikes, wm6 are the rear rims these bikes should've had and wm6 rims have been available since the early 70s.</p> <p>P5 unlimited are running rims way outside their era limit and are P5 unlimited specific. At the moment, a 125cc P4 can run the same rims as a 1300cc P4 in this class, so maybe this rule could be P4 unlimited specific. We are already running 130mm wide tyres on wm4 rims through counter leaver side walls on avon and dunlop tyres (dunlop now cease production). 18" wm6 rims would only increase this to 140mm to 150 mm maybe, but with modern mainstream construction. Therefore would be more cost effective through volume production, this would make little difference to the contact patch - only a few millimetres, but would make a huge difference to the tyre construction and therefore the safety and price. I think this is a fair and reasonable request as for whatever slight traction gain will benefit every make and model in the class.</p> <p>This is not like asking for a performance gain such as bigger carbs or later model brakes, this will give only a small gain in performance but will provide a much safer tyre contact patch. This is all important in a motorcycle racers' safety. We need to attract more people to the sport and a safer and cheaper option such as this, is a step in the right direction.</p>	<p>HRRC do not support this proposal.</p>		Refer HRR759	See HRR759

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
HRR763	Shannon Reimann	Crossing a "live" track	N/A	<p>There is no rule in MoMS regarding the crossing or entering of a hot/live track.</p> <p>Peregrine Group who are building the Tailem Bend Motorsport asking where this 'rule is' regarding crossing the track. Hence why we are at this point at the moment.</p> <p>This is assumed in road racing, and I know is pretty much ignored in other disciplines, but I think it is important that we have it put in writing as soon as possible to confirm it. At least in the Road Racing section.</p>	HRRC recommend that this is at the discretion of the Clerk of Course.		Refer RR1266	Refer RR1266
HRR764	MA	Fibre glass fuel tanks	N/A	<p>Add or Amend Rules</p> <p>There has been an ongoing issue with fibreglass tanks for years. Like anything there are good and bad products, you get what you pay for and products that are designed for general use are in many cases not suitable for racing purpose.</p> <p>MA does not have the resources to look at fibreglass tank standards, record and register products at present. We would be relying on competitors to send in a document that we would accept in good faith, so what happens when it does come apart and explode? Nothing: MA insurance still pays. The idea is to look at how we minimise the risk and while less rules are in most cases better, there are situations where they are necessary when it comes to safety.</p> <p>What rules need to be implemented to moderate the amount of risk?</p>	HRRC recommend that this matter is under further investigation, pending trying to locate manufacturer details.		R&T request the details of the investigation. Refer RR1270	<p>HRR are to submit a proposal on how to improve the safety around fibreglass tanks.</p> <p>RR may take advantage of this proposal if it is deemed relevant.</p> <p>For example: All fibreglass tanks must be fitted with fire retardant material; All aftermarket fibreglass fuel tanks must be fitted with a fuel cell bladder</p>
HRR765	Darren Tindale	11.19.1.1	Unless otherwise contained in the machines original specifications, wheel rim dimension of a minimum of 18"(457mm) diameter, and a maximum of WM4 on all wheels.	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>Unless otherwise contained in the machines original specifications, wheel rim dimension of a minimum of 18"(457mm) diameter, and a maximum of WM6 on all wheels.</p> <p>I thank you for the opportunity to contribute feedback/opinion regarding the ongoing rules and governance that pertain to (in my case) period 4 unlimited historic racing, in particular, section 11.19.1.1.</p> <p>Where the rule currently reads "Unless otherwise contained in the machines original specifications, wheel dimensions of a minimum of 18" (457mm) diameter, and a maximum of WM4 on all wheels, I would like this section to read , "Unless otherwise contained in the machines original specifications, wheel rim dimension of a minimum of 18" diameter, and a maximum of WM6 on all wheels. I believe, that due to the fact that the only tyres available for our class, were designed over 30 years ago for bikes with 30-40 HP less than todays machines, this change will dramatically increase safety and reduce the alarmingly high tyre cost in the class.</p>	<p>See HRR 759.</p> <p>HRRC does not recommend as this would require widening of the swingarm and perhaps altering the frame. These alterations would be inconsistent with the era.</p>		Refer HRR759	Refer HRR759

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
HRR766	Tim Britlife	11.19.3.5b	Allow Yamaha TZ with 4 port cylinder to run in Period 4 . Machine must use Petrol not Methanol	With the large number of early Yamaha TZ 250 and 350 that were available . This would boost Period 4 grids	Marcus de Caux agrees, John Simms disagrees for the following reasons: Later model barrels can be fitted which are almost identical. Who is going to check what fuel they are using. The average Eligibility Scrutineer would not know what cylinder was fitted to the bike after a Logbook was issued.	Rick Johnson agrees with John Simms	R&T recommend no change to the current rule	No change
HRR767	HRRC	11.26.1.6 a)	11.26.1.6 Steering / front forks: a) Leading or trailing forks, with front wheel equally supported on both sides, ...		HRRC recommend the rule change to allow single sided front forks as used in the period.		R&T support the recommendation of the HRRC and will put forward wording for an immediate rule change.	No change to current rules. Log Book is to be suspended/revoked. When a suitable P6 class becomes available then this type of machine by become eligible for competition

MEETING CLOSES: Sunday 13th March



PO Box 134
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205

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

Motocross & Supercross Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 12th to the 13th March, 2016

PRESENT: Graeme Baynes (Chair), Rodney McGee, Shannon Reimann, Rebecca Lipsett, Melissa Holmes
APOLOGY: NIL
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 12th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
MX1155		Welcome / apologies	Chairman welcomes those present and opens the meeting.	-	-	-	-	-
MX1156		Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2015 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.	-	Confirmed by Rodney & Graeme	-	-	-
MX1160	Rodney McGee	12.25.5.2		<p>Clarification Required</p> <p>The way I read this rule is that if a rider falls during a race & rips the end of his hand grip he can be black flagged for safety. If this is correct maybe the wording needs to be altered.</p>	<p>MXC recommend to add the wording: 'Exposed handlebar ends must be plugged with a solid or rubber cover at the start of each race.'</p> <p>Rationale: It is clear for Officials if anything occurs during a race that a rider should not be black flagged.</p> <p>MXC request that MA sends out a reminder to all States & Clubs that rule 12.25.5.2 has changed so that all parties are aware in the future.</p>	On further review and feedback, the MXC believe no change is necessary and request that MA sends out a reminder to all States & Clubs that rule 12.25.5.2 has changed so that all parties are aware in the future.	R&T recommend no change to the rule. This can be highlighted with the NOC for additional comment.	No change
MX1161	Jarod Griffiths	12.12.1.2	<p>In Junior competition,</p> <p>a) A riders' age on 1st January will determine their age for competition purposes for that year, b) A rider may move to the next higher age class when they become eligible by reason of celebrating a birthday, but once the rider moves to that higher age class, they may not move back to the lower age class, c) Any points earned by the rider in the lower age class cannot be transferred when the rider moves to the higher age class, d) This GCR applies to all riders up to and including the age of 16 years.</p>	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>In Junior competition,</p> <p>a) A riders' age on 1st January will determine their age for competition purposes for that year, b) A rider may move to the next higher age class when they become eligible by, (i) reason of celebrating a birthday, or (ii) elects to advance to the next higher age class but not cc class due to reason of height. The rider shall meet the criteria set out in Appendix (No) and make application to MA or SCB in the prescribed form, but once the rider moves to that higher age class, they may not move back to the lower age class, c) Any points earned by the rider in the lower age class cannot be transferred when the rider moves to the higher age class, d) This GCR applies to all riders up to and including the age of 16 years.</p>	<p>MXC thanks Mr Griffiths for his submission but does not endorse this request on the basis that by changing this rule as requested, it would contravene rule 12.12.1.6.</p> <p>However, the MXC would like to seek feedback from the manufacturers and other stakeholders on the possibility of allowing the 85cc classes to combine the Standard & Big Wheel bikes while leaving the age grouping as it currently is.</p>	No change	R&T recommend no change to the rule.	No change

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
				I propose that the age class bracket 9-12 year old (85cc) and the restriction on allowable wheel size (small wheel) is excluding junior riders that are exceptionally tall for their age from participating in motocross. In some cases the current rule has excluded junior riders from competing in motocross for 1-2 seasons. In my case, my son (10.5 yrs.), who has been riding off road motorbikes since the age of 4 and has 2 motocross race seasons experience (65cc & 85cc) will not be able to participate in MWA permit race events for the next 2 seasons. I feel having him ride competitively on his current small wheel 85cc would make it unsafe not only for him but to other competitors. Other parents have also experienced this scenario and have had to sit their junior rider out of competition until eligible for next age class/bike size. It would seem reasonable that to keep tall junior riders in the sport there should be a mechanism to allow them to apply for a progression to a big wheel version bike with same cc capacity. This rule change would effectively only apply to the 85cc class and allow tall junior riders to continue to ride in same cc class and progress to larger capacity/size bike 125cc at age 13.				
MX1162	Michel Constantinou	Amateur National Series proposal			MXC are happy to support this series as a 'National Series', however, the dates must not conflict with the MX Nationals or the Australian SX series. Michel should now work with the States to find dates. As per MA protocol, the Supp Regs and dates are to be provided to the MXC for approval prior to release. The MXC to review the series after 2 years.	After further discussion with MA the MXC recommend that Mr Constantinou look at other avenues of competition with an example being Arena X which there is a badly needed shortfall of National competition to try and develop riders and a series as a stepping stone to SX.	R&T do not support the proposal. They suggest a look at other avenues of competition (Arena X for example).	Policy decision for MA with regards to Permit, to be made in conjunction with SCB's etc.
MX1163	John Gierke Toowoomba Motocross Queensland	12.11.1.1	Junior Eligibility 12.11.1.1 Juniors only to compete in junior competition	Change Rule To keep as is except with a clause for Junior Women aged 15 to be able to compete in women's only class at club level only. We are finding so many junior girls leaving the sport when racing junior Lites at club level. The older junior Lites males are at that age when they cannot see danger and ride very aggressively. The girls get worried about this and keep getting told they would stay if they could compete in the women's only class. This would only be allowed to happen in girls only class and not when a women's class is combined with another class. Does not matter how many risk assessment you do on these girls in the junior Lites they always state it is safer to remove these girls out of this class. As this is a true family sport you should do everything in our power to try different things to promote the sport. From my understanding there is only one or two clubs running a women's only class and would it not be beneficial to have a trial somewhere in the country to see if this works. It would have to have some form of Check to make sure the junior rider had the capability to be able to ride safely in this class, like a coaching endorsement.	MXC thank Mr Gierke for his submission however the MXC cannot support this change due to some States have rules prohibiting 15yo from competing with Seniors but we recommend John speak with his SCB about split/staggered starts in order to assist clubs to retain girls in the sport.	MXC thank Mr Gierke for his submission however the MXC cannot support this change at this stage due to some States have rules prohibiting 15yo from competing with Seniors but we recommend John speak with his SCB about split/staggered starts in order to assist clubs to retain girls in the sport. However the MXC will review other Motorcycle racing disciplines one this subject and see if there is other rules already used that may assist 15yo girls riding with Senior women.	R&T recommend that eligible classes adopt Road Race style rules to allow 15 year old girls to ride with Senior women.	Rider Endorsement based on RR 10.8.1 * eligible for Club and Inter-Club events only * 13 to Under and MX2 Class running comparable capacity machines Garry Lambert to head discussion with State Managers

