ASSOCIATION OF LAND ROVER CLUBS

President: Charles Darby

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

Tuesday 2nd February 2027
starting at 20:00
To be held in via Zoom meeting

The Zoom meeting link will be circulated 2 weeks before this date

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: Charles Darby

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 6th October 2026
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 publicise any concluded issues in their club newsletters. The minutes are sent by e-mail to the secretaries and chairs 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.
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),
CCROC	Simon Day (L)
CDLRC	Phil Heys (S L), Mark Tedstone (S L), Guy Cashmore (CM)
CVLRC	Matthew Fullwood (SLCM), Stuart Newton (SCM)
LRLRC	Don Randall (SLR), Steve Limb
P&DLRC	Dennis Wright (SLCM), Neil Mellish, Gordon Renshaw (S L), Stuart Bruce, Ben & Lewis Parkes, John & Linda Webster
SLORC	Neil Scott (CM). Mike Robertson (L), Douglas Thomson (L)
SROC	Dave Canham (SLCS),
WWLRC	Ray Godwin (L),
	APOLOGIES
ALRC	Ralph Coulson (CM)
CVLRC	Tim Linney (S CM)
MROC	Richard Rowley
NWLRC	David Mitchell (R)
SROC	Debby Darby (CM), Charles Darby (R),
WWLRC	Adam 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 23 attendees, and 9 clubs were represented with apologies from a further 1 clubs. There are 25 competitive clubs within the ALRC. Present were 8 members of the S&ORC and 4 other log book scrutineers. Apologies received from a further 1 log book scrutineers.

New Log Book Scrutineers:
Mike Robertson – Scottish LROC – 10 Main Street, Stoneyburn, Bathgate, West Lothian, EH47 8BA. 01506 763620 / 07730615410. email: logbook2885@alrc.co.uk
Douglas Thomson – Scottish LROC – Northeast Holehouse Farm, Avonbridge, Scotland FK1 2JP
Tel: 07771 776590 email: logbook2941@alrc.co.uk

1. **Open the Meeting.** The meeting was opened 20:02 hrs by Matthew Fulllwood as Chair. He thanked everybody for attending the meeting and said it was good to see so many attending.

2. **Apologies for absence.**
Apologies for absence were recorded. See table above.

3. **Review the minutes of the previous meeting**
Minutes from 2nd June 2026
Dennis Wright wished to correct the discussion regarding RACMSA roll cages (5) originally being for single use as this should have be attributed to Michael Bruce.
Under 6.v. it should read ATB's, not ATV's.
The accuracy of the minutes was then proposed by Don Randall and seconded by Dave Canham and agreed.
The minutes were signed by Simone Birch

4. **Review of ongoing Topics.**

(i) Should there be a deadline for logbooking prior to the National and how does this work with the new online system?
DECISION: No deadline is to be set and emails evidencing two successful checks are sufficient for vehicle use in competition for a maximum of 30 days. This was agreed by the ALRC Council at their meeting on the 11th June. CLOSED

(ii) Digital Log Books. Should a competitor have to print out a copy of the pdf log book to hand in at an event where required? No, they can show a log book on their phone and any comments required to be added to the log book can be made digitally.
Should there be a formal process for handling log books at events?
This will vary from club to club and is dependant on Wi-Fi signal at events. It is to be monitored over the next 12-24 months to see how to progress and with more online booking for events being done, if the details were uploaded then, they could be checked prior to the day. **CLOSED**

(iii) Q-class, specifically the use of limited slip differentials. Currently, the wording says Class Q. A vehicle manufactured from Land Rover parts in accordance with MSUK Regulations. Vehicles must retain Land Rover axles, engines and drivetrain (prop-shafts, axles, gearbox and transfer box). Internals may be changed. Vehicles must retain the appearance of a Land Rover. Please refer to the article entitled Q Class.
ACTION: Gordon Renshaw and Kevin Peake and one other un-named person have agreed to look at re-writing the regulations for Q Class to remove the lack of clarity about what is and is not permitted. This is ongoing.
See Appendix 1 for Q Class definitions
See 5.(iii) Rule Change Proposal for further information regarding LSDs.

