

Minutes for the Year 2020

VC1

:

1. All accepted the constitution as last amended in 2016. It was noted that the last major change was in 2012. PDF email to follow for online signing
2. It was proposed unanimous agreement for a one year extension of the Yokohama tyre contract.
3. After a brief discussion it was accepted that WA Delegates suggestion that a distribution of the sponsorship via the 2019 members numbers verified by the capitation fees would be the most equitable option. The Victorian Delgate expressed that an announcement by video by Queensland in a similar format would be ideal. Queensland accept to undertake this. NA will contact Alan Bradshaw if there is any further leveraging of the announcement that may benefit Yokohama.
4. While there were several reservations about agreeing to Grandfathering without a final wording there was no opposition and therefore accepted. There was wide ranging discussion of the holes in the current rules on blocks, possible holes in the options on the table. The option for passing back the responsibility for determining outcome to Motorsport Australia, and therefore the AMRC was raised
There was mention of frustration with the lack of engagement on the existing propose options.
Further discussion time was requested by the delegates.
The NA will send an email to frame the discussion around.
The undertaking is to complete the discussion by the 22nd of June 2020
5. Next meeting 8pm Eastern Standard time (7:30pm Central, 6pm WA) on the 22nd of June 2020

VC2 2020

1. It was discussed that Yokohama want the sponsorship tied to an event. Event options were discussed. Ray Hislop queried if Yokohama's sponsorship needs to be spent by a particular date. NA to follow up.
2. Further to a delegate request the NA has had discussions about an additional budget tyre option from Yokohama. Yokohama submitted indicative costing and have advised there will be a drop off in tyre performance with a budget option. Yokohama have offered to supply tyres for a test if the option is to be pursued.
3. MRF have been actively engaging to be included in the tyre tender and are looking at expanding their tyre size options. They have also contacted competitors to undertake testing of their tyres
4. The tyre chart was discussed with a proposal to drop the aspect ratio requirements. Alignment of LM rules to standardise tyre options by allowing flaring, consistent with EM rules. This would give better tyre coverage to competitors with some manufacturers/tyre tenderers. Delegates to discuss with their committees before the next meeting with the intention of voting on the issue.
5. The Victorian Delegate discussed the tyre sizes ordered from the 2016 Nationals being a good snap shot of the tyres used in the category. PDF attached for reference.
6. There was a wide ranging discussion on the block issue at hand. Items discussed included, airbox restrictors, rpm limits, capacity limits, octane limits, whether the survey results are to be the direction the delegates follow
7. It was discussed that a total of four competitors located in TAS, WA, NSW 7 QLD maybe affected by a rule change.
8. It was proposed that if there are any further competitors are to be affected that a more comprehensive list be made so as to identify any implications of rule changes. WA didn't think it was required
9. Victoria has fielded block queries and is concerned about their large number Commodore entrants rushing towards non-production blocks. Victoria is also concerned about looking after the mid pack competitors which may be disaffected by a block/engine arms race.
10. WA is concerned about not losing any competitors from any rule changes.
11. NSW is concerned about the burden of proof that may be required for competitors that are running imported front cut engines. With the specific mention of Honda K20 and SR20 blocks with 4A blocks ex-Japan and 7A Australian blocks.
12. Proposal by Vic to separate out the consideration of blocks that are delivered in vehicles when sold (which would mean existing import blocks could be managed separately) vs blocks that are not.
13. Queensland outlined their concerns of defining the issue further with a discussion paper.

14. Further items discussed were Family compliance query of 4.2B and burden of compliance part 1.4 in reference to Audi VW engine swaps
15. No consensus on the determination of a rule change was forming. Queensland proposal to form a document to weigh the pure decision of whether to/or not amend the block rules was accepted. The goal being to circulate among the delegates for a week or so to amend or comment and discuss with the state committees before coming to a decision.
16. Rule updates were talked about with the completion of the electric steering conversion back to hydraulic steering swap on Commodores to be amended in the rule set. Document to be circulated by the 26th of June
17. Next VC3 meeting date goal of between the 6-8th of July

VC3

1. After discussion of Commodore and future electric steering rack swap implications there was agreement to address the Commodore issue at this point of time only. The intention is to not allow modifications to existing crossmembers/mounting points. Cross members may be swapped between families of vehicles where they are interchangeable, and pick up the same mounting points to facilitate the replacement of an electric rack to hydraulic or vice versa. Also that the control arms can be swapped across, but the same type of suspension must be retained as the original vehicle. i.e. Macpherson strut cannot be swapped to double wishbone or vice versa
VIC was to come back with interchangeability of front suspension arms between VF and VE Commodore
2. It was expressed that adding flares to LM aligns the rules for EM and LM. WA expressed the view that it gave better product differentiation to 3J IPRA from 3E Production. SA expressed that late model cars can fit the allowed rims without the addition of flares. VIC mentioned that the wider rims can be fitted with custom hubs, but it is a more expensive option than fitting flares
It was proposed that a weight limit rule for EM to run larger wheel would offset discontent from EM entrants about LM gaining the ability to fit flares.
Dropping of aspect ratio has general support but a vote wasn't taken. It was proposed to circulate WA delegates 11.1 rules from April.
3. Motorsport Australia advised the wish to amend fuel tank rules to allow floor pan modification to fit a fuel tank within the back seat area within the roll cage. The delegates request Motorsport Australia to clarify the exact rule changes. It was noted that IPRA has strictly limited floor plan modifications and there is a desire to see the driving reasons to allow a change to the longstanding restriction.
It was expressed by NT that changes could be written in Schedule N and then just referred to in our regulations.
4. The NA outlined that a discussion with the AMRC outlined their concerns of category overlap in the rules between 3E, 3J and 3D. he AMRC desire differentiation be maintained between the categories.
5. There was general discussion on the issue of blocks with consensus reached to make a decision on the executive document at the next meeting on the 20th of July 8pm Central 8:30pm Eastern and 6:30pm Western. Prior to that the goal was to conclude changes to the document by the evening of the 15th of July 2020 for consideration by Delegates/States
6. It was noted that the WA IPRA President had resigned.