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
MX1164	Commission	Yellow Flag			<p>The MXC would propose the following based on the FIM rules:</p> <p>Yellow flag: held stationary Danger, ride cautiously.</p> <p>Yellow flag: waved Great danger, prepare to stop, no overtaking. Reduce speed immediately; no jumping.</p> <p>White flag with a red cross: Medical staff on the track, proceed with extreme caution. Riders must roll each jump individually with no overtaking until past the area of concern.</p> <p>The MXC agree the penalty should be in line with the current FIM penalty.</p> <p>Further the MXC request that MA issue a bulletin to all States & Clubs notifying them of the rule change on yellow flags.</p>	<p>The MXC would propose the following based on the FIM rules:</p> <p>Yellow flag: held stationary Danger, ride cautiously, no jumping.</p> <p>Yellow flag: waved Great danger, prepare to stop, no overtaking. Reduce speed immediately; no jumping.</p> <p>White flag with a red cross: Medical staff on the track, proceed with extreme caution. Riders must roll each jump individually with no overtaking until past the area of concern.</p> <p>The MXC agree the penalty should be in line with the current FIM penalty.</p> <p>Further the MXC request that MA issue a bulletin to all States & Clubs notifying them of the rule change on yellow flags.</p>	<p>R&T will consider to adopt the FIM rules, in consultation with the NOC</p>	Proposal approved to adopt FIM regulations
MX1165	MA & Lynn Long	255cc Capacity Limit		<p>The option of enabling riders to enter their 250cc in the 250 class and perhaps the Open class should be provided to encourage participation not preclude it. Women are given that very option.</p> <p>It seems to be meaningless as firstly you cannot ride more than one machine in a class at once but then two people can ride the same machine in the MX Pony Express. I don't understand why an open class needs to start at 255cc and upwards- is there some rationale behind the concept?</p> <p>Given the declining numbers in MX at all levels perhaps it is time to find ways of increasing participation options for motorcycle owners rather than making it an expensive hobby where increasingly, black events are looking so much more attractive and active.</p>	<p>The MXC would like to recommend the following change:</p> <p>12.1 & 12.5 MX1 122cc & over 2 or 4-stroke MX2 122cc to 250cc 2 or 4-stroke MXD 122cc to 250cc 2 or 4 Stroke</p> <p>12.2 & 12.5 SX1 122cc to 450cc 2 or 4-stroke SX2 122cc to 250cc 2 or 4-stroke</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>Further note: Supplementary Regulations for events should clarify whether a single machine can be ridden in more than one class.</p>	<p>R&T support the recommendation of the MXC</p>	Proposal approved.
MX1166	Brian Anthony	12.26.1	N/A	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>12.26.1.15 Sidecars may be double mounted handlebar and lever protectors for all Motocross events.</p> <p>Purely a safety precaution to stop any chance of another bikes chair bar (passenger grab rail) being able to hook onto the other bikes front brake level; causing locked front brake etc. Similar to MotoGP now, in having front brake protectors, but sidecars need double mounted as there is no fairing to help protect the lever.</p> <p>Also during sidecar cross in Europe I have witnessed bikes racing Grand Prix's and other FIM governed meetings with double mounted protection for this reason.</p>	<p>MXC thank Mr Anthony for his submission and agree with this change to the rule.</p> <p>Proposed rule: 12.26.1.15 Sidecars may have double mounted handlebar and lever protectors for all Motocross events.</p>	<p>No change</p>	<p>R&T support the recommendation of the MXC</p>	Proposal approved.

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
MX1167	Michel Constantinou		<p>12.16.5.1 For events where speed is the determinant:</p> <p>a) A chequered flag must be displayed to each competitor as each crosses the line, with the flag being displayed:</p> <p>i) To the first to complete the event, who will, subject to the results of any protests, be the winner, and</p> <p>ii) Thereafter to each competitor who:</p> <p>Has completed not less than 75% of the event distance, and</p> <p>Is still competing in the event on the lap in which the chequered flag is displayed to the winner, with the sequence of completion of the event being the determinant of placings.</p> <p>I would like to see this rule changed because:</p> <p>1. It does not reward riders with points for finishing back to 20th position.</p> <p>2. What is the point of having a scoring system that awards competitors back to 20th or 30th position in National/State Titles, if riders aren't going to be scored anyway because they haven't completed 75% of the race.</p> <p>3. There are different skill levels of riders, and the slower riders still compete but might be lapped by the leader, not complete 75% of the race, and therefore not be scored.</p> <p>4. It creates tension between the parents, riders and officials because the riders/parents feel that they have not been scored correctly, and when they were told why they were not scored, there was a lot of disagreement. In 2012 at East Coast MX in Canberra there were 12 riders on the grid in the 7-u9 65cc class, and only the first 3 riders scored points because they lapped all the other riders who didn't complete 75% of the race.</p> <p>5. Riders/parents want a reward for their efforts. They are spending money to go racing and have fun. In the case where there is less than 20 riders on the grid, if some riders are consistently not going to be scored they may stop competing because they are not going to be scored anyway.</p> <p>6. We want to encourage all levels of riders to compete at race events, and I believe this rule discourages beginner riders from competing.</p>	<p>Delete Rule</p> <p>12.16.5.1 For events where speed is the determinant:</p> <p>a) A chequered flag must be displayed to each competitor as each crosses the line, with the flag being displayed:</p> <p>i) To the first to complete the event, who will, subject to the results of any protests, be the winner, and</p> <p>ii) Thereafter to each competitor who:</p> <p>Has completed not less than 75% of the event distance, and</p> <p>Is still competing in the event on the lap in which the chequered flag is displayed to the winner, with the sequence of completion of the event being the determinant of placings.</p> <p>I would like to see this rule changed because:</p> <p>1. It does not reward riders with points for finishing back to 20th position.</p> <p>2. What is the point of having a scoring system that awards competitors back to 20th or 30th position in National/State Titles, if riders aren't going to be scored anyway because they haven't completed 75% of the race.</p> <p>3. There are different skill levels of riders, and the slower riders still compete but might be lapped by the leader, not complete 75% of the race, and therefore not be scored.</p> <p>4. It creates tension between the parents, riders and officials because the riders/parents feel that they have not been scored correctly, and when they were told why they were not scored, there was a lot of disagreement. In 2012 at East Coast MX in Canberra there were 12 riders on the grid in the 7-u9 65cc class, and only the first 3 riders scored points because they lapped all the other riders who didn't complete 75% of the race.</p> <p>5. Riders/parents want a reward for their efforts. They are spending money to go racing and have fun. In the case where there is less than 20 riders on the grid, if some riders are consistently not going to be scored they may stop competing because they are not going to be scored anyway.</p> <p>6. We want to encourage all levels of riders to compete at race events, and I believe this rule discourages beginner riders from competing.</p>	<p>MXC agree partly with this proposal but recommend the following wording:</p> <p>12.16.5.1 For events where speed is the determinant:</p> <p>a) A chequered flag must be displayed to each competitor as each crosses the line, with the flag being displayed:</p> <p>...</p> <p>iii) Thereafter to each competitor who:</p> <p>Has completed not less than 75% of the event distance for all Australian Championships and 50% of the event distance for all other events.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>Rider ability varies at events, however Australian Championships should continue to be held in high regard and requires a higher standard than at State, Region or club level.</p>	<p>MXC agree partly with this proposal but recommend the following wording:</p> <p>12.16.5.1 For events where speed is the determinant:</p> <p>a) A chequered flag must be displayed to each competitor as each crosses the line, with the flag being displayed:</p> <p>...</p> <p>iii) Thereafter to each competitor who:</p> <p>Has completed not less than 75% of the event distance for all Australian & State Championships and 50% of the event distance for all other events.</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>Rider ability varies at events, however Australian & State Championships should continue to be held in high regard and requires a higher standard than at Region or club level.</p>	<p>R&T recommend that the MXC considers to remove the rule entirely.</p>	<p>Proposal approved for the rule to cover ALL classes at 50%</p> <p>Commissions in other disciplines should also consider this rule in 2017</p>
MX1169	Michel Constantinou	Race Start	N/A	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>I think that clubs/promoters should be able to run Double gate drops in the same race for classes that are combined but scored separately.</p> <p>This would be safer for example with Women classes combine with the men. It also gives the lesser class their own race start with their own age group or gender.</p>	<p>MXC understands that split / staggered starts are already accepted by some SCB's under special circumstances, as long as the total number of riders on the track at one time does not exceed the track licence.</p> <p>MXC recommend a new rule:</p> <p>12.16.4.5</p> <p>...</p> <p>d) In certain circumstances split or staggered starts may be used under approval of the relevant SCB</p>	<p>MXC understands that split / staggered starts are already accepted by some SCB's under special circumstances, as long as the total number of riders on the track at one time does not exceed the track licence.</p> <p>MXC recommend a new rule:</p> <p>12.16.4.5</p> <p>...</p> <p>d) Split or staggered starts may be used under approval of the relevant SCB</p>	<p>R&T recommend a wording change to the MXC suggestion:</p> <p>d) Split or staggered starts may be used under the approval of the relevant RCB.</p>	<p>Proposal approved</p>
MX1170	MXC	4.2.9.1 d)	Fire Extinguishers	Remove Rule	<p>MXC recommend that this rule should be in the track guidelines rather than MoMS.</p>	<p>No change but should this be included in the SR's rather than Venue Guidelines (or as well as)</p>	<p>R&T recommend removal of the updated rule; and will work to advise an alternative.</p>	-

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
MX1171	MXC	Add rule		Recommend new rule: 12.16.5.2	<p>MXC recommend a new rule is introduced to better define the official finish time to a race:</p> <p>12.16.5.2 A race will be deemed completed 5 minutes after the winner receives the chequered flag.</p> <p>Rationale: Currently the rules do not properly define a finish time for races as at the moment GCR 12.16.5.1 b) defines the race is finished when the flag is displayed to the last competitor. However this does not define how long this last competitor has to cross the line.</p> <p>MXC recommends that this is defined with this new rule.</p>	Revised rule: 12.16.5.2 A race will be deemed completed 5 minutes after the winner receives the chequered flag, or a time not exceeding 5 minutes as specified in the Supp Regs.	<p>R&T support the recommendation of the MXC, however it could be included to allow for a duration chance in the Supp Regs:</p> <p>12.16.5.2 A race will be deemed completed 5 minutes after the winner receives the chequered flag, or a time not exceeding 5 minutes as specified in the Supp Regs.</p>	<p>No change to current GCR's</p> <p>Proposal approved to add to the current rule</p> <p>12.16.5.1 b) ... A maximum time limit after the winner crosses the line may be stipulated in the Supp Regs.</p>
MX1172	MXC	Junior National Championship Classes		Remove Australian Championship status for children under the age of 12 years Including: 50cc Division 2 65cc classes 85cc 9 to Under 12 years class	<p>Rationale:</p> <p>The FIM decided in 2015 to not award Championship status for under 12 years, the MXC agree with this decision. MXC believe that there is too much pressure put on children at a young age and that by removing Australian Championship status for age groups under 12 it may improve longevity within the sport. Upon review of other sports including Tennis, Athletics, Swimming and other Motorcycle disciplines, MXC believe that the age of 12 is an appropriate age for the start of Australian Championships.</p> <p>The MXC still support the 50cc, 65cc & smaller 85cc age classes to be held as support classes at AJMXC.</p>	After further discussion and feedback from all parties the MXC withdraw this proposal but future consideration needs to be given to how we develop riders through to Senior ranks at National levels as the current decline of rider numbers will not be sustainable in the future years. All levels of the sport from Clubs right through to National need to consider how we develop Junior riders into Senior riders and increase grid numbers for every class. MXC will continue to review all the classes and their structure based on the previous years entries to assess possible future improvements to the class splits.	<p>R&T advise that no changes will be made prior to the end of 2017 (no change to events currently awarded to promoters).</p> <p>R&T are looking for proposals to be submitted that will assist the implementation of this across all relevant disciplines.</p>	-
MX1173	MXC	Policy	Recommendation	A working group comprising of a Riders Rep, Clerk of Course/Race Director, Medical personnel and MA representative assess all National Championship venues prior to the Competition, once all the Promoter's infrastructure is in place.	<p>Rationale:</p> <p>MXC believe that venues and tracks change from the initial inspection approval. This working group will ensure that track guidelines are followed as closely as possible once all infrastructure is in place for race day.</p>	No change	R&T note the recommendation.	-
MX1174	MXC	Add rule	Riders Representative	The MXC believe that the Riders Rep position should be selected by the current Commission, and should be for a period of 2 years.	The MXC recommends that Dan Reardon be appointed Riders Rep with Kirk Gibbs appointed as a deputy.	MXC note that for the MX Nationals Jay Wilson has been appointed Rider Rep and thank him for accepting this role.	R&T advise that this is not a rule. This is for consideration when managing Championship events	-
MX1175	MXC	Ref MX1062	Concussion	The MXC requested in 2013 that a policy be considered regarding Concussion. As we understand it there is yet to be a policy created by MA. The effects of concussion has become a strong topic of debate amongst many sports and the MXC believe that MA should be leading the sporting community in setting a formal policy on concussion.	MXC recommends that MA, in consultation with RACESAFE, create a policy and launch as a matter of urgency given the increased scrutiny world wide in Sport on concussion. Consultation with RACESAFE is critical given their protocols and policies for National level events are world standard. MA has the opportunity to reassure future participants that this policy would encompass more than just our National levels riders and therefore push our sport to the forefront as a leader in the topic of concussion at all levels.	No change	R&T agree in principal that a Policy is required. This item has been noted and open for discussion with an MA Medical Officer.	-

