

ASSOCIATION OF LAND ROVER CLUBS

President:



Please Reply to: Simone Birch
1A Duncan Avenue
Huncote
Leics
LE9 3AN

E-mail: secretary@alrc.co.uk
07786 443474

Scrutineering & Off Road Committee Meeting

16th November 2024 starting at 13:00
Via Zoom Meeting

AGENDA

1. Open the meeting.
2. Apologies for absence.
3. Acceptance of minutes the previous meeting.
4. Ongoing Topics.
5. Rule change Proposals
6. Enquiries received since the last meeting.
7. Any other business this meeting.
8. Date and location of next meeting.
9. Close the meeting.

ASSOCIATION OF LAND ROVER CLUBS

President:



Please Reply to: Simone Birch
1A Duncan Avenue
Huncote
Leics
LE9 3AN

E-mail: secretary@alrc.co.uk
07786 443474

Minutes of the Scrutineering & Off Road Committee meeting 29th June 2024

The accuracy of these minutes will be confirmed by their acceptance at the next meeting.

Distribution: Via club secretaries who forward them accordingly to their club members, Scrutineering & Off Road Committee members, Log Book Scrutineers, Club Representatives, Council members and other interested parties. Note: Recipients of these minutes need to ensure that these matters are discussed at club committee meetings and also to publicise any concluded issues in their club newsletters. In the majority of cases, the minutes are sent by post and e-mail to the secretaries of all competitive clubs, S&ORC, Log Book Scrutineers, club delegates and members attending the meetings.

The elected Scrutineering & Off Road committee members and log book scrutineers, marked (S or L), represent the ALRC as a whole; the club name is included for information only.

Matters that are concluded will be marked CLOSED.

Any enquiries should be directed to chairman@alrc.co.uk and copied to Simone Birch at the above address, so that they can be entered into the minutes of the meeting with the correct wording.

CLUB	PRESENT
ALRC	Simone Birch (CM)
BLRC	Kevin Peake (CM)
C&DLRC	Guy Cashmore (CM), Phil Heys (S L), Mark Tedstone (S L), Fraser Parish (L)
CVLRC	Stuart Newton (CM), Matthew Fullwood (S L).
ELRC	Mark Pycraft
LLRC	Lee Houltyby (L)
LRLRC	Don Randall (R)
MROC	Richard Smith (L)
P&DLRC	Dennis Wright (S L CM), Gordon Renshaw (S L)
SROC	Dave Canham (S L CS), Debby Darby (CM), Charles Darby
WWLRC	Mykul Jones (L)
	APOLOGIES
ANG LRC	Andrew Flanders (L CM)
C&DLRC	David Jeffery (L)
CVLRC	Tim Linney (CM S)
NWLRC	David Mitchell (R)
W&WLRC	Ray Godwin (L)

S = Scrutineering Committee member. L = Log-book Scrutineer. CM = Council member.

CS = Chief Scrutineer (of the named club), R = Club Representative.

There were 18 attendees, and 10 clubs were represented with apologies from a further 2 clubs. There are 25 competitive clubs within the ALRC. Present were 6 members of the S&ORC and 4 other log book scrutineers. Apologies received from a further 3 log book scrutineers.

1. **Open the Meeting.** The meeting was opened by Kevin Peake who apologised for the date change but as there is no current chairperson for this committee, he was standing in and is unavailable for the original date.

2. **Apologies for absence.**

Apologies for absence were recorded. See table above.

3. **Review the minutes of the previous meeting**

Kevin asked whether everybody had read the previous minutes and whether there were any amendments required. There were no amendments requested. The minutes were proposed by Dave Canham, seconded by Dennis Wright, and agreed unanimously. Signed by Simone Birch.

4. **Review of ongoing Topics.**

- a) **Hydraulic Handbrakes** – whether hydraulic handbrakes are permitted that are part of the footbrake line – ongoing with KP to investigate further.
- b) **Q Class Clarifications** – Dave Canham had agreed to look at the Green Book and note updates that are required to bring it in line. This remains ongoing.