(iv) **Composite Fire Extinguishers.** Composite units are lighter and only require servicing every 10 years and could present benefits to our sport. MSUK specify the required units. This is not regulated by ALRC. MSUK NCR 7.6.3 currently require more regular servicing. This would need to be referred to MSUK Technical Team for them to review the NCR. **ACTION**: Ongoing action with Stuart Newton for February meeting

(v) There are 31 people with access to the digital log booking and 23 people have logged in to date.
We can only assume that details are correct for the 8 who have never logged in.

(vi) We currently have an issue regarding an ALRC member and their vehicle and the full compliance of it with the current rules.
There have been rumours about a certain vehicle being relogbooked before the 5 year due date but this has been investigated and is found to be untrue. It was last log booked in 2023 so is due in 2028.
It was asked who had log-booked the vehicle? Old records before the digital system did not hold this information but it has been determined that the last check was carried out by someone who is not in this meeting so will not be named. It was not the owner of the vehicle but was an experienced log book scrutineer. Everyone has a different way of carrying out the inspections but one of the benefits of the digital system is that any anomalies can be picked up sooner.

It has already been determined that rear cross members with holes in are not allowed under the current rules.
Whether it's been logbooked or not, the vehicles need to abide by the rules. Now, it may be that the vehicle is safe, and at a particular club-level event, the scrutineer and clerk of the course may still decide that that person can play, or ask them to move into a different class, such as Q-Class.
But I don't think the expectation should be that just because you've got a logbook, it gives you a permit to run an ineligible vehicle for 5 years. You know, it'd be the same as anything else that was wrong on the

vehicle.
You'd be sort of told, it's not right, we'll let you play today, but, you know, when you come back next time, it needs to be corrected. This was agreed by Ben Parkes who said they had a competitor who did change their vehicle to comply with the rules once it was pointed out to them. Simone also said that another competitor had also changed their rear cross member when it was pointed out that holes were not allowed.
Stuart Newton said there was a vehicle at the Majors event that had filled in the holes to comply with the ruling.
The following was sent to the S&ORC members on 26.08.26 via email to ask for their vote on 2 options

A) To move all vehicles with holes in cross members into Q Class until rectified, with logbooks updated at next 5 year re-check (or before), or

B) All logbooked vehicles with holes in cross members can continue to compete in their respective class until their next 5 year re-check.

Replies received from the S&ORC members A = 4, B = 3 with 3 abstentions.

It will be confirmed after this meeting that the vehicle being discussed will be classed as a Q class unless a change is made.
Anyone who has such a modification and doesn't want to be in class Q is welcome to submit a formal rule change proposal. It must be remembered that the rules are written by the members, for the members.

5. Rule Change Proposals

(i) Rule change proposal to allow ASN (National Sporting Authority - in the UK, this is Motorsport UK / MSUK) certificated ROPS in ALRC events. This was sent out for consultation on 16.06.26, ending on 25.08.2026.
Background: The current Regulations allow a Motorsport UK certificated roll cage (ROPS) to be used in Competitive Safari but may not be allowed in trials/team recovery/point to point. It doesn't make any sense to exclude these roll cages when the risk must be considerably higher travelling at high speeds rather than the sedate speed of a CCV trial. The ASN (Motorsport UK) ROPS carry a certificate to prove that all calculations and installations have met a required standard to protect vehicle occupants in the event of a vehicle accident.
Proposed by Kevin Peake (Chairman ALRC) , seconded by Charles Darby (President ALRC)
Section F – Cross Country Vehicle (CCV) Trial-Specific Technical Regulations
F.1. ROLL-OVER PROTECTION
F.1.1. All vehicles must be fitted with an ALRC approved roll-cage. See separate regulation set for details.
Change to
Section F – Cross Country Vehicle (CCV) Trial-Specific Technical Regulations
F.1. ROLL-OVER PROTECTION
F.1.1. All vehicles must be fitted with an ALRC approved or ASN certificated roll-cage. See separate regulation set for details.
Section G - Competitive Safari-Specific Technical Regulations
G.1. ROLL-OVER PROTECTION
G.1.1. All vehicles must be fitted with an ALRC approved full roll-cage. See separate regulation set for details.
Change to
Section G - Competitive Safari-Specific Technical Regulations
G.1. ROLL-OVER PROTECTION
G.1.1. All vehicles must be fitted with an ASN approved full roll-cage. See separate regulation set for details.
Section H - Timed Trial-Specific Technical Regulations
H.1. ROLL-OVER PROTECTION
H.1.1. All vehicles must be fitted with an ALRC approved roll-cage. See separate regulation set for details.
Change to
Section H - Timed Trial-Specific Technical Regulations
H.1. ROLL-OVER PROTECTION
H.1.1. All vehicles must be fitted with an ALRC approved or ASN certificated roll-cage. See separate regulation set for details.
Section I - Point to Point & Team Recovery-Specific Technical Regulations
I.1. ROLL-OVER PROTECTION
I.1.1. All vehicles must be fitted with an ALRC approved roll-cage. See separate regulation set for details.
Change to
Section I - Point to Point & Team Recovery-Specific Technical Regulations
I.1. ROLL-OVER PROTECTION
I.1.1. All vehicles must be fitted with an ALRC approved or ASN certificated roll-cage. See separate regulation set for details.