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
MX1176	MXC	2.4.2.6	An SCB which issues an official's licence must, within one month of issue, notify MA which must enter the information on a register of licenced officials to be maintained for that purpose and kept at the registered office of MA.	Remove Rule	Rule to be deleted as no longer required with the National database.	No change	R&T support the recommendation of the MXC	Proposal approved.
MX1177	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.	Change Rule 2.4.3.2 A licenced official: ... f) Must be in attendance no later than half an hour (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 recommend that for most MX events only half an hour is needed given that they generally start at sunrise, so an hour is excessive.	No change	R&T refer the matter to the NOC	NOC
MX1178	MXC	2.4.5	Race Director role	How does the Race Director hold more rank at an event than a Steward? And what accreditation do they have to have?	MXC recommend that Promoters not be allowed to be a Race Director of their own series. Also that any Race Directors are not given higher power than a Steward.		R&T refer the matter to the NOC	NOC
MX1179	MXC	2.4.5.1	2.4.5.1 MA may appoint a Race Director for any MA Series.	Change Rule 2.4.5.1 MA must approve the appointment of a Race Director for any MA Series. A Race Director cannot be the promoter of the series.	Rationale: MXC believes this re-wording further clarifies the appointment of a race director.	MXC further note that this recommendation effects all disciplines and therefore understand that any recommendation must suit all disciplines.	R&T advise that this is an All Disciplines matter and therefore requires in put from all parties, and the NOC	NOC
MX1180	MXC	12.14.0.2/Appendix A - Cross reference to B under helmets	Helmet ejection systems		MXC would like to remind all Competitors for ALL Australian Championships - including the Australian Junior Nationals that they must have helmet eject system fitted to their helmet. The MXC request MA to send out a press release reminder for all competitors as we approach the start of our National Season..	No Change	Noted	-
MX1181	MXC	12.4.3.3	12.4.3.3 The cost of the photograph will be subject to price approval by the State Controlling Body and recoverable from MA.	Remove Rule	MXC recommend that this rule be deleted based on the fact that it is no longer valid.	No Change	R&T support the recommendation of the MXC	Proposal approved.
MX1182	MXC	12.10.1.1 b)	12.10.1.1 No person may participate in Freestyle Motocross unless they: ... B) Have a current MA Senior National competition or MA Senior Freestyle Motocross licence which endorser under the following Rules		MXC request that the information for the FMX Only licence be finalised, inserted into 3.1.2 licencing table and sent to the SCB's.	No Change	R&T advise that the "Freestyle Licence" should be included under the "One Event Licence" inclusion - with the relevant endorsement. Endorsement potentially requires review to ensure all participants are capable.	LICENCE CHAPTER Review still to be completed
MX1183	MXC	12.4.2.2	12.4.2.2 Medallions and points will be awarded in all Australian Championships where there are: a) 10 or more starter for solo classes which actually participate in practice, qualifying or races, b) Six or more starts for sidecar classes which actually participate in practice, qualifying or races.	Add Rule 12.4.2.2 Medallions and points will be awarded in all Australian Championships where there are: ... c) Eight or more starters for all female classes which actually participate in practice, qualifying or races.	MXC believe that the female classes are still growing and a more appropriate number to constitute a class should be eight (8) competitors.	No Change	R&T support the recommendation of the MXC	Proposal approved.

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
MX1184	MXC	Appendix A - Body Armour	Edit rule	Commercially manufactured full body armour must be worn under clothing.	MXC recommends that the wording 'under clothing' be removed as it should be at the participant's comfort.	No Change	R&T note that this change has already been made	-
MX1185	MXC	Appendix A - Notes (Note 3)	Enclosed footwear MUST be worn in pit lane at all times	Edit Rule	MXC recommends that the wording be amended so that the words "pit lane" read 'pit area'.	MXC note the feedback and further recommend that the words "pit area" be further defined as "Restricted areas" which would cover mechanics areas, pit board areas, start grid, dummy grid or managers areas and any other restricted zones in the pit area.	R&T note that this change has already been made	-
MX1186	MXC	One event licences	Emergency contact information	The one event licences NEED to have a section for Emergency Contact information	MXC recommends that there be a new section on the one event licence application that allows for Emergency contacts as currently there is no information for officials in this instance. This is a matter of urgency for this to be changed.	No Change	R&T support the recommendation of the MXC	Proposal approved.
MX1187	MXC	12.16.10	12.16.10 Stopping and Re-running of Events where Electronic Timing is used	Replace 12.16.10.1 with 12.17.4.1 and 12.17.4.2	This will bring the restart rule for electronically timed, non National SX/MX events into line with the National events.	No Change	R&T support the recommendation of the MXC	Proposal approved.
MX1188	MXC	Helmet Cameras			MXC understand that the FIM has now made the decision to ban helmet cameras from World MX GP. The MXC will continue to work with MA to monitor this decision with a view to the future of such devices in Motorcycle Sport in Australia.	No Change	R&T recommend implementation of a total ban of helmet cameras across all disciplines under the following conditions: Unless the camera is integrated into the helmet, by the design of the manufacturer, they are excluded from all competition from 1st of January 2017.	Proposal approved.
MX1189	Penny Anell	12.16.7.1 a)	12.16.7.1 In addition to the general start requirements for all competitors, Juniors must comply as follows: a) Competitors may use up to two starting blocks (one per side) up to a maximum of 100mm high and must be able to start in the event unaided while sitting on the machine, ...	Change Rule 12.16.7.1 a) Competitors may use up to two starting blocks (one per side) up to a maximum of 400mm 150mm high and must be able to start in the event unaided while sitting on the machine,	MXC support a change to the rule, however they recommend the following: Competitors may use up to two starting blocks (one per side), up to a maximum of 400mm high, which will not interfere with the competitor or any another competitor or their machines, and must be able to start the event unaided while sitting on the machine, MXC believe there is no need to stipulate a maximum height for starting blocks given that a rider must still be able to be able to meet the requirements under 12.12.1.3	No Change	R&T support the proposal. Also recommended that this is implemented across all relevant disciplines.	Proposal approved.

MEETING CLOSES: Sunday 13th March



PO Box 134
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205

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

Classic Motocross & Classic Dirt Track Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 12th to the 13th March, 2016

PRESENT: David Tanner (Chair), Shane Fraser, Nick Maxfield
IN ATTENDANCE: Greg Scriven, Alan Halley, Michael Hughes
APOLOGY: NIL
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 12th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
CMX406		Welcome / apologies	Chairman welcomes those present and opens the meeting.	-	Note to the MA Commission Charter	-	-	
CMX407		Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2015 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.	-	Confirmed	-	-	
CMX408	Claire Boston President of the Vintage Motocross Club of Western Australia	13.8.1.5	Side number plates must: a. Be fitted above a horizontal line drawn through the rear axle, b. Be fitted so that the front edge of the plate is behind a vertical line drawn at 200mm to the rear of the rider's footrest,	Remove this requirement or change so it does not pertain to classic (Pre 78) bikes This is quite a modification to a pre 78 bike and effectively was negated from the late 70s onwards by the manufacturer's standard number plates. It is also currently negated by the fact that at major meetings - titles etc. the use of transponders is mandatory and is used as the main means of rider identification and placement. Titles also require the back number plate as identification. It is also not really relevant to clubs who do not run for points, such as the Vintage Motocross Club of WA. The bikes have a front number plate and side number plates, which due to the manufacture of the bikes, do not meet this rule's requirements.	CMXC recommend to remove 13.8.1.5 The rule is unrequired and an unnecessary imposition to riders.		R&T support the recommendation of the CMXC	Proposal approved
CMX409	Colin Metcher	Race Secretary		I wish to submit that for Classic/Post Classic motocross the rule that the Race Secretary cannot compete be relaxed. The Race Secretary has no authority of management of the meeting in the sense that the Clerk of Course and Steward do. While taking of entries, timing, etc. is performed electronically, the Race Secretary's commitment on the day is vastly reduced. With the above in mind, the Race Secretary's work is virtually done before the meeting starts. The Race Secretary would still be responsible for that officials function, but practice in running two Australian Championships and two Queensland Championships, plus our own club events shows that on the day their constant presence/supervision is not needed. Getting enough qualified officials is an ongoing problem for small clubs, and this recommendation would go a long way to alleviate this, particularly this year when we are running both Classic and Post Classic Australian Championships.	CMXC support the proposal at club and interclub level, however at National events there should be a nominated assistant to take over the roll - subject to the approval of the CoC. Note: As a member of this club David Tanner declares a Conflict of Interest with regards to Item CMX409.		R&T advise that this can be included in the Supp Regs for the event by the relevant promoter	Proposal approved for inclusion in the Supp Regs for Club and Interclub events only

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
CMX410	Kevin Mortimer	Track Closure Pre-National Championships	N/A	<p>Include GCR's similar to MX: e.g. The track is closed 8 days before a Championship round.</p> <p>Brisbane MCC are running the Australian Post Classic MX Championships on the 23/24 of July at Harrisville. The calendar schedules a practice day (Saturday) and then a club championship round(Sunday) at Harrisville the week before this meeting 16th & 17th July.</p>	<p>CMXC support the proposal.</p> <p>Note to general rules for Australian Championships - suggest no track use 8 days before national championship.</p>		R&T support the proposal with inclusion in all disciplines.	Proposal approved
CMX411	Kevin Mortimer	Clash of Dates	N/A	<p>The SCB of a Australian Championship round probably doesn't schedule a MX in the same area on the date of the Australian Championship.</p> <p>The HEAVEN VMX club have scheduled a race meeting on the same days as the Australian Post Classic MX Championship at Harrisville. Their meeting is the Hawkesbury River Classic at Dargle. While this meeting is a reasonable distance away from Harrisville I'm sure it could have an affect on the Australian Championship. Classic/Post Classic MX & DT only have a limited number of competitors to draw from, especially those willing to compete at major Classic meetings.</p> <p>I believe a little bit of co-operation is needed, we have already seen the effect scheduling Aust Classic MX and Classic DT on the same weekend can have even with the distance between those two championships.</p>	<p>CMXC support the proposal.</p> <p>It would be desirable if similar events (especially those within the same discipline) were not be scheduled on the same day as an Australian Championship.</p>		Noted	-
CMX412	Kevin Mortimer	Eligible Machines	N/A	<p>Will the Maico Only S1 bikes from the UK be considered eligible for the Evolution class? I have attached three photos. These bikes are built from scratch using refurbished and reproduction parts and a frame made from scratch to suit the 1983 model Maico motors from single shock bikes from that year. They are very expensive around about 8,000.00 pound in the UK. They are built for the Twin Shock class in the UK. If this bike is permitted to be used it will open the class up to further similar bikes. Racebase a firm in the UK http://www.thesuspensionguru.com/ make Maico replica frames to suit motors from all four Japanese manufacturer from linkage suspension machines. The potential for these frames and others to be used is real. If the Maico Only S1s are permitted in the class.</p>	<p>CMXC advise that the machine is eligible under the Evolution class rules.</p> <p>Bike would not be acceptable for pre 85</p>		Noted	-
CMX413	Kevin Mortimer	Rule Interpretation	N/A	<p>Can parts of linkage bikes (non evolution class bikes) be converted to fit an Evolution Class bike?</p> <p>The answer should possibly be included in the MoMS to ensure clarity for all involved.</p>	<p>CMXC recommend an addition to Evolution GCR's:</p> <p>Components will be used as designed, forks will have been designed for drum brakes, frames will be as designed.</p> <p>Delete - "after the period" from 13.14.6.1</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the CMXC	Proposal approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
CMX414	Kevin Mortimer	13.13	13.13.1 Eligible Machines 13.13.1.1. Only machines conforming to the requirements set out in this chapter will be accepted for competition. 13.13.1.2. The onus of proof of eligibility shall rest wholly upon the rider or entrant of the machine. Service and parts manual publications dates are not proof of eligibility.	new rule probably insert after 13.13.1 13.13.? Eligible Components 13.13.?? Major components are: a) All engine and gearbox castings b) Frames c) Swingarms d) Brakes e) Suspension (front and rear) 13.13.?? All other components shall be considered as minor components. 13.13.?? Replicas of components can be made provided they are a reasonable copy of the original part. Replicas of aftermarket components are also allowed, provided they are a replica of a component available during the era of the machine. Components can be improved for safety reasons but must be approved by MA. 13.13.?? The following components will be considered to be free provided they remain visually compatible with the period of the machine. a) Rear shock absorber/s b) Front fork internals c) Ignition d) Levers and controls e) Rims f) Foot pegs (wider pegs may be used) g) Exhaust	CMXC do not support this proposal.		R&T support the recommendation of the CMXC	No change
CMX415	Kevin Mortimer	13.13.4		Addition to current 13.13.4. 13.13.4.? Modern larger diameter handlebars are permitted for Pre 78 to Pre 90. Rationale for these suggested changes is as follows: a) The current rules apart 13.14.1.2 & 13.14.2.2 do not permit replicas of either the OEM frames or after market frames that were available in a machines era. b) There is also no mention of what is acceptable and what is not. It has become common practice to fit new shock absorber/s and there is unwritten rules as to what is permitted for each era. It is common to modify front suspension with modern internals. c) Also it is common when replica parts are made they are improved for safety reasons. I think they need to be approved (by MA) so it isn't open slaughter. d) This also addresses the problem of metal fatigue. Replicas can be made in better material. e) The other things that are changed from standard are: i. Ignitions ii. Footpegs iii. Handle bars iv. Levers and controls	CMXC do not support this proposal.		R&T support the recommendation of the CMXC	No change