5. **Rule Change Proposals.**

a) The Council meeting on 4th June 2024 ratified the rule change below:

New Regulation wording:

C.5.1

Any Land Rover suspension system and components may be used on any model and the suspension mounts modified to accommodate the components, the use of air suspension is prohibited except in classes and periods where fitted as original equipment. McPherson strut may be replaced with coil-over unit on independent suspension vehicles using standard wishbones.

Relating to this issue, a question was raised about how this would affect regulation 'C.8.1 The chassis may be constructed from one or more original Land Rover chassis or one(s) of Land Rover design maintaining a chassis rail separation of Land Rover Ltd design specification. The profile and rectangular cross section above and between the axles must remain as the original. All welding on the chassis must be of a high standard.' This needs to be clarified to further explain whether this separation is the dimension of the donor vehicle or that it should match the dimensions of the original chassis design of the body above in the final build. It is not intended that C.8.1. should prevent the use of a D3 chassis under an 88" Series style build.

This will be addressed during the process of the production of the next Green Book and any clarification will be ratified by the Council prior to publication.

b)

Mark Tedstone has submitted a rule change proposal. Mark spoke to explain his aim is to encourage more entries into competitive safari by creating a class for 80" wheelbase modified vehicles. Currently these vehicles are not separated from the longer vehicles and so are sufficiently disadvantaged as to discourage their entry. Engine size is not so relevant for the shorter vehicles so all engine sizes could be accommodated in a single class. Additionally, given the decreasing availability of 3.5l V8 engines, Mark is suggesting that the two classes for modified vehicles that are defined by engine size should be changed to move the vehicles up to 4l into the small engine class, and those over 4l in the larger engine class. Simone read the proposal submitted by Mark as follows:

Kevin feels this is in line with our current aim to increase participation.

Proposed change to Competitive Safari Class Structure

BACKGROUND:

The majority of the vehicles in our sport are coil sprung and modified. Looking at the entry lists for competitive safaris across the country, there are very few 80" vehicles entering. Given that these shorter vehicles are the preferred choice for trialling, there are many of them in competition. Currently these modified vehicles are split into classes by engine size. Class 8 is up to 3600cc and Class 9 is above 3600cc. There is no separation for wheelbase and very few 80" coil sprung vehicles enter comp safaris. Perhaps because they are so disadvantaged in comparison to the longer vehicles as they cannot cross the ground with anything like the fluidity of the longer vehicles. This appears to be acting as a disincentive to entry.

Also, the smaller 3.5l and 3.6l engines are becoming scarce so as engines fail, they are likely to be replaced with larger engines. It is therefore proposed that the 3.9l engines be moved into the 3.5l class leaving 4.0l and above in a different class.

REASON FOR THIS PROPOSAL:

To increase entry numbers by removing the barrier to entry for short wheelbase (80") trial vehicles. At the same time, in response to the availability of engines, a small change in the cut-off for engine sizes is proposed.

Although engine size has a significant impact for the longer vehicles that are able to cover the ground smoothly, it is not believed to be a significant factor for the 80" wheelbase vehicles.

CURRENT REGULATION:

L.1.3 Competitive Safari:

- 8 Coil/air sprung up to 3600cc
- 9 Coil/air sprung above 3600cc

PROPOSED REGULATION:

- 8 Coil/air sprung up to 84" wheelbase – all engine sizes
- 9 Coil/air sprung over 84" wheelbase – engines up to 4000cc
- 10 Coil/air sprung over 84" wheelbase – engines over 4000cc

The meeting generally agreed that separating the short wheelbase vehicles is a good idea, but with the diversity of engines in the market, there was no agreement about where the separation in engine size should be set.

It was agreed that the 2025 ALRC National Rally will have supplementary regulation to add a class for 80" coil sprung vehicles as a trial and further work to understand existing engine sizes of existing competitors will be undertaken. To gather data, the 2025 entry form will request manufacturer and size of the engine for a comp vehicle on the entry form. Other clubs are welcome to include the 80" class in their SRs to see whether this promotes additional entries. If this proves to be popular, the rule will be considered for a permanent change.

c) **ALRC – CHANGING THE RULES**

In the past, the ALRC has been criticised for the slow pace of change. The Green Book has a page which explains how rule change proposals should be submitted. This needs an overhaul and Debby has been looking into it.