One question raised during this time, was asking how the ROPs would be recorded on the log book? A photograph of the certificate could be uploaded onto the digital record of the log book and be available for officials at events to view.
Secondly, it would be down to the vehicle builder / owner to make sure that if they fit a certified cage that their work is then approved by the cage manufacturer.
After the clarification about the differences between MSUK and ALRC regulations, support for the proposal has already been given by Southern ROC.

At this meeting (outside of the consultation period), Dave Canham did raise the question that historically he had been led to believe that the ASN type roll cages were not as reusable as ALRC ones. It was replied that obviously if a cage was to deform it would need replacing.
He also asked as we comparing like for like? Kevin replied – No, because what we are comparing is ours that we believe are correct against one that has had all the calculations and testing done and is backed by the insuring body that we run under. The rule has been changed to allow cages that currently can be used in comp safari to be able to be used in trials as well.

John Webster asked why ALRC cages are not approved for comp safari but are for all other events? Our current cages are listed but if we were to change the specification they may not be. This is not an issue for any vehicles currently running in the events. This has been bought in to allow for MSUK certified cages to be allowed in trial events as well as ALRC cages.

This will now be discussed at the ALRC Council meeting on 15th October 2026 for agreement go out to the clubs for voting on at the EGM on 17th November 2026

(ii) 80” Comp class, how to add as a permanent class and update the ALRC Competition Regulations now that the trial period to allow 80” vehicles in Comp Safari..
This has been popular at the last 2 National Rallies and we should look to include this as a permanent class. The meeting agreed that this is a good idea and a formal Rule Change Proposal should be submitted to Simone.

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.

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.

Proposed by Mark Tedstone (SORC), Seconded by Charles Darby (President ALRC).
Current Text:
L.1.3 Competitive Safari: ……
8 Coil/air sprung up to 3600cc
9 Coil/air sprung above 3600cc
Proposed Text:
8 Coil/air sprung up to 3600cc
9 Coil/air sprung above 3600cc
10 Coil/air sprung up to 84” wheelbase – all engine sizes

To avoid all 80” vehicles needing a new log book it could be an optional class which would extract 80” vehicles from classes 8 and 9 for any particular event, as long as the SRs are clear.
This was discussed at the meeting and it was agreed by Mark Tedstone that “air” should be removed from the new proposal as there was no factory fitted air suspension in an 80”
Ben Parkes said it was a good idea but was it really necessary as an 80” had won the ALRC National Rally!

8 Coil/air sprung up to 3600cc
9 Coil/air sprung above 3600cc
10 Coil sprung up to 84” wheelbase – all engine sizes

It was agreed at this meeting that the proposal be sent out for a 70 day consultation period.

(iii) The following Rule Change Proposal has been proposed by Matthew Fullwood and seconded by Tim Linney for discussion at the next S&ORC meeting on the 6th October 2026. This was put into the minutes of the ALRC EGM held on the 7th July 2026 for information only at that stage but has already had comments sent in about it.