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
CMX416	Kevin Mortimer	13.14.6.2	13.14.6.2. Modifications converting later equipment to comply will not be allowed.	<p>13.14.6.2. Modifications converting later equipment to comply will not be allowed.</p> <p>Take the word "later" out. Previously 13.14.6.3. said "All components will be of the period the machine was manufactured". This meant (in my opinion) each machine had its own period. So components after the year of manufacture of that machine couldn't be modified to make them fit. Now with the rule changed later equipment could be argued to be only that equipment after Pre 90. So any equipment in the pre 90 range could be modified to fit. This is totally wrong and not within the true spirit of the class as first introduced in Queensland in 1997, seven years before in was in the MoMS. Despite what has been said (but not written down) the Evolution class is not a straight out technology class. It is however a class that has in the past and should continue to represent the change over in technology from air cooled, drum brakes and no linkage suspension to water cooling, discs brakes and single shock linkage suspension.</p> <p>This class has been and should continue to be a representation of not only the change over in technology but the bikes which represent that change over. Not bikes that never existed back in the era.</p> <p>I think it is reasonable to permit some follow on components, but not complete new bikes built from different bits.</p> <p>So I believe the word "LATER" has to come out of 13.14.6.2.</p> <p>I also believe consideration needs to be given to permitting carburetors both round and flat slide to be free for the Evolution, Pre 85 and Pre 90 class. Most new carbys still look the same as the carbys from the era and provided more modern computer tuneable carbys aren't used there shouldn't be a major problem. Most scrutineers don't even know what to look for.</p>	Refer CMX 413		R&T support the recommendation of the CMXC	Refer CMX413
CMX417	Heaven VMX Inc.	Rear Sprocket Guard	N/A Rule has been deleted : 13.13.6.6	<p>Reinstate Rule</p> <p>13.13.6.6 A chain guard made of suitable material must be fitted in a way to prevent trapping between the lower drive chain run and the final drive sprocket at the rear wheel.</p> <p>This rule has been in and out of the MOMS a few times. It has been ignored at several National Title events even though it was clearly in the MOMS. There is a clear safety advantage in having the rear sprocket guarded as described in the rule and it is not difficult for every machine to comply.</p> <p>The administration of our sport's has a duty of care and that duty is brought into doubt when a clear and genuine real risk to the safety of riders or officials is identified and a rule is implemented to mitigate that risk, if that rule is then removed without controlling the risk in some other fashion. All modern bikes comply with the rule as manufactured and HRR requires bikes to comply yet our branch of the sport just removes it leaving early bikes of Pre78 and earlier clearly presenting a real risk of injury to both riders and officials.</p>	CMXC ask for feedback from SCB and the Rules & Technical Committee.		<p>R&T recommend the rule is reworded as follows and is across all disciplines:</p> <p>A chain guard must be fitted in a way to prevent trapping between the lower drive chain run and the final drive sprocket at the rear wheel.</p>	Proposal approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
CMX418	Heaven VMX Inc.	13.8.1.5	13.8.1.5 Side number plates must: a) Be fitted above a horizontal line drawn through the rear axle, b) Be fitted so that the front edge of the plate is behind a vertical line drawn at 200mm to the rear of the rider's footrest,	Change Rule 13.8.1.5 Side number plates must: a) Be fitted above a horizontal line drawn through the rear axle, b) Be fitted as originally designed by the manufacturer. If the machine was not originally fitted with number plates or if desired the number plates should be installed so that the front edge of the plate is behind a vertical line drawn at 100mm to the rear of the rider's footrest. The current rule is difficult to comply with as written as most models 1978 and earlier where not designed to allow number plates to be fitted so far to the rear of the machine. Many owners/riders do not wish to damage their often valuable machine to fit number plates in a fashion not used when the machine was a current model.	Resolved CMX 408		R&T support the recommendation of the CMXC	Refer CMX408
CMX419	Heaven VMX Inc.	13.14.6	Evolution Class	Remove entire Evolution class from MoMS and replace with Pre 82 13.14.6 Acceptable machines and components: Pre '82 Class Solo 13.14.6.1 Acceptable for the Pre82 class are machines and components built up to and including the 1981 model. The only exception to this rule is where the model remains unaltered after this date, are excluded under rule 13.14.6.2 or included under rule 13.14.6.10. 13.14.6.2 Machines or components from machines sold with water cooled engines and/or linkage suspension are excluded. Adopting brakes or wheels from period machines sold as road bikes is not permitted for motocross but is acceptable for dirt track. 13.14.6.3 Modifying machines or components to comply will not be allowed. Period after market components or replicas thereof, available for complying models is acceptable. It is acceptable to build a machine by combining components from complying models. 13.14.6.4 Engines, gearboxes and front forks must remain externally unchanged. 13.14.6.5 Any carburettor type commercially available prior to 31 Dec 1981 may be used. 13.14.6.6 All machines will be fitted with an effective muffler and comply with sound control regulations in GCR 13.10. 13.14.6.7 Folding footrests must be fitted. 13.14.6.8 Countershaft sprocket covers will be fitted. 13.14.6.9 The handlebars must be equipped with a protection pad on the cross bar. Handlebars not fitted with a cross bar must be equipped with a protection pad located in the middle of the handlebars covering the handlebar clamps. 13.14.6.10 Acceptable follow on models for the Pre82 class and must also satisfy 13.14.6.2 and 13.14.6.3 are: a. Yamaha DT175 b. Suzuki TS185 c. CR/OR/WR/TE/AE Husqvarna models up to the 1984 model without water cooling d. CanAm 1982 twin shock Sonic Models e. 1982 model Yamaha IT250 and IT465 f. 1982 model Maico GS250 & GS490	CMXC do not support this proposal.		R&T support the recommendation of the CMXC	No change

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
				<p>The 2016 rules (13.14.6) relating to the Evolution class were comprehensively altered for the 2016 MOMS in a manner which completely and irreversibly destroys the intent and history of the class. The changes were contrary to all minuted submissions, suggestions and discussion by Commissioners, riders or clubs during the review process of the MOMS in 2015. The 2016 Evolution rules appear to have been compiled and implemented outside of the published MOMS review process. It is disturbing that the CMX Commission appears to have taken a deliberate and wilful decision to damage our branch of the sport as the changes were completely un-minuted and was not even available for comment prior to publishing. It was interesting that some members of one smaller Queensland VMX club spread the general idea of the rules on social media some weeks before the MOMS were available.</p> <p>The 2016 changes have completely destroy the Evolution class as it no longer represents any period of racing or style of machine in the history of MX. The two largest Classic MX clubs in Australia, which includes Heaven VMX have now removed Evolution class from their programs and replaced it with Pre82 as outlined above. This must, or should, raise alarm that a significant portion of the CMX membership feels that the MA process has failed them so badly that they move away from the standard class format at club and even open level meetings.</p> <p>The 'new' Evolution rules have been meant with complete contempt by virtually every rider in Heaven VMX even the couple who previously wanting to include some parts such as '82/'83 Yamaha and Honda forks.</p> <p>We ask the CMX Commission to now recognise that an error has been made and correct it in a clear and definitive fashion by removing Evolution class completely and introducing Pre82 as we have proposed including the inclusion and exclusion clauses. This will bring all classes in Classic MX & DT to the same basic class model. We would suggest that it should be applied immediately (before most clubs commence their 2016 programs) to minimise damage.</p>				
CMX420	Heaven VMX Inc.	13.14.1.2 & 13.14.2.2	Frames of any manufacture are acceptable within the suspension criteria and considerate of the era.	<p>Delete Rules</p> <p>This was rejected by the commission last year and we request closer consideration and feedback on the deliberation process as just minuting the Commission does not agree is not an adequate reason. Considerate of the era is none descriptive and does not give any real guidance to an entrant or rider. This style of rule wording is not to be found anywhere else in the rules except in pre60 and pre65 Classic MX/DT. The wording suggests that almost anything will do but this is a specific Classic ERA of racing. Allowing frames designed much later into earlier classes does not encourage owners of genuine Pre65 machines to enter in fact it discourages them.</p>	CMXC do not support this proposal.		R&T support the recommendation of the CMXC	No change

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
CMX421	Heaven VMX Inc.	13.14.1.5 etc.	Modifications to externals	<p>Rule as been deleted in all sections.</p> <p>Reinstate Rule: Engines and gearboxes must remain externally unchanged.</p> <p>This rule was deleted for 2016 and once again removes a defining rule of each class. Without this rule it leaves the class open to complete interpretation by the eligibility scrutineer. This is both undesirable as it leads to conflicting interpretations and leaves competitors completely unclear on what is or is not acceptable. There seemed to be no clear reason to remove the rule and once again the published process of MOMS review was not followed as the change was not contained in any minuted meeting by the CMX Commission and therefore could not be commented on before it was published in the 2016 MOMS.</p>	CMXC do not support this proposal.		R&T support the recommendation of the CMXC	No change
CMX422	Dave Radford Maryborough Motor Cyclist Club Inc.	National Championships		<p>We (Maryborough MCC) are a century old club that has seen our enthusiasm and participation rise and fall linked to the membership's engagement at any particular time. We are in a transition phase of activity at present and are building momentum towards being able to host championship events, but this is still a little way off for us just yet. We hope this title event is still available when we rebuild to the level required to host title events.</p> <p>At present we are more concerned about the long term viability of this event. It was attempted by Temora in 2015, and I understand an ACT club in 2014. No one has applied for it in 2016 and we think the viability in it's current form needs to be investigated. This event is languishing at present and we fear the current state of neglect will be terminal.</p> <p>We would like to see the Classic Motocross and Classic Dirt Track Commission conduct an investigation/enquiry and call for submissions from interested stakeholders, consider their input, and recommend changes, probably to the class structure and the overall range of classes. Not just a rebranding exercise, but a review of the current setup and a recommendation of changes to ensure the event's viability into the future. We aren't convinced the current one size fits all approach to Classic/Post Classic MX and Dirt Track Championship Classes is working any more (it works fine for MX). We are aware of the procedure for proposing changes to the MoMS, but think a more collaborative approach will deliver a result that will suit more stakeholders and work into the future.</p>	CMXC recommend that they will have Dave Tanner make contact with the club and talk about a future.		Noted	-

MEETING CLOSES: Sunday 13th March



PO Box 134
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205

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

Enduro Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 12th to the 13th March, 2016