Debby has been giving some thought to the rule change process that we have in place currently and think that it is perhaps time to consider this. One of the things that the ALRC has been criticised for over the years is the slow pace of change and how long it takes to have new ideas ratified.

There is an opportunity with our new and pro-active approach to membership engagement to address this.

DD has been looking at the difference in power between an AGM and an EGM and there is little, or no difference. There are several definitions online, but basically they all say

- When a company has a shareholder (for us, we should read stakeholder) meeting that isn't its scheduled annual meeting, it's called an extraordinary general meeting (EGM).
- The extraordinary general meeting is utilized to deal with urgent matters that come up between annual shareholders' (stakeholder) meetings.

Therefore, our EGMs have the same powers of ratification as AGMs.

The current process for changing a General Rule is relatively quick, but the process for a Vehicle Reg change is really long winded.

According to our current rule book rule change proposals have to be in by 1st June for consideration. They then go through a pretty long winded process before being presented to the AGM in the following calendar year (March) for implementation on January 1st of the next calendar year.

By that process, a rule change proposal submitted now would be considered to be submitted by 1st June 2025 for final voting in March 2026 and implementation in January 2027. Given we are trying to be more

proactive and prove we are 'listening' that seems ludicrous. It is no wonder people lose the will to live when trying to put a change through.

In recent times, most changes have either been put through as safety or clarification.

I would like to put forward the following:

Vehicle Regulation Rule change proposals should be submitted to ALRC Secretary signed by a proposer and a seconder, both of whom must be members of an ALRC competitive club.

The proposal must include the complete text of the new/revised rules as they would appear if accepted.

The proposal will be circulated to the Council and SORC by email and discussed at the next meeting of the SORC. If agreed, it will be circulated to all Clubs via the Club Secretary and posted on the ALRC website with a 70 day consultation period for objections.

If no objections are received the proposal should go to the next Council meeting and then onto the next available General Meeting (either AGM or EGM) for voting and the Council should then ratify to enable implementation on the following 1st January if approved.

If objections are raised, the proposal should be referred back to the original proposer and the SORC committee for amendment if appropriate.

This could cut the time it takes to change a regulation by 2 years. i.e. a proposal put in now would be considered at SORC in June, then to EGM in October for implementation January 2025 and it is important that we do not create a system that does not allow sufficient time in the process for proper consideration.

This change was welcomed.

6. **Enquiries received since previous meeting.**

- a) From Mark Pycraft – Tubular shock mounts on RTV. Mark seeks clarification about whether tubular shock mounts are permitted within the standard classes, specifically where they are the same height as standard. He also seeks clarification on the use of non-standard, adjustable panhard rods. Given that he is unable to find any reference to these items in the printed regulations he is concerned that he is being moved/failed on the basis of unwritten regulations and it is his view that a scrutineer should be able to quote the relevant regulation that is being violated at scrutineering.

Kevin had answered as follows. The Competition rules start in the ALRC Handbook: Section B - Standard Class Vehicle Regulations This section lists the permitted changes from the original standard production / factory design and dimensions of the whole vehicle and its component parts.

MSUK Yearbook is the same - if it doesn't say you can then you can't is the general format.

As B.10 has no allowance for changing the standard turrets then any change from standard parts puts the entry into modified, and in your case Class 10. If a rule change were proposed then we would need to know the height of all standard damper mounts to give the scrutineer a method of checking, and that would be difficult within the 6 minutes allocated per car at events.

Again, with the adjustable panhard rod, there is nothing in Section B to say you can have it in standard class, nor can I see anywhere else that it would be allowed, unless it is a standard Land Rover part and is used on the associated axle that it was designed for then the only way it could be used would be in a Q Class.

In summary, the current regulations do not permit the use of either tubular shock mounts or adjustable panhard bushes in the standard classes.

Mark agreed with these views but suggested that this be clarified in the next Scrutineering Bulletin.

Dennis reminded the meeting that the issue of tubular shock mountings have been issued before but have never been moved through to a rule change. If a rule change proposal were made, with the relevant measurements by an interested party, then the change could be processed via the correct process.