Section B – Standard Class Vehicle Regulations

Current Text:

B.17. AXLE DIFFERENTIALS

B17.1. Lockable axle differentials may be fitted on condition they are disabled in an unlocked state to the satisfaction of the scrutineers and not used during competition.

B17.2. Any gear ratio may be used. (Implemented 1st January 2012).

Proposed Text:

B.17. AXLE DIFFERENTIALS

B17.1. Lockable axle differentials may be fitted on condition they are disabled in an unlocked state to the satisfaction of the scrutineers and not used during competition.

B17.2. Any gear ratio may be used. (Implemented 1st January 2012).

B17.3. Leaf sprung vehicles may be equipped with limited slip differentials, not limited to the original factory fitment clutch-plate design. An automatic torque biasing (ATB) design is deemed a suitable alternative.

Section C – Modified Class Vehicle Regulations

Current Text:

C.5. SUSPENSION & AXLES.

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.(Implemented 4th June 2024)

C.5.2. Any axle types may be used (provided they have Land Rover part numbers or equivalent cross-references).

C.5.3. Coil assisters (where the coil is separate from the shock absorber / damper) may be fitted to a leaf-spring vehicle. The suspension system shall then be deemed to be a coil-spring type and not a leaf-spring type.

C.5.4. Bump-stops must be fitted in the appropriate location and must be complete factory-specification items that match either the chassis or axles in use.

C.5.5. The suspension system is defined as including anti-roll bars, shock absorbers, Panhard rods, radius arms (in matched pairs per axle), leaf, coil and air springs, and associated bushes, mountings and parts capable of moving under suspension loadings. All suspension nuts and bolts must be fastened properly and tightened to a minimum of the manufacturer's appropriate torque settings. (Amended March 2010) (Implemented 1st January 2011)

C.5.6 Crown wheel slipper pads or pegs can be used. (Implemented 1st January 2012).

C.5.7. Axle casings can be modified. (Implemented 18th March 2017).

Proposed Text:

C.5. SUSPENSION & AXLES.

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.(Implemented 4th June 2024)

C.5.2. Any axle types may be used (provided they have Land Rover part numbers or equivalent cross-references).

C.5.3. Coil assisters (where the coil is separate from the shock absorber / damper) may be fitted to a leaf-spring vehicle. The suspension system shall then be deemed to be a coil-spring type and not a leaf-spring type.

C.5.4. Bump-stops must be fitted in the appropriate location and must be complete factory-specification items that match either the chassis or axles in use.

C.5.5. The suspension system is defined as including anti-roll bars, shock absorbers, Panhard rods, radius arms (in matched pairs per axle), leaf, coil and air springs, and associated bushes, mountings and parts capable of moving under suspension loadings. All suspension nuts and bolts must be fastened properly and tightened to a minimum of the manufacturer's appropriate torque settings. (Amended March 2010)

(Implemented 1st January 2011)
C.5.6 Crown wheel slipper pads or pegs can be used. (Implemented 1st January 2012).
C.5.7. Axle casings can be modified. (Implemented 18th March 2017).
C.5.8. Coil sprung live axles vehicles can run limited slip differentials, not limited to the original fitment clutch-plate design. An automatic torque biasing (ATB) design is deemed a suitable alternative.

Explanation and background:
In circa 1966 Land Rover offered a factory option of a limited slip differential (clutch-plate type). It was offered for civilian use, but I believe also available for some military vehicles and contracts. It was a factory fitting and not a modification
The part numbers I've for this are 542340 or under the wider assembly of RTC3095.
We do not know how many were produced but could it perhaps run in a Standard class only in the vehicles it was in originally?

Matthew thought that we should be defining which classes (standard or modified) could be using the ATB as whilst it fundamentally works in a different way to a clutch plate design, it delivers the same result. Dave Canham disagreed with this statement as he thought that as they worked differently , they were not interchangeable.