PRESENT: Chris Gray (Chair), Don Atkins
APOLOGY: Denise Hore
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 12th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
EO923		Welcome / apologies	Chairman welcomes those present and opens the meeting.	-	Apology from Denise Hore	-	-	-
EO924		Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2015 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.	-	Confirmed	-	-	-
EO925	Ralph Freeman	14.14.11.1 g) v)	v) After 60 minutes have elapsed, the rider will be required to present his machine to the noise control test official for testing. If the noise level is above the required standard, the rider will be disqualified (or other penalties given as provided for in the GCR's).	GCR 14.14.11.1 g) v); the word "disqualified" should be replaced with 'excluded' so as to not contravene GCR 7.1.6.6, where only an appellate body may impose a "disqualification".	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO926	Ralph Freeman	14.26.5.3	The Souvenir Bronze Medal will be awarded to all riders who complete the A4DE within the allotted time.	For the Gold and silver medals there is mentioned "an allotted number of points achieved" expressed as a percentage of the first rider in that class. "Within 500% of the number of points achieved by the first rider in that class", (or another more appropriate percentage), should replace 'the allotted time'.	EC recommend The Souvenir Bronze Medal will be awarded to all riders who finish the A4DE within the allotted time.		R&T would like to know where information relating to the "allocated time" is found?	Awaiting response from COMMISSION
EO927	Aurora De Fazio	14.8.1.3	No rider competing in the AORC event may compete at another event at the same venue on any of the 8 days immediately preceding the AORC event.	No rider competing in an AORC or VORC event may compete at another event at the same venue on any of the 8 days immediately preceding the AORC or VORC event. - To conduct a free and fair playing field for competitors entering in national and state levels. Competitors competing in club days 5 days prior to a national or state level championship at the same venue should be excluded irrespective of age, capacity and class.	EC recommend no change to the rule and refer to the SCB for update as required		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	No change

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
EO928	Collin Jennings	14.14.11.1 m)	14.14.11 Maintenance, Repair, Alteration and Refuelling 14.14.11.1 m) There must be at least one refuelling depot at a maximum of every 35km.	Change Rule 14.14.11.1 m) There must be at least one refuelling depot at a maximum of every 50km. EO918 in the Enduro Commission Minutes (April 2015) requested a change to the wording of JUNIOR Rules by adding "at a maximum of". This change for Juniors was approved. The SENIOR wording was also altered to match the juniors but the refuelling distance was changed. Refuelling at 50km is the international standard in the FIM rules and should be the same for Australian Enduros. As an organiser of a number of traditional enduro events each year it is impractical / undesirable to enforce having a refuel every 35km. Enduro motorcycles are more than capable of travelling 50km on a tank of fuel and the rule should be returned to the previous distance in keeping with the international standard. A Time Check is required at least every 35km but this doesn't mean that organisers can always find a suitable refuelling location at the same place. It is often easy to accommodate a No Service time check in a place where a refuelling depot would be not possible.	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO929	Don Atkins	14.4.5	14.4.5 Australian Off Road Awards	Change title to Australian Off Road Championship Awards Referred to as AORC in many locations, sup Regs, etc.	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO930	Don Atkins	14.14.2.2.vi	vi) Be indicated by: White flags placed 200 metres, and Yellow flags placed 20 metres before the control table,	Change Rule vi) Be indicated by: White flags placed approximately 200 metres, and Yellow flags placed 5-20 metres before the control table, This allows flexibility for organisers with space constraints and different display clocks to allow riders to wait at an appropriate location.	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined. EC also recommend that a similar change be made to 14.14.1.1 b) Yellow flags displayed on pegs - time check 5 - 20 meters		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO931	Don Atkins	14.14.8.6	14.14.8.6 During an event the competitor must have all marked parts on the motorcycle at all times when on the course, subject to GCR 17.14.11.	Update Rule 14.14.8.6 During an event the competitor must have all marked parts on the motorcycle at all times when on the course, subject to GCR 14.14.11 . Not adjusted when earlier MOMS version condensed	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO934	Don Atkins	14.14.12.6	14.14.12.6 In any replenishment area, the chain can be lubricated but only the rider is allowed to do this work.	Relocate Rule 14.14.11.1 o) In any replenishment area, the chain can be lubricated but only the rider is allowed to do this work. Relocate the same rule to be grouped with other matters relating to Maintenance, Repair, Alteration and Refuelling	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
EO935	Don Atkins	14.14.13.1	14.14.13.1 At any time check a relevant official: a) Must record the time as displayed on the clock when the competitor's time card is presented,	Change Rule 14.14.13.1 At any time check a relevant official: a) Must record the time as displayed on the clock when: i) The competitor's time card is presented, or ii) When the motorcycle enters the control by passing the yellow flags. The method to be used will be announced in the Supplementary Regulations or Riders Briefing. Allow the organisers flexibility in their scoring methods.	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO936	Don Atkins	14.14.15.1 f)	f) Competitors may inspect special test courses on foot,	Delete Rule This is a duplicate to 14.14.14.1 b) which states Competitors may inspect test courses on foot but not by wheeled vehicle.	EC recommend no change to the existing rule.		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	No change
EO937	Don Atkins	14.14.18.1	Final test – for each uncompleted lap plus the time of the slowest completed test time in the same class	Change Delete Rule EC now propose to delete this rule entirely. Refer EO951 for updated rule version Final test – for each uncompleted lap plus the time of the slowest completed test time in the same class group . Sometimes classes are broken into groups (14.14.16.4) if there are too many riders for a single grid. This process normally splits the riders on results to that time. When this happens, some riders are significantly disadvantaged as they have times imposed on them by much slower riders.	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO938	Don Atkins	14.14.20.1 d)	d) Failing to have all marked parts on the motorcycle at all times when on the course, subject to GCR 17.14.11.	Update Rule d) Failing to have all marked parts on the motorcycle at all times when on the course, subject to GCR 14.14.11. Not adjusted when earlier MOMS version condensed	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO939	Don Atkins	14.14.21.1 e)	e) Receiving outside assistance other than for purposes of: i) Refuelling, ii) Removing, replacing and replenishing: Coolant, Brake fluids, Engine and gearbox lubricating oils and removal and replacement of oil filters. iii) Inflating tubes and tyres.	Change Rule e) Receiving outside assistance other than for purposes of: i) Refuelling, ii) Removing, replacing and replenishing: Coolant, Engine and gearbox lubricating oils and removal and replacement of oil filters. iii) Removing air from the braking circuit, iv) Inflating tubes and tyres. v) Cleaning number plates and plastic parts of the motorcycle with the aid of a sponge or cloth. Replacing the points i-v from 14.14.11.1 b) ensures consistency between the two sections.	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
EO940	Don Atkins	14.15.1.1	112 with a 4dB/A allowance	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>112 with a 2dB/A allowance before the race 112 with a 3dB/A allowance during and after the race</p> <p>After an initial bedding in period it is now time to be in line with improved limits. These proposed are from the 2015 FIM requirements of rule 79.11 from the Technical Rules Enduro.</p>	EC recommend that the noise rule could be done in a matrix similar to Appendix A Protective clothing & Equipment		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO941	Don Atkins	14.14.18.1	<p>PENALTY POINTS</p> <p>Late arrival at the start line 60 points per minute Not crossing the 20m line under power within time 10 points Early and late arrival at a time check 60 points per minute Stopping between yellow flags and control table at time check 60 points Starting of engine in starting area prior to start signal 60 points Starting the engine in the parc fermé or work area 120 points Uncompleted day for a competitor 7200 points Special tests - for each 1/100 sec 1/100 point Final test – for each uncompleted lap plus the time of the slowest completed test time in the same class 60 points Individuals who re-start – per day plus points for completed special tests 7200 points</p>	<p>Change points to seconds.</p> <p>Modern scoring methods use time (hours, minutes, seconds) to display results and not as cumulative points.</p>	Support and Recommend, 14.1.4.19.4 ,		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO942	Don Atkins	14.26.1.11	14.26.1.11 Riders nominated in the Veterans, Masters and Women's class are not eligible for the Trophy Team.	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>14.26.1.11 Riders nominated in the Veterans, Masters and Women's class are not eligible for the Trophy Team.</p> <p>Allows for team entry from states with smaller rider representation at the A4DE. See also a request for change to 14.24.1.5 regarding starting order.</p>	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO943	Don Atkins	14.26.2.11	14.26.2.11 Riders nominated in the Women's class are not eligible for the Junior Trophy Team.	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>14.26.2.11 Riders nominated in the Women's class are not eligible for the Junior Trophy Team.</p> <p>Allows for team entry from states with smaller rider representation at the A4DE. See also a request for change to 14.24.1.5 regarding starting order.</p>	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
EO944	Don Atkins	14.24.1.5	14.24.1.5 The starting order must be established to allow the Trophy, Junior Trophy and selected seeded riders to start first.	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>14.24.1.5 The starting order must be established to allow the Trophy, Junior Trophy and selected seeded capacity class riders to start first. Those Trophy and Junior Trophy riders nominated in the Veterans, Masters and Women's classes will start with their respective class.</p> <p>Veterans, Masters and Women's classes are to be run with the same group of riders. See also requests to change 14.26.1.11 and 14.26.2.11.</p>	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO945	Don Atkins	14.26	N/A	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>14.26.6.1 The outright individual winner of the A4DE will be awarded the John Hall Perpetual Trophy named in honour of the mastermind and original organiser on the first A4DE in 1978.</p> <p>The trophy is in existence. It has been awarded at the A4DE since 2013. This rule formalises and recognises the existing arrangements and the legacy left by John Hall.</p>	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO946	Don Atkins	14.18.1	14.16.1.1 Fuel tanks may be constructed from any material that has been approved by the Australian Standards Association as a petrol or fuel container material.	<p>Update Rule</p> <p>14.18.1.1 Fuel tanks may be constructed from any material that has been approved by the Australian Standards Association as a petrol or fuel container material.</p> <p>The rule appears to have been incorrectly numbered in previous edition.</p>	EC support and recommend the proposal as outlined		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO949	EC	14.14.19.2	14.14.19 Classification of Individuals and Teams ... 14.14.19.2 For individuals, daily penalty points will be accumulated.		<p>EC recommend to change GCR</p> <p>14.14.19.2 For individuals, daily penalty points-time will be accumulated.</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved
EO950	RC	14.14.19.4	14.14.19.4 Where a competitor is a member of a team: a) The team will incur 7,200 penalty points for each day of the event that the rider does not complete. b) If the competitor is permitted to re- start after exclusion for a day, the team will incur 7,200 points for the day the competitor was excluded plus 7,200 for each following day.		<p>EC recommend to change GCR</p> <p>14.14.19.4 Where a competitor is a member of a team: a) The team will incur 7,200 penalty points-seconds for each day of the event that the rider does not complete. b) If the competitor is permitted to re- start after exclusion for a day, the team will incur 7,200 points seconds for the day the competitor was excluded plus 7,200 seconds for each following day.</p> <p>Consistent with E0941</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the EC	Proposal approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
EO951	EC	14.14.16.10	N/A	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>14.14.16.10 For the riders who do not complete the same number of laps as the winner, the following formula will be applied to calculate their time:</p> <p>$T / L \times W$</p> <p>Where: T = total time taken by the rider to reach the finish line L = number of laps completed by the rider W = number of laps completed by the class winner of that particular heat</p> <p>If a rider does not cross the finish line within 5 minutes after the winner, his time will be the time of the slowest rider of his class heat to reach the finish line, plus 5%.</p>	EC recommend to add GCR, in conjunction with the removal of 14.14.18.1 (refer EO937) to streamline and ensure clarity within the Chapter			Proposal approved

MEETING CLOSES: Sunday 13th March



PO Box 134
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205

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

All Terrain Vehicles Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 12th to the 13th March, 2016