- b) Steve Limb has raised a query regarding the future of Team Recovery. Kevin noted that there is only one Team Recovery permit issued per year by MSUK which is for the ALRC National Rally. Steve feels that the

recent change to require full harnesses to be worn is discouraging entries. Another suggestion is to do away with the timing element and 'count' an alternative, such as the number of pulls. Kevin indicated that MSUK regulations state that this is a timed event, so this is not viable. A third option would be to allow a passenger/runner to participate so that the drivers do not need to remove and refit their belts, or finally, remove the requirement to wear a belt as this is not required by MSUK, but is an additional requirement made by ALRC. Kevin is currently working with MSUK to see whether the helmet requirements can be relaxed to help with these barriers.

There was discussion about the ideas with concerns raised about having a runner. However, the risk could be mitigated by having a 'safe zone or runners post' that they would need to be in to protect them. Reverting to a lap-strap requirement was more favourably received.

Kevin would welcome a rule change proposal and Steve L volunteered to write a suitable change to the regulation for submission.

c) Roll Cage Front Hoop clarification.

Charles Darby Charles was presented with a vehicle at Scrutineering for a CCV trial that had a Series I bulkhead with a roll cage front hoop bolted to the windscreen tabs. Charles 'failed' this vehicle as being non compliant with ALRC regulation 5.2.3 (page 122) which states 'Where a standard/original bulkhead is used, the front hoop must bear down onto the chassis or suitably strengthened or fabricated outriggers as shown in para 7.1'.

The competitor argued that it came under the grandfather rights for a type A cage which Charles believes is only relating to the rear stays.

This vehicle has been recently re-log booked as a renewal and was passed. The blue tag broke when the competitor was trying to move it to confirm the number. It still has a yellow tag.



This vehicle is approximately 30 years old. Dennis stated that he believes that this configuration was permitted at the time. There was discussion about whether 'grandfather rights' apply to the front hoop or just the rear stays and hoop.

The following rule was quoted '5.2.3. Where a standard/original bulkhead is used, the front hoop must bear down onto the chassis or suitably strengthened or fabricated outriggers as shown in para. 7.1.' The pictures do not comply with that regulation.

Fraser feels that the vehicle is not currently compliant with the regulations. He has visited the vehicle owner who has agreed to change the bulkhead to a fabricated bulkhead. The owner has questioned whether he needs to change the rear hoops prior to re-log booking. The hoop design will not be changed. The meeting agreed that it will only require one signature to have a new tag affixed.

The meeting agreed that if a rule is to be applied, whether it is 'grandfather rights' or any other regulation, then it must be printed in the current regulations. That being said, as nobody can locate any wording which would indicate that the design in the pictures is permitted, then that vehicle does not comply and should not be permitted to enter an event that requires ROPS. Kevin agreed to include this topic in the next Scrutineers Bulletin.

Fraser asked for clarification about whether a log book can only be written on by a log book scrutineer, or is an event scrutineer permitted to write on it? It was clarified that any event official can write in a log book.

Log Booking – Dennis requested that any tags that are returned to him only need the plate with the number – please do not return the knuckle.

7. Any other business.

- a) **Online Log Booking Process.** This is well underway. It will not be mandatory and log book scrutineers can choose to continue to use the paper process. Kevin demonstrated the new system. The process is led by the owner of the vehicle, who completes an online form available on the website to 'buy' the service required and then complete their information and upload vehicle pictures. Log Book scrutineers can then mark the checks online. A physical log book will be issued. Renewals will generate a new physical log book. It is intended that the information held online will be available to scrutineers and event officials. Data available online at events will be an abbreviated version with only data applicable to that level of official.

This was well received by the meeting and will be progressed. It is hoped that this will be available for use soon after the next Council meeting.

Dennis advised the meeting that he has resigned as Log Book Secretary (LBS) and was currently acting in an interim basis pending the appointment of a new LBS. A new LBS will be actively advertised.