Kevin said that the precedence has been set as we already allow some modifications i.e. C-section rear cross members in certain models. We also have a regulation that allows for suitable alternative parts (A.5.2)

This would be covered under ALRC Regulation A.5.1 – *"Where factory fitted" - This expression (or something akin to it) appears in the following rules. Where a change is made by Land Rover Ltd. during the life-span of a model design, then the applicability of that change is retrospective. For example, disc brakes have replaced drum brakes at the rear of Defenders, so disc brakes are now permitted at the rear of Ninety's and One Ten's regardless of age. The factory mentioned is a Land Rover factory or a location specified by Land Rover for official accessories to be added.*

Also, in Section A.5.2, *"Equivalent cross-references". Rover parts may be replaced with parts by other manufacturers on condition they are the same basic design offered for sale as a direct like-for-like replacement for those Rover parts.*

Gordon Renshaw raised the question as to how this could be policed as there is no way of scrutinising the vehicle to tell the difference between a clutch plated one and an ATB. We already struggle to get drivers in RTVT's and if a vehicle with ATB's turned up regularly, everybody else would stop coming as it would be an unfair competition.

Dennis Wright said we should not be allowing anything in the regulations that do not have proven numbers and they should be homologated to appear in a class. Dave Canham said that this word does not appear in our regulations at all but he did agree with the earlier comment made by Kevin.

Steve Limb thought that the regulation should be limited to Series II as it was from 1966. We usually list all Series vehicles together. He also agreed with Dave that the ATB and clutch plate design work differently and are not interchangeable.

Ben Parkes agreed they should only be allowed in Series II in standard class and not in modified class at all. Open diffs should be kept.

John Webster said he had read the proposal as allowing LSD's in anything so we need to be careful that this does not become the norm. It appears they were very rare, even when they were first introduced so would it not be better to say they cannot be used? Matthew did not think that we should outlaw a genuine Land Rover part.

Donald Randall – There is a slight problem with LSD's anyway. In 1966, there were a clutch plate type if that only worked whilst both wheels were turning. If you had one wheel spinning, it didn't really work. In the 1980's you then had wavy brakes fitted to a limited slip diff, and it works more like a locking diff, and both wheels have traction at the same time, without whether one's wheel's spinning or not. You could still spin one wheel from a stack from pulling away.
Matthew replied an ATB works on the principle of torque biasing, so you generally if you've got a wheel dangling in the air, an ATB is not really going to kick in. You would need to have resistance on that spinning

wheel for an ATB to do anything, whereas a clutch plate, depending on how you've got it set up, could be far more aggressive in its engagement.

Other comments received via email:
At an earlier stage in the process is a rule change proposal to allow limited slip differentials (LSDs) in off-road events. Southern ROC (15.07.26) - The committee members present expressed opposition to the idea, citing concerns about creating a two-tier system where only those who can afford expensive modifications would compete. They agreed that allowing LSDs would move the sport away from its grassroots and make events more elitist. Debby was tasked with expressing the club's unanimous opposition to the proposal.

Russell Cook (13.07.26) - I strongly disagree with this proposed change, I cannot see the need for it and I only can see safety concerns because of it. It is already very difficult (especially in dry conditions) to stop a coil sprung 80 in a CCV, by allowing LSD or ATB diff is making it even more difficult to stop forward motion of the vehicle. Consequently, this will require the event organiser to make the sections more severe and most probably be climbing up and across banks which are currently unachievable. We already push the limits due to the grip obtainable from the current tyres available to us. This will just add another layer of unnecessary risk to the events for competitor, marshals and spectators.
In addition to this, CCV trialling has still remained at "Clubmans" level and generally speaking still dependent on how well you drive, rather than how big your wallet is. I would not want this to change with the introduction of fancy diffs where the sky is the limit with prices.
My final thought on this matter is the beauty of competing in ALRC events is the fact that with the vehicle classes you are competing on a fairly level playing field which makes it fair and enjoyable. I have competed in many "open" events where my "competitors" have locking diffs and fiddle brakes and to be honest, you just f eel like putting it back on the trailer as you can only drive the first handful of gates competitively. I do not want the ALRC to go this way as I believe you could lose more competitor than you would gain.
It seems strange in a world where we can debate door heights, rear cross members for months that this, to me, is a much bigger proposal that could potentially change the sport forever is restricted to one line of text.
These are my personal thoughts, not those of Midland Rover Owner's Club. If competitor wish to use these diffs then my opinion is that there are many Off-Road clubs in which they can compete rather than ALRC clubs.