PRESENT: Darrell Knight (Chair), Len Pipicello
APOLOGY: Martin Stone
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 12th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
ATV211	-	Welcome / apologies	Chairman welcomes those present and opens the meeting.	-	Apology from Martin Stone	-	-	-
ATV212	-	Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2015 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.	-	Confirmed	-	-	-
ATV216 & DT598	MA	ATV MX Class at National Championship	N/A	<p>Any classes would undoubtedly have to line up with the current Junior ATV GCR specifications in Section 15 for other discipline areas (MX etc.).</p> <p>Appropriate classes from table in GCR 15.2 Junior Aust Championships. Flexing of these descriptions should be very strongly resisted (tonnes of painful work in there).</p> <p>7 to under 11 Limited 60cc to 90cc 2-stroke & 85cc to 110cc 4-stroke 8 to under 12 Comp 60cc to 90cc 2-stroke & 85cc to 125cc 4-stroke 12 to under 16 Comp Up to 200cc 2-stroke & 250cc 4-stroke</p> <p>You would know best about Dirt Track grid sizes and race formats. But I will suggest that the best measure might be to go in boots and all and offer the classes with sealed minimum number.</p> <p>Meaning the class should be offered and catered for by the Promoters of Championship events, but does not have to be run if the minimum numbers are not met.</p> <p>In Section 15, 15.3.2.2 c) we state that the Minimum Number for Junior ATV Championship classes must be 6 entries (but I believe this could be varied by SR).</p>	<p>ATVC support the addition in principal.</p> <p>To be run as a support class suggested for implementation year, which will likely be 2017 with a view to possible Championship Status for 2018. (Note: the 2016 event being Easter 2016 and only 2 weeks away).</p> <p>DTC and ATVC discussed Junior ATV classes on their own merit and support on that basis, however, with MA generally considering reducing Motorcycling Championship classes down from 270, and All Com Item ALL19 re minimum ages for classes being 10 or 12 years old. This class could be supported for addition and then removed within the same process.</p> <p>DTC and ATVC to discuss after 2016 event. Championship event discipline combinations. Event sizes, fit and format to be further researched.</p> <p>12-16 year old National Championship class recommended for Championship status.</p>	<p>ATVC thanks the NSW MX Sport Committee for their comments. The tragic situation of Junior racing in NSW has long been an ATVC complaint that it appears no-one in MNSW or MA has ever made formal application to address. ATVC have dug into this issue countless times and never seen evidence of an application. If incorrect, we would love to see any agenda item, minutes, and outcome of any formal attempt. The top of our sport need to address this point for NSW, which also has National flow on effects particularly in neighbouring states. For all other States, the recommendation works and it may be 'not utilised in NSW' due to their unfortunate Junior racing position.</p>	<p>R&T advise that a move towards the removal of U12 National Championships will allow additions to the support classes for ATV's.</p>	<p>No change. Classes must be run in 3 states with numbers prior to introduction to National level.</p>

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
ATV218	Sandra Siemensma	Discipline Specific Officials for ATV	N/A	<p>Please consider grading officials on discipline only for the following reasons.</p> <p>Not every parent aspires to have a child in every discipline. Not every club member aspires to compete in every discipline.</p> <p>Not every discipline has hundreds of competitors, smaller disciplines really struggle with the number of available officials within their own disciplines.</p> <p>At the end of the day we are all volunteers, only interested in the particular discipline our children or our members compete in. For example, I am not, nor would I ever be interested in officiating at any other discipline except quads.</p> <p>If officials can concentrate and put all their energy into the rules and regulations into the discipline of their choice this can only enhance that particular discipline.</p> <p>If this rule was to be included it would also ensure that the officials at state or national titles know exactly what is required at those events. For example we do not currently have any L4 officials for the quads within our club, so if we were once again to host a national event we would be allocated those officials from a bank of people many who have not even attended a quad event.</p>	<p>ATVC strongly support and recommend this request which has been a considerable problem for many years. ATVC also recognise that this is a matter for NOC and MA Technical.</p> <p>Simply not supporting this recommendation will needlessly stress an isolated and small discipline. ATV specific higher level 'endorsement' should be considered similar to the existing precedent set for Speedway and other unique disciplines.</p>	<p>Further explanation offered; R&T point taken, submission and ATVC does not clearly explain request/recommendation. For example; a level 2 official seeking an upgrade to level 3 with outstanding ATV experience, but not enough broad experience to justify the full level increase, may be upgraded as; Official L2 & ATV only L3. At a Solo MX event, this official could only act in the capacity of a L2. This type of grading does already exist for other specialist areas like Speedway and Trials etc. The request is that ATV have the same specialist upgrade capability in what ever form the NOC might recommend to facilitate the requested. Please note: The ATVC understands that across the entire sport, this request may seem quite a trivial 'want', but at the small ATV discipline grass roots level this request is critical to sustainability to the point where events get cancelled because it is too difficult to appoint officials. If events get cancelled, (or more to the point not even planned) officials don't go, and no-one gets their hours up. When the next Open event comes around, no officials have got their hours to upgrade and meet event officiating requirements.</p>	<p>R&T advise that this proposal would perhaps limit the number of officials available for an event.</p> <p>"Generic", all-rounder, officials will always be required to ensure events can be adequately covered - especially Level 4 officials.</p> <p>R&T will consult with NOC.</p>	NOC Scrutineering
ATV219	N/A	Hybrid Machines	N/A	<p>At a recent Dirt track race meeting it was noticed by a fellow MA member that a 700cc engine was fitted to an OEM 450 Rolling Chassis. Photos were provided. It was obvious the Main Frame/Chassis had been heavily modified to accommodate the larger engine. On this occasion the welding and work around the area that wasn't covered by body covers and accessories looked neat. The real issue I see is that anyone with no experience can build or modify Frames/Chassis and race it at a spectator event. Currently no qualification or certification is required. Its simply left up to the scrutineer on the day.</p> <p>I cannot see how a Modification of this magnitude could be deemed safe without proper assessment by a Qualified Engineer. Who could possibly know what is really behind a Major Modification and or a low budget non production Chassis/Frame from a visual inspection? I believe our competitors, fellow racers and spectators are currently at unnecessary risk from a potential Catastrophic failure. I motion that its our duty of care to see that our members and the public have the best possible chance to go home safely.</p>	<p>This proposal is not supported by ATVC. ATVC recommend that inspection responsibility is seen to fall within normal event scrutineering process where all manner of other engineering modifications are included.</p> <p>The ATVC considered that the two top tubes of this example frame had indeed been modified, and appeared to be quite well done. This example was passed by scrutineers on the day and no incident resulted. The main concerns with imposing an engineering requirement on frame welding or modifications is that such a ruling would immediately effect a great number of top level competition machines today. Most common MX machines have frame-work, after OEM welding or full gusset kits welded in.</p> <p>Questioning the structural integrity of ATV frames also raises concerns of setting a precedent of justifying any other modification that could affect frame strength or critical component integrity and security. To name one extremely common modification such as wider front A-arms, these add considerable lever forces to standard frames, and are not supported by OEM frame manufacturers. Many riders of these machine correspondingly weld full gusset kits into these frames to avert failures, which still occur. Yet this common example has never required certification.</p>	<p>No change to recommendation. ATVC thanks the NSW MX Sport Committee for their support.</p>	<p>R&T support the recommendation of the ATVC</p>	No change

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
				<p>have the best possible chance to go home safely.</p> <p>It is my opinion that Heavily modified frames or non OEM non production Chassis/Frames should be properly tested and certified by an appropriate welder or engineer. The welder or engineer could offer a certificate to the owner so it can be offered to the scrutineer on day of race.</p> <p>I propose we Amend/Add Rule to the effect: Hybrid ATV's with Major Modifications to Frame/Chassis or Non production Frames/Chassis be certified by an appropriate engineer. Certificate to be offered to the scrutineer at each race meeting.</p>	<p>The ATVC also noted that high level competition bikes often crack or damage components over time and are quite regularly repaired by welding, but we do not know of one single case where such a failure has caused a catastrophic accident. Usually the rider can still complete the event and return to pit safety. ATVC also shared the concern that any engineering approval would only be valid for that day / event. Welding does indeed cause it's own frame stresses, invites fatigue, is rewelded and so on.</p> <p>Requiring modification certification is seen to be onerous, expensive, still will not prevent failures, and will open up a can of worms as to what modifications must or need not be engineered and how often. For the above reasons the majority ATVC did not support engineering certification and does believe the current system where inspection responsibility is left to the accredited scrutineer on the day is most appropriate.</p>			
ATV220	MA	15.11.6	Scoring Table	<p>Amend Rule</p> <p>There are only 6-8 Starters in ATV Competition, not the 30 that is outlined. Should the points system be condensed to cater for the limited number of participants; finishing "last" in ATV should be awarded a similar number of points as in other disciplines - not the same as finishing "6th"...</p>	<p>Recommendation not supported by ATVC.</p> <p>Points system is consistent with 2 wheel MX discipline and across most all ATV disciplines (except speedway).</p> <p>Some ATV Enduro events have had more than 30 entrants, and MX can have up to 20. In any case, more advantages than disadvantages are seen to come from adoption of the 35 point system.</p> <p>However, the following recommendation is made which will avert some DNF disadvantage, while rewarding participation, but still inflicting significant points disadvantage/penalty. This addition is seen to advantage the vast majority of likely scenarios and also keep the competition pressure alive for subsequent place getters.</p> <p>15.11.6.5 An entrant suffering a DNF will attract 21st place points (10pts) or last place points, whichever is the lesser. If two DNF's occur in one race they will be awarded subsequent 21st and 22nd place points, and so on, with the latest DNF finishing highest of the DNF's.</p>	<p>No change to recommendation. ATVC thanks the NSW MX Sport Committee and R&T for their support.</p>	<p>R&T support the recommendation of the ATVC</p>	No change
ATV221	MXC	MX1169	Split / staggered starts	<p>The MXC recommendation will be a very valuable feature particularly at low volume smaller club level ATV events.</p>	<p>ATVC supports MXC recommendation.</p>	<p>No change to recommendation. ATVC thanks the R&T for their support, and without explanation as to why, notes NSW Sport Committee objection.</p>	<p>R&T support the recommendation of the ATVC. As per comment on MX1169, Track Density will always need to be considered when using Staggered Starts.</p>	Refer MX1169
ATV222	ATVC	Junior National Championship Classes		<p>Remove Australian Championship status for children under the age of 12 years</p> <p>Including: 60cc to 90cc 2-stroke & 85cc to 110cc 4-stroke</p>	<p>ATVC in consultation with MXC believes that the minimum age for Junior Championship Status classes should be 12. Classes under 12 should still be offered for normal competition support classes.</p> <p>Refer MX1172. ATVC recommendation aligns with and supports MXC and thanks for their input.</p>	<p>No change to recommendation. NSW Sport Committee position understood, maybe someone will fix this one day, see comments in ATV216 & DT598</p>	<p>R&T refer to MX1172</p>	

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
----------	-----------	------------------------	---------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------	---	----------------

MEETING CLOSES: Sunday 13th April

FINAL



PO Box 134
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205

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

Speedway Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 12th to the 13th March, 2016

PRESENT: Ivan Golding (Chair), Shane Parker
APOLOGY: Matt Jones
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 12th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
SW808		Welcome / apologies	Chairman welcomes those present and opens the meeting.	-	Apology from Matt Jones	-	-	-
SW809		Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2015 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.	-	Confirmed	-	-	-