- b) **Rock Sliders.** When fitted to a Defender type vehicle. Which class should these vehicles be put into. B.12.5. Underbody protection may be added. Therefore, this is permitted. B.20.1 permits entry steps so where they are fitted, the vehicle still remains in the standard class. However, the meeting accepted that where these are fitted with the expectation of using a tree to complete a turn, then the course design is at fault. This will also be included in the next Scrutineering Bulletin.
- c) **Tomcat vehicles – can they be fit into an ALRC class (not Q).** This was raised by Dave Canham, but he would not be drawn on the exact nature of his query, but the query relates to Competitive Safari and therefore there is no Q class available. Any Tomcats of 100" wheelbase are accommodated under 'C.8.3. 100" wheelbase with Defender or Series bodywork is permitted. All other minimum dimensions as per a Series 1, please refer to the Vehicle Sizes Chart. The silhouette as viewed from the side must still resemble the shape of a Land Rover.' The meeting discussed the Tomcat variants with no side door, but a bar with a triangular entry/exit aperture. If a panel were to be fabricated to fill in the aperture so that the vehicle showed bodywork to the body capping line, would that meet the current regulations. There was discussion about whether the additional width would mean that the vehicle would be excluded as it would exceed the tolerance on vehicle width due to the 'kick out' created by the tubes. There was no consensus of opinion about where the overall width of the vehicle is measured, and whether the 1" tolerance would be applicable to the bulge in this vehicle.

Given that the members present at the SORC could not agree on this issue, Kevin agreed that a plan view should be issued and the tolerance updated to remove the maximum (as having a vehicle that is too wide is a disadvantage so a bulge to accommodate a protection bar or additional elbow room within the cab, would not be outside the regulations). The minimum width will be measured at three points on the vehicle (rear body, front corners where the wings are and the bulkhead) and this will be made clear on the plan view.

It is possible that the extension of the Q class regulations should be considered to enable Comp Safari to run the relevant vehicles without allowing them to win the event overall. Q class vehicles can have roll cages that meet MSUK regulations, but not perhaps also meeting ALRC regulations.

Dave C also questioned the regulation concerning the overall length of the vehicle. It was agreed that the regulations are clear about the overall measurements in this respect and without pictures of the particular issues created when moving the front bumper to comply with that dimension, it is impossible to give an answer to Dave's question. If it is unclear to the owner whether the vehicle is compliant, then submitting pictures and specific questions will enable the SORC to advise further. It was also suggested that the owner check the conformity of the roll cage mountings on this vehicle.

- d) **RTV Working Group.** What is the latest on this group? The two members who started this group are not present and whilst during this process they explained that their success had come from setting up RTV trials in two categories RTV1 and RTV2 to indicate the severity of the event to potential entrants. However, there does not appear to be any update on this idea from other clubs. They also suggested keeping a specific date (e.g. second Sunday) for every month throughout the year but this again has not proved possible for many clubs who have

other criteria affecting land availability. There has been no further work on this issue since the findings were circulated.

- e) **Liaison between ALRC and MSUK.** There is an understanding at MSUK that ALRC are a significant 'customer' for them and there is now a monthly meeting between ALRC and MSUK. If there are any issues that KP should consider for raising at these meetings, please let the ALRC Secretary know. Currently, the discussions are surrounding reducing the requirements for team recovery, and some categories of competitive safari. If a competitive safari is run at a lower average speed (perhaps 22 mph) and shorter course lengths, this would encompass around 70% of the entrants at the ALRC National Rally, and may enable some of the requirements set for higher speed events to be relaxed due to the decreasing risk presented. Currently, competitive safaris vary significantly from events well within a 22 mph average, up to events that are very close to Stage Rallying with very high average speeds. This would promote entry level events, potentially increasing participation and therefore acting as a 'feeder' for the faster/higher level events.

Dennis reiterated his view that MSUK are creating an additional barrier by requiring MSUK Scrutineers and operating a system which makes it very onerous for volunteers to achieve the status. He continues to campaign for the re-introduction of a Cross Country Scrutineer grade. KP confirmed that this issue is also on the discussion agenda for the monthly meeting. There are implications for the sharing of information and training for a discipline specific category, but this could be addressed if ALRC were to be made a Regional Association. Kevin will continue to pursue this and keep the subject on the agenda with MSUK

8. Date and location of next meeting. Dates for 2024 AGM / EGM / S&ORC – 16th November via Zoom.

2025 dates 15th March, 5th July and 15th November. The March date each year will be face to face and a hybrid option is being investigated to enable those who cannot attend can also participate.

9. Close of Meeting. The meeting closed at 15:50