Stuart Bruce (04.08.26) - Having been a long standing member and competitor I can remember life before the Green book / rule book when clubs had their own SR’s and you could queue for hours at scrutineering only to be told your car didn’t meet their regs and to be sent home.
The introduction of the Green book/ Rule book has brought clarification and stability to the sport for many years and has helped make it what it is today. With people even using “ALRC tagged” as a selling point for spec and condition.
I was led to believe that the introduction of Q class was to welcome new members and over time they would modify their cars to meet the Green Book regs. In reality the total opposite has happened with it being used as a loop hole by people having no intention of meeting the regulations. At the Stainby National we were offered a chance to have a vote at some stage, to the best of my knowledge this has never happened.
There has been talk of some Q class motors running ATB diffs, obviously to gain an advantage. And now out of the blue someone has found that they were an optional extra offered by Land Rover (that long ago, most people competing were not born) the proposed rule changes to allow these diffs to be used and Q class needs to be put to a vote, open to all people who have an ALRC log book who have been following the Green book regs and not just a few people on a committee. Q class is an insult to everybody running their cars to the rule book. The only Q class rule is that it uses Land Rover parts and no log book is required.
Page 90 of the Green book says all vehicles need a log book to compete.
The ATB diffs will affect everybody that competes in RTV and CCV alike. The massive costs involved will reduce entries as sections get even tougher and who wants to pay for entry fees to only reach gates 8 or 9.

Matthew replied that there was no evidence that members were building Q class vehicles to enter events. We have documented evidence of people entering in Q class and either the vehicles have been changed or the rules have been amended to incorporate them into other classes. This has been on-going to many years and has been successful in recruiting members into clubs.
Simone agreed with this and said that over the years there had been very few Q class vehicles entered in events. Q class was originally asked for by the clubs in 2016 and covered RTVT, CCVT and Comp Safari. After the initial trial period the results showed that entries were mainly in RTVT’s so it was allowed for that event. Following a further period it was asked for in CCVT and then extended to comp safari to further assess the uptake. At each point this has been requested at meetings by the member clubs.

It must be remembered that Q class are part of the ALRC regulations

Richard Rowley (09.09.26) - Locking Diffs – in my opinion locking diffs / torque biassing diffs should not be approved for use.
After spending the last 2 days laying out the majors and only a few months back the national, it is already hard enough to lay out an event that challenges the current cars, introducing locking diffs would mean we need even more severe ground and sections which in my opinion equates to the sections becoming dangerous, land suitable to our needs is already difficult to find.
I understand there is a question around how to tell if there is a torque biassing diff fitted, I have spoken to Nigel Barker of excess 4x4 who has told me any locking diff type will show up on rollers, if the ALRC wants to get a representative from the S&ORC to talk to him to understand more he is open to passing on his knowledge.

Kevis said he had also had a conversation with someone who used to work with Nigel Barker and he would be willing to help in this matter. He would be happy to give his opinion if a diff was being tested and has a simple test to see if it complies with our rules so we are trying to put steps in place to try and help our scrutineers. If anyone believes there is an issue with a vehicle, tell us who they are and it can be investigated.

Kevin said that with his MSUK hat on, we fly very much under the radar in lots of aspects and although permits seem to be always going up, they are held at a level based on the risk and everything else. He thought that if we put something like this in and we became far more extreme, we become far more publicised and are more likely to have increased incidents at events which could lead to clubs being looked at more closely. Personally, he did not think it's right for the ALRC at this time. Ground is becoming harder to find, as are volunteers to run the events and this would give us another hurdle to overcome.
He also said he fully supported Matthew's intention of not stopping anybody in a standard Land Rover vehicle with the parts that they bought from new on. Maybe the alternative to that is to amend the regulation that says lockable diffs are not allowed unless factory fitted in that specific model. We cannot blanket ban any sort of LSD as they are available as standard in some Land Rover models e.g. Discovery III and we should not be trying to stop those with these vehicles taking part. In the future as new models do have LSDs fitted the rules may need to be looked at again.