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
SW810	MA	Log Books		<p>Discussion</p> <p>Are these mentioned in the MoMS at all? Are they still required. If not, what notification needs to be released to ensure that competitors are not penalised for not having them.</p>	<p>SC recommend that Log Books are completely phased out by 1.1.2017</p> <p>Rationale: With the introduction of Computers, SC believe it is time to faze out log books</p>	Agree	R&T support the recommendation of the SC	Proposal approved
SW811	Mark Lemon		<p>The riders for the FIM World Cup teams will be chosen by the MA Speedway Commission in consultation with the Australia Speedway Manager</p> <p>To be eligible for selection in the World Cup Teams, both Senior & Junior, riders must participate in the Australian Senior Solo or the Under 21 Championships for that year. In addition Team selection will be based on current form, previous achievements, suitability to the venue and willingness to represent Australia. Note: Australian GP riders are exempt from this requirement.</p>	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>16.14.3.1 The riders for the FIM World Cup teams will be chosen by the Australian Speedway Manager in consultation with the MA Speedway Commission.</p> <p>16.14.3.2 World Cup Teams, both Junior and Senior, selection will be based on current form, previous achievements, suitability to the venue and willingness to represent Australia.</p> <p>This has been ignored for as many years as I can remember and for good reason - we need to be able to field the best possible riders for selection at the time of the events and avoid zealous parents getting involved as we witnessed in 2015, remembering its a World Championship and not a training program.</p>	<p>SC support the proposal.</p> <p>Rationale: Team Manager is in a better place to judge riders performance at the time of selection.</p>	Agree	R&T support the recommendation of the SC, however advise that this is a policy issue, not a rule.	<p>R&T support removal of the rule. New conditions will be listed under:</p> <p>Speedway Commission Terms of Appointment (Policy)</p>
SW812	Mark Lemon	16.4	<p>19.2 AGE RANGE CAPACITY / CLASS</p> <p>13 to under 16 250CC Solo</p> <p>Individual 19.4</p> <p>Age Range Capacity / Class 13 to 19.4.1</p> <p>under 16 250cc Solo</p> <p>Juniors only to compete i junior competitions</p> <p>19.19.0.3 Riders using these machines must be:</p> <p>a) A minimum age 250cc 13 years to under 16 years, minimum age 350cc 14 years to under 16 years</p> <p>e No juniors permitted on tracks with seniors</p>	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>13 to Under 16 : 250cc Solo</p> <p>Allow the limit for the minimum age (13 years) to start on the date of the rider's birthday and the limit for the maximum age finish at the end of the year that they reach the age of 17, pursuant to FIM Medical Code.</p> <p>This is an FIM rule and we are on of the few nations not in compliance with age groups, so we send riders to compete in the Youth 250cc World Cup against older riders.</p> <p>Hopefully on day we can host the FUM Youth Training Camp and the World Cup and we would have to adhere to FIM rules. It would also allow some Youth riders who develop and mature at different rates to build confidence before transferring to seniors. It will give kids more options to remain in the sport. Under current rules Senior riders can ride 250cc or 350cc machines.</p>	<p>SC support the proposal.</p> <p>Proposed Rule Change</p> <p>16.2 Categories for Junior Australian Championship Classes &</p> <p>16.4 Junior Competition Classes</p> <p>13 to Under 46 17 250cc Solo 250cc Solo</p> <p>16.6.1.1 Juniors only to compete in Junior competition except when a rider is competing in the 13 to Under 17 250cc Solo Class.</p> <p>16.21.1.2 Riders competing on these machines must be:</p> <p>a) a Minimum age of:</p> <p>i) 13 to under 46 17 years 250cc</p> <p>ii) 14 to under 16 years for 350cc</p> <p>Rationale: To allow riders to compete at FIM events in the same age groups.</p>	<p>Commission after receiving more information from FIM Recommend 16.2. 16.4. 16.6.1.1 16.21.1.2 NO Change to the current GCRs. Australian riders competing in a FIM Event can nominate now as is. FIM also looking at lowering the age to U16 in 2017.</p>	<p>R&T advise that this is potentially an irrelevant change to the Speedway Class rules. The current legislation prohibiting Seniors riding with Juniors will restrict the availability of events.</p> <p>R&T also ask for information as to why it is necessary to match FIM regulations in this case; when there is no restriction on a 17 year old Australian rider competing in the Junior World Cup (as per FIM rules).</p> <p>R&T request more information from the Speedway Commission and/or Mark Lemon.</p>	<p>Proposal approved to align with FIM.</p> <p>Decision to hold until FIM agree to 2017 age groups (meeting in August)</p>
SW813	Terry Poole	Neck Support	N/A	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>Under Protective Clothing & Equipment:</p> <p>For all Speedway competition a neck support must be worn.</p> <p>This is a safety issue in Speedway and should be improved.</p>	<p>SC do not support this proposal. SC recommend that it is left to riders choice at the moment.</p> <p>Rationale: Some Rider cannot adapt to the use of neck braces.</p>	Agree	R&T support the recommendation of the SC	No change

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
SW814	Paul Slade	16.24 Sidecar Tyres	N/A	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>For 1045cc Sidecars the rear tyres must be a minimum of 4ply and a load rating minimum of 280 kg.</p> <p>This rule ensures all competitors have a tyre that is safe for Speedway sidecar competition.</p>	<p>SC do not support this proposal. The current rules are sufficient, but recommend if tyres are a issue at a Venue the Referee should look at cutting laps to 3 Laps.</p>	Agree	R&T support the recommendation of the SC	No change
SW815	Steve Kurtz	16.19.4	N/A	<p>Add Rule</p> <p>For all Speedway solo competition a maximum of two (2) rear tyres per race meeting may be used.</p> <p>This is to bring the cost of Speedway down, and make it a more even playing field.</p>	<p>SC recommend that this is not a rule - it can be applied in Supplementary Regulations by event.</p>	Agree	R&T support the recommendation of the SC	No change
SW816	Paul Slade	16.3.2.2	<p>Medallions and point will be awarded in Australian Championships where there are: Senior & Under 21 Solo : 16 starters Senior Sidecar : 16 starters Junior 250cc Solo : 13 starters Junior Sidecar : 9 starters Junior 125cc Solo : 16 starters Junior 125cc Solo Teams : 14 starters</p>	<p>Change Rule</p> <p>Medallions and point will be awarded in Australian Championships where there are: Senior & Junior Solo : 10 riders Senior & Junior Sidecar : 6 riders</p> <p>To make Speedway the same as every other discipline and encourage participation in the sport.</p>	<p>SC do not support this proposal. SC recommend that the current rule is effective.</p>	Agree	R&T support the recommendation of the SC	Proposal approved based on feedback from SCB's
SW817	SC	16.21.1.7	16.21.1.7 For 250cc machines only, Refer to the relevancy MA Track specifications for track length.		<p>Re-instate GCR that was removed</p> <p>16.21.1.7 For 250cc machines only refer to the relevant MA Track specifications for track length track must be no more than 350 metres in length, and licenced by MA or the relevant SCB.</p> <p>Rational: SC recommend that it has NOT worked putting this rule in the Venue Standards. Parents and Commission have concerns of safety for Riders.</p>	<p>Agree , Commission do request SCBs to abide by the Track Guidelines.</p>	R&T advise that the inclusion in the Track Guidelines is sufficient; and should be enforced from there.	No change

MEETING CLOSES: Saturday 12th March



PO Box 134
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205

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

Dirt Track & Track Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 12th to the 13th March, 2016

PRESENT: Keith Davies, Peter Baker
APOLOGY: Les Thomas (Chair)
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 12th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
DT594		Welcome / apologies	Chairman welcomes those present and opens the meeting.	-	Apology from Les Thomas	-	-	-
DT595		Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2015 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.	-	Confirmed	-	-	-
DT596	MA	Application of Chapter	<p>Application of Chapter</p> <p>The Rules set out in this chapter are for the discipline of Dirt Track.</p> <p>Everything that is not authorised and prescribed in this chapter is strictly prohibited.</p>	<p>Change Rule:</p> <p>Application of Chapter</p> <p>The Rules set out in this chapter are for the discipline of Dirt Track</p> <p>Everything that is not authorised and prescribed in this chapter is strictly prohibited.</p> <p>Rule should be removed to allow for inclusive competition, and clearer Rules for Dirt Track.</p>	DTC recommends that the Application of Chapter rule be retained in Dirt Track Chapter 17.		<p>R&T advise that the sport requires a consistent approach across all disciplines to ensure clear rules and standards. As the majority of disciplines can and have moved away from the "God Clause" in the Application of Chapter, so should Dirt Track and Track.</p> <p>Should the addition of this restriction be required, it can be included by CLASS, not to cover the entire chapter.</p>	<p>Proposal approved.</p> <p>The rule is currently inconsistent with acceptable regulations. The Commission are asked to write rules for Junior and Senior classes (production or "limited" class) if and where required.</p>
DT597	MA	Application of Chapter	<p>Application of Chapter</p> <p>The Rules set out in this chapter are for the discipline of Track.</p> <p>Everything that is not authorised and prescribed in this chapter is strictly prohibited.</p>	<p>Change Rule:</p> <p>Application of Chapter</p> <p>The Rules set out in this chapter are for the discipline of Track</p> <p>Everything that is not authorised and prescribed in this chapter is strictly prohibited.</p> <p>Rule should be removed to allow for inclusive competition, and clearer Rules for Track.</p>	DTC recommends that the Application of Chapter rule be retained in Dirt Track Chapter 18.		Refer to DT597	<p>Proposal approved.</p> <p>The rule is currently inconsistent with acceptable regulations. The Commission are asked to write rules for Junior and Senior classes (production or "limited" class) if and where required.</p>

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
DT598 & ATV216	MA	ATV MX Class as a National Championship	N/A	<p>Any classes would undoubtedly have to line up with the current Junior ATV GCR specifications in Section 15 for other discipline areas (MX etc.).</p> <p>Appropriate classes from table in GCR 15.2 Junior Aust Championships. Flexing of these descriptions should be very strongly resisted (tonnes of painful work in there).</p> <p>7 to under 11 Limited 60cc to 90cc 2-stroke & 85cc to 110cc 4-stroke 8 to under 12 Comp 60cc to 90cc 2-stroke & 85cc to 125cc 4-stroke 12 to under 16 Comp Up to 200cc 2-stroke & 250cc 4-stroke</p> <p>You would know best about Dirt Track grid sizes and race formats. But I will suggest that the best measure might be to go in boots and all and offer the classes with sealed minimum number.</p> <p>Meaning the class should be offered and catered for by the Promoters of Championship events, but does not have to be run if the minimum numbers are not met.</p> <p>In Section 15, 15.3.2.2 c) we state that the Minimum Number for Junior ATV Championship classes must be 6 entries (but I believe this could be varied by SR).</p>	<p>DTC recommends that clubs run ATV classes for 8 to Under 12 and 12 to Under 16 competition as support classes to the 2017 Championships, and if successful, DTC may recommend granting Championship status in the future.</p>		Refer to ATV216	See ATV216
DT599	DTC	Starting Blocks			<p>DTC recommends:</p> <p>DIRT TRACK: Relocate and Change GCR 17.11.8.1 a) to</p> <p>17.11.6.3 Competitors must be able to start in the event unaided while sitting on the machine. The competitor may use up to two starting blocks (one per side) up to a maximum of 100mm high.</p> <p>TRACK: Relocate and Change GCR 18.11.6.1 a) to</p> <p>18.11.4.3 Competitors must be able to start in the event unaided while sitting on the machine. The competitor may use up to two starting blocks (one per side) up to a maximum of 100mm high.</p>		Refer to MX1189	Refer to MX1189
DT600	MA	Knobby Tyres		<p>Discussion</p> <p>What is wrong with allowing Knobby Tyres if the <u>venue</u> approves their use. Are they unsuitable? We are already aware they are uncompetitive.</p>	<p>DTC recommends that knobby tyres can be dealt with in Supplementary Regulations with amendments as follows:</p> <p>DIRT TRACK: Amend 17.16.9.1 a) to read: Metal studs, spikes, chain, rope, other non-skid attachments, paddle, scoop or knobby treaded tyres may not be used unless permitted by the relevant supplementary regulations.</p> <p>TRACK: Amend 18.16.9.1a) to read: Metal studs, spikes, chain, rope, other non-skid attachments, paddle, scoop or knobby treaded tyres may not be used unless permitted by the relevant supplementary regulations.</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the DTC	Proposal approved.

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
DT601	DTC	Sound Testing			<p>Due to ongoing feedback and the enforced restrictions by councils and track owners, DTC recommend the following as new Sound Testing limits for Dirt Track and Track events.</p> <p>For implementation: 1st January 2017 2 Metre Max Method Discipline Limit dB(A) Dirt Track & Track 115 + 3dB(A) tolerance, total 118dB(A) max</p> <p>Followed by an updated regulation effective 1st January 2018: 2 Metre Max Method Discipline Limit dB(A) Dirt Track & Track 114 + 2dB(A) tolerance, total 116dB(A) max</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the DTC	Proposal approved.