Matthew wanted to point out that there seemed some confusion between people mixing up limited slip diffs with locking diffs, especially as a reference to fiddle brakes and locking diffs for non-ALRC events. These are significantly different. The difference in cost is also not seen as a barrier as an ATB is not that expensive. Many members already have parts fitted but fly under the radar and these can cost substantial amounts

Neal Mellish disagreed with this and said that anything other than an open diff will make a difference. We're at the limit as to what the suspension can do on CCVT vehicles. Ben Parkes agreed with this and said we were in danger of making the events more dangerous as it is already becoming more difficult to stop a vehicle. We're a Land Rover club and should run open diffs.

Steve Limb reiterated that they should only be allowed where they are fitted as a standard in a Series vehicle as the meeting did not support general use.

The meeting seemed to agree that only open diffs should be allowed.

Vote from the S&ORC to decide if the rule change proposal should proceed through the due process.
Standard Class
B17.3. Leaf sprung vehicles may be equipped with limited slip differentials, not limited to the original factory fitment clutch-plate design. An automatic torque biasing (ATB) design is deemed a suitable alternative.

For = 2, Against = 6. Not agreed to proceed.

Modified Class
C.5.8. Coil sprung live axles vehicles can run limited slip differentials, not limited to the original fitment clutch-plate design. An automatic torque biasing (ATB) design is deemed a suitable alternative.

For = 1, Against = 6, Abstain = 1 Not agreed to proceed.

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

(i) Russell Cook (13.07.26). I do not feel it is correct that a Logbook scrutineer should be able to sign off their own motors for either a 5 year re-inspection or for any rectification work carried out. It should always had an independent inspection, this is the way with any quality or financial audits in any company in the UK, you are not permitted to audit your own work.

There is another email (21-08.26) in a similar vein which raises the question of the integrity of some scrutineering processes and says that this concern is brought about because a vehicle has been sold with an incorrect logbook, disadvantaging the new owner through no fault of their own.

This topic has been discussed in the past and agreed that it was acceptable to check their own vehicles. Matthew said that in the main, it is thought that the log book scrutineers do a very good job.
Dennis Wright thought it may be time to stop this practice as it may have been abused in the past.

Kevin said that under the new digital system there is better accountability and mistakes can easily be rectified. We have not had a major issues with only two isolated cases that have arisen. This will be looked at again in the future should there be a recurring issue.

Stuart Newton said that recently there was a logbook that appeared in the digital system and its changed owners twice and all they've done is cross out the original owner and address and wrote their own on. This has been going on for some time but now we are going digital this will hopefully not happen as often.

A reply will be sent by Simone to Russell and the other email received stating that whilst it would be good practice to have somebody else carry out a log book check, it was permissible to check your own vehicle.

7. Any other business.

(i) Neil Scott said they had received a query asking if the 2litre MPI engine that could be turbo charged could be used or trying to get a clarification as to why not? The query has come about as you've got the MPI in Rover cars with the turbo and we already are allowing big Jaguar engines to be fitted.

Matthew replied that physically you can turbocharge it, but our regulations do prohibit force induction engines – See C.3.4. To change this would require a rule change proposal to be submitted.

Neil questioned if it would be worthwhile trying to put in a rule change proposal and the answer from Matthew was that it may need to be a very specific rule citing the specific T-series MPI engine to gain any traction.

Simone said there is a process to add an engine to the engine list – see A.2

(ii) Stuart has received a query over the digital logbooks. At the moment if you bend the front hoop, you need to book a recheck to get it sorted. Should the scrutineer carry out a 5 year check at the same time as there is a payment of £10 charged for this. This would make sense and the date would start from the date of the recheck.

Matthew asked if some guidance could be added to the website.
Simone said that Debby had already started to produce such a document with questions and answers but was waiting for a reply from Matthew and Stuart before proceeding any further. This will be discussed and finalised at the ALRC Council meeting on the 15th October 2026.

(iii) Kevin said that as the ALRC were co-ordinating the 2027 ALRC National Rally at Tong with various clubs taking on the events. It would be ideal in the ALRC log book scrutineers could assist with this. He would be happy to sort out a rota for the weekend. Names will be asked for in February and Matthew said he would be happy to help.

(iv) Ben Parkes asked why Q class vehicles were allowed to be entered for team trophies at the National Rally. This matter is being addressed at the ALRC Council meeting on the 15th October 2026. Unfortunately, this was missed this year, from an earlier agreement that Q class were only eligible for class awards and nothing else.

(v) Phil Heys wished to give some positive feedback on the digital log booking system. Mark Tedstone and himself from C&DLRC have been trying to promote this and get all their cars through. Of the approximately 90 vehicles currently in the system, 17 of them are from C&DLRC which is probably about 80% of our active CCVT and comp vehicles. It's been very well received and they would like to thank Stuart, Ralph and Debby for all their help. Any teething problems have been resolved very quickly.

Kevin said it was a testament to the Association and the volunteers within it, that we have managed to produce. on a very limited budget, with just purely volunteers something that is probably better than our governing body has done with tens of thousands of pounds and lots of salaried employees. Many thanks to those who have contributed to the system.

Gordon asked if there was going to be a search bar available to be able to find a vehicle quickly, instead of scrolling through because as the list grows this will get more difficult. It was liked that it was in numerical order and the system will continue to evolve over the next few years with such refinements added. Stuart and Ralph have already had a discussion about setting up a search bar.

Gordon then asked if there was a charge for replacing a damaged tag, as there has not been in the past. This could be added to the question and answers sheet. This could be inputted via the comments box on the website or if still using a paper form, an email to Stuart is required. It was not thought necessary to make a charge for this.
Phil suggested that if a vehicle was close to a 5 year check then this could be done as well then. Thought to be a good idea.

Gordon also asked why 3 photographs were now required for the logbook as he had received many queries about this. It was clarified that the classes, especially for comp safaris are engine size related and we have in the past had an issue when somebody had been awarded a trophy wrongly and this did cause problems when sorting it out. We have had members entered in the wrong class so this is to try and stop this.

(vi) Kevin – Just one matter that has been raised at other meetings and was mentioned again tonight was a conversation at the Stainby National Rally of a vote taking place with regard to Q class. Q class is still developing and once we are in full agreement on the regulation for this, it will go out to the membership for voting on.
Matthew agreed with this sentiment but thought that we would need to be careful on why and what we're asking clubs to vote on. Q class has been included for the last 10 years and is still evolving. If members don't like Q class as it is, they are welcome to put in a rule change to give an alternative.

8. Date of next meeting.

2nd February 2027 @ 8pm – zoom

2027 meetings
13th March @ 13.00 – in person / zoom
8th June @ 20.00 – zoom
5th October @ 20.00 – zoom

9. Close of Meeting. The meeting closed at 21.45 hrs

Appendix 1 - To be discussed on 2nd February 2027.

Q Class Definition

Design – Must retain the appearance of a Land Rover vehicle minimum body width 60.5"

Governance – Must comply with all ASN Regulations

Chassis – Must be of a design used on a Land Rover vehicle ladder frame or a Land Rover produced monocoque Wheelbase Minimum 79", Maximum 131"

Engine – Must have external casting of Land Rover product from engine list, internals, position and orientation free. Induction as ALRC regulations

Gearbox - Must have external casting of Land Rover product, internals free

Transfer box - Must have external casting of Land Rover product, internals free

Axles – Live axle - Must have external casting of Land Rover product – internals to be discussed at next S&ORC meeting

Independent – Diffs must have external casting of Land Rover product – internals to be discussed at next S&ORC meeting

Steering – Must have mechanical link between steering wheel and road wheels, or if hydraulic comply with ASN requirements

Seats – Must have proprietary seat fitted for driver and any passengers

Seat belts – Must comply with ALRC requirement for the event entered

Suspension – Land Rover components with springs and dampers free

Dampers – Free, with any pressurised vessels, guarded to prevent risk to occupants, officials and spectators

Exhaust – Must comply with any noise test for the event entered and exit after the passenger compartment

Radiator and plumbing – Free, but must be guarded to prevent risk to occupants, officials and Spectators

Fuel tanks– must comply with ASN Regulations

Wheels – Free

Tyres – Maximum diameter of 37”

Recovery points - Adequate front and rear recovery attachments must be provided for recovery purposes in all event