MEETING CLOSES: Sunday 13th March



PO Box 134
South Melbourne
Victoria 3205

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

Trial Commission Meeting Minutes

Meeting held 12th to the 13th March, 2016

PRESENT: Kevin Zarczynski (Chair), Steve Scragg, Bob McGlinchy, Christine Knee
APOLOGY: NIL
MEETING OPENS: Saturday 12th March

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
TL613		Welcome / apologies	Chairman welcomes those present and opens the meeting.	-	-	-	-	-
TL614		Confirmation of minutes	Minutes of the 2015 meeting are confirmed as a true record of the meeting.	-	Confirmed	-	-	-

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
TL615	MA & Bob McGinchy	Junior Age Groups	N/A	I have had some discussion with Peter Goddard and Steve James on the issue and we feel a lowering of the age would be a benefit for youngsters coming into the sport. History dictates that up until 2007 only under 10yo was mentioned in the GCRs and that year clause 23.2.1.1(c) - Juniors - 7 to under 16years was an inclusion. This probably was a safety measure due to concern of the welfare of the rider both in the sections and on the loops connecting the sections. With the Electric Trial Bikes now becoming popular and much safer it is apparent that the lower age should be modified.	TC does not support this change. Competitors are presently able to ride on a mini license non competitive from age 4 to 7, at any trial event. TC feels this existing capability may not be well known within the trial sport.		Noted	
TL616	MNSW Trial Committee	20.0.0.1	It is recommended that the Australian Trial Championship each year be conducted by 31st August of that year.	Delete rule Deleting this ruling will allow more scope for to allow for requirements & weather criteria depending on which State will be hosting the National Championships for that year. Outcomes from the Australian Championships were previously thought to be needed to help select participants to represent Australia at the Trials des Nations and other International competitions. Current State and National practices now allow us to compare riders abilities without needing to resort to "ride offs" using a single National event for comparison of rider abilities.	TC support removal of this rule.		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	Proposal approved
TL617	MNSW Trial Committee	20.5	Junior Trial: Electric Machines Junior 7 - <13 = Up to 1.5Kw Junior 12 - <16 = Up to 10Kw	20.5: Junior Trial: Electric Machines still be separated into two Kw classes but defined as: Junior 7 - <13 = Up to 1.5Kw Junior 13 - <16 = Above 1.5Kw or "Open / Unlimited" Kw At the moment, the maximum Kw of electric bikes is about 7.5Kw, however that is likely to be updated in the near future as more manufacturers and models become available. By restricting this older junior category to 7.5kw does not give scope for potential and possible machines. See 20.7.1. Endorsements for junior trials riders are simply specified as <125(cc); <200(cc) and Trial Open Capacity for those that ride fuel (petrol) powered machines and - "Trials Electric Bike" and that these machines are not be further categorised into power limits. The "Open Kw" terminology was deleted in the 2016 MoMS.	TC supports the current 10kw rule, and that an unlimited power for Junior competition is not prudent. Should a need arise in the future when new power capacities create the need for a review it can be undertaken at a suitable time. An investigation with all current manufacturers indicates none have an machines in development approaching 10kW.		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	No change
TL618	MNSW Trial Committee	20.7.0.6	Unless otherwise permitted in writing by the Relevant Controlling Body, for any event there must be no greater age variation between (junior) competitors than four (4) years	Delete this rule This reasoning seems to have been carried over from other disciplines and has been in the MoMS for many years. It appears to be related to "racing" safety. In Trials there is no direct "competition" between participants as they participate and ride individually in each section. Currently in TRIALS, there exists for juniors, the options of riding in the age groups 7 to <13 and 13 to <16. Once they are 13, young riders can also opt to ride as Youth in 13 to <21.	TC recommends removal of rule 20.7.0.6, the rule is not relevant.		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	Proposal approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
TL619	MNSW Trial Committee	20.2, 20.5, 20.10.2.1	<p>20.2: Junior 7 to Under 13 Junior Open 13 to Under 16 Junior Women 7 to Under 16</p> <p>20.5 Internal Combustion machines: 7 to 12 13 to 15 7 to Under 13 13 to Under 16 7 to Under 16</p> <p>20.5 Electric Machines: 7 to Under 13 12 to Under 16</p> <p>20.10.2.1 Rider and Grade Identification Juniors: 7 to 12</p>	<p>Existing age groups should be collectively specified as: 7 - <13 7 - <16 13 - <16 (not (intermittent) use the "12 years" grading which confuses things). Or specify age as 12 (not "<13") Ensure continuity of age specifications.</p> <p>The need for continuity between age classes specifications in various Chapter / subchapter rulings. The need to standardise on age ranges for all rules where junior age classes are applicable and to reflect ages at which junior rider development typically occurs.</p>	<p>TC recommend changing 20.5 classes Junior from 7 to 12 to now read 7 to under 13,</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	Proposal approved
TL620	Don Latham	Kill-Switch Lanyard		<p>During the 2015 season, I observed a couple of instances where the lanyard has become unplugged in a moto-trials section due to it coming in contact with an errant small, but strong enough tree branch. The rider then incurs a 5 point penalty as they foot with the engine stopped. I think this is a shame. I have seen one or two instances where the rider would have scored 0 points for the section if it were not for the lanyard incident.</p> <p>One of these was at the Qld titles (great meeting by the way), the rider's line was over near a tree at the edge of the section. His lanyard was unplugged by the tree, but it was not until the engine had stopped that he realised what happened. A clean score turned into a 5.</p> <p>I would like to see a rule where the rider may be permitted to restart the section if the lanyard has become unplugged due to a tree branch etc. pulling the plug, or may restart their engine with a 1 point penalty? Maybe we say at the observers discretion? I don't know. But it is giving the lanyard a bad wrap as we score points due to the lanyard, not our skill level. Yes, I too have scored many 5's due to the lanyard. I have repositioned mine a few times and also changed the lanyard type to try and avoid the problem. But it can take a meeting or two to find this out.</p>	<p>TC does not support any change. It is the riders responsibility to ensure the lanyard is secured correctly, and not dislodged by bushes etc.</p> <p>Riders are always free to examine the course for obstructions e.g. branches before making their attempt. TC believes the lanyard rule has improved rider safety since it's introduction.</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	No change
TL621	Multiple	Classic Trials Open	See submitted proposal	<p>Amend the rules for Classic Trials to make the class more inclusive. This proposal builds on the one submitted by Mr Roger Galpin to allow Triumph Cub square barrels & heads, but seeks to extend it to other makes & models in use in Classic Trials in Oz.</p> <p>Our aim was to have a proposal that is more inclusive, fair and agreeable to all parties (i.e. owners of different makes & models) without favouring one make/model.</p> <p>It has been discussed widely among owners of different makes & models from six MA-affiliated clubs across Qld, NSW and Vic, listed below, who currently ride Classic & Post-Classic machines.</p>	<p>TC does not support changing the class names or dates, the current classes should remain.</p> <p>Rule 20.1.16 f) allows for modified machines to compete in specials.</p>		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	No change

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
TL622	Roger Galpin	20.16.1.2	20.16.1.2 Major Components a) All engine and Gearbox external Castings 20.16.1.6 Eligibility a) Pre 65 : Manufactured before 31st December 1964	Change Rule To allow Triumph Tiger cubs to be able to use Square Barrels that were introduced to Production bikes in January 1965. The only advantage in fitting a square barrel instead of the oval version is to provide better cooling for the engine. There are 12 other Tiger Cubs in QLD and I have spoken to all the owners; they are also in favour of this relaxation of the rule.	TC does not support changing the class names or dates, the current classes should remain. Rule 20.1.16 f) allows for modified machines to compete in specials. TC recommends amending: 20.16.1.2 e) Forks. and		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	R&T advise that the definition of 20.16 will include these machines as manufactured prior to 1965 (i.e. in late 1964 for release in Australia in January 1965). Wording on 20.4 needs to be amended to ensure consistency
TL623	TC	Goggles in Trial	N/A	7.2.0.3 Goggles are not required in the discipline of Trial.	TC recommend that as goggles are not required in Trial, a rule needs to exclude this particular discipline.		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	Proposal approved
TL624	TC	Missing Rule	N/A Under 20.11.3.2 in the 2015 MoMS		TC advise that this rule has dropped accidentally from the publication and printing of 2016 MoMS and needs to be returned. Commission request than MA issue a rule clarification to LCB's urgently for 2016 reason. 20.11.3.2 ... The handlebar of the motorcycle touches the ground: applies to trial, no-stop trial, and super trial, penalty 5 points		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	Proposal approved
TL626	TC	Women's participation in Trial	N/A		Peta Thomas from MV joined the meeting for a discussion of women in Trial. Key point is women continue to prefer to compete in the skill based classes in equal competition with the men's riders, not on special courses for women. TC is invested in continuing the growth in women's Trial, and will look at initiatives to support women and junior women in Trial.		Noted	-
TL627	TC	Protective Clothing	Appendix A (Section 2, Condition D)		TC recommend a Rule Change: Trousers and a shirt that cover rider from top of their boot to their waist, and a shirt with sleeves. TC aims to secure a minimum standard for clothing in Trial. Trousers must cover the riders leg completely leaving no skin exposed between waist and the riders boot. Shirts must have sleeves and give cover to protect the rider from waist to mid forearm. Tank tops, singlets, and sleeveless shirts are not acceptable.		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	Proposal approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
TL628	TC	Categories for senior Australian trial championships	20.1 (Table) Solo Sidecar Classic Post Classic Youth Veteran Age Groups Masters Women Air Cooled Mono Shock		TC recommend phasing out of some Australian Championship classes for 2017. Australian championship status to be retained for classes in which there is regular competition through-out the year, and across a wide section of the country. 20.1 (Table) Solo Sidecar Classic Post Classic Youth Veteran 40 years+ Age-Groups Masters Women Air-Cooled Mono-Shock National Championship status requires there to be regular competition in the class across the country throughout the year. Non-championship classes are to be allowed at Australian Championships to cater for riders not wishing to ride a championship class but still participate in national title meetings.		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	Proposal approved
TL629	TC	Categories for Junior Australian Trial Championships	20.2 (Table) Junior 7 to under 13 Junior Open 13 to Under 16 Junior Women 7 to under 16		As per direction of MA across all discipline, TC recommend that Junior National Championships will not be awarded for riders under 12: 20.2 (Table) Junior 7 to under 13 Junior Open 13 to Under 16 Junior Women 7 13 to under 16 TC supports MA initiative to move away from the youngest age championships. Championship classes will be for riders under 16 in men's and women's, championships to not be awarded for riders under 12. Clubs hosting national championships should include non-championship classes to support the participation of young riders in the events.		R&T advise that no changes will be made prior to the end of 2017 (no change to events currently awarded to promoters). R&T are looking for proposals to be submitted that will assist the implementation of this across all relevant disciplines.	-
TL630	TC	20.0.0.4	20.0.0.4 For the Australian championships, only those competing for those championships may use the course during the period of competition		TC recommend deleting this rule. Allowing support classes at Australian championships is the opportunity for hosts to attract larger entries to make events more viable. Support classes offer more riders the opportunity to participate in the national title meeting, making the nationals more inclusive. Riders will not be forced into Championship classes for a single event to be part of the Aussie titles.		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	Proposal approved

Item No.	Raised By	Rule # (Issue/Item)	Existing Rule	Proposed Rule Change & Rationale	Commissions Recommendation	Commission Recommendation Change	Rules & Technical Committee Recommendation	Final Decision
TL631	TC	20.3.2.3	20.3.2.3 Riders of any nationality may be awarded an Australian Championship. The Trial Commission recommends that the Promoter provides a trophy for the best Australian should an Australian not win the title.		TC recommend to delete the rule. MA/Promoters do not need an extra trophy to be presented.		R&T support the recommendation of the TC	Proposal approved
TL632	TC	20.11.2 Courses	N/A		Add Rule: 20.11.2.3 Riders must attempt the sections in sequential order. Promoter has the ability to start individual classes at different sections on the course. TC recommend that competitors riding the sections in order allows for greater competitor access to other riders to learn during the event, driving improvement in the level of riding and competitive skills across all classes. Riders completing the section in sequence also allows spectators, the public and media to follow the riders on the course and reduces instances of two way traffic of riders on the lap.		R&T advise that they do not support the proposal. The TC should consider that events are usually run in a clock-wise direction anyway, and if additional instructions are required they should be included in the Supp Regs for that particular event.	Proposal approved. R&T support the Commission's recommendation
TL633	TD	Junior National Championship Classes		Remove Australian Championship status for children under the age of 12 years Including: 7 to Under 13, Junior & Junior Women, Up to 125cc	TC agree there are too many National Championship classes. For Trial we suggest having one open Junior Championship class for Under 16 and Under 16 females, and junior classes under 12 should not be championship classes.		Refer TL629	Refer TL629

MEETING CLOSES: Saturday 12th March