VC4 2020

1. The integration of canbus communication to after-market ECU and complications of rotating steering wheel when on hoist and losing calibration of factory ECU was discussed. SA has a BMW M2 with an electric rack which is having communication issues. It was agreed by all to forward SA Delegate's document to Motorsport Australia as our intent for a formal wording to be returned for a final vote.
2. Aspect ratios there was discussion on the topic which rolled into the interconnectedness of the performance gain of this combined with flares and wheel changes. There was concern on the cost to competitors of wheel change to facilitate other changes. It was outlined that most late model cars could fit a wider rim without flares. There was general agreement on weight-based limitation for fitting a larger and wider rim. RX7 performance gains were a concern. Preliminary executive document to be finalised by NA for amendment by delegates
3. Fuel tanks changes proposed by Motorsport Australia. There was agreement to move ahead with changes proposed. It was noted the expense of fitting an FIA tank for most IPRA competitors is prohibitive. It was also noted that there are other 3E rules which may need to be added to the rule set such as polycarbonate rear quarter windows in coupe style vehicles. It was requested that Motorsport Australia review and provide feedback on any additional proposed changes
4. 2019 Nationals incident. The outcome of the incidents was discussed. There was concern at how Motorsport Australia can distribute the outcomes to Clubs etc more clearly and to advise how this is currently handled. . It was expressed a uniform disciplinary code/standards/principles be established. It is requested that each state come back with their current documents and procedures to establish a uniform system across the category.
5. Holden Cage. NTC to make a determination. Victorian EO to be supplied document for completion and return to WA Delegate.
6. Block Executive Document. Queensland wish to discuss the additional attachment at their next club meeting on the 3rd of August. NT also would like to discuss with committee/members. QLD has concerns with ensuring members with Chev 101 blocks are accommodated as does Tasmania. WA and SA don't want to exclude competitors. VIC is not looking to remove competitors but is concerned that we need to manage our future, and not let the decision CEC decision advantage a couple of brands.
7. VC5 scheduled for the 4th of August with a vote on the block Executive document regardless of any late changes to document.

VC5

1. Please find Alan Bradshaw's email as a record of the tyres discussion.
2. A long read through of Block Executive Document, with a number of small changes was undertaken.
3. The document was voted on with an unanimous vote for Option 1 to amend the rule.
4. WA Delegate's block rule is to be added to the Dropbox as a starting point (Version 0). Please leave version 0 copy and add edits notes and comments as a new version on a new page (FYI document is now live on Dropbox)
File name is IPRA Proposed Block rule amendment 06082020
5. The option of additional rule changes were discussed. As rules need to be concluded by the end of August, it was concluded that there was enough work in finalizing the existing items (Block, flare/tyres/wheels, power steering, fuel tanks, HQ cage and remaining items from last year) without adding more.
There was a desire to examine WA Delegate's April document further over a longer time frame.
6. VC6 set for the 18th of August 2020.
- 7.
8. Meeting closed and outstanding items deferred to next meeting

VC6

1. Flares/tyres/Rim paper was read through and discussed. QLD expressed concern about direction and competitors opinion of the change. Other delegates have already discussed with committee and/or members. A vote was taken with QLD abstaining. Final document attached for review before pdf signature process. Please check over as I have tidied some wordings under minor reshaping. Document once signed will be forwarded to Motorsport Australia for rule change before returning for members to vote.
2. NTC document for roll cage wording change to resolve HQ issue was agreed to be sent through to Motorsport Australia for rule change.
3. Proposed amendments list for rules for 2021 was read through. Turbo rule description was queried by Victoria. Read through of NTC document clarified previous decision which along with Class E rule change resolved the query. NTC document will be sent to Motorsport Australia.
4. Amendment list can be discussed to indicate possible changes and upcoming votes by members.
5. NA request input from delegates on possible rule change 9.15
6. Yokohama one year extension agreement was discussed. Paragraph below to be reinstated to ensure if a Nationals is run in 2021 the usual full payment is received.

~~Yokohama also agree to support the IPRA Nationals event to be held each year, to the value of \$20,000.00 inclusive of GST. \$15,000.00 of this must be directly spent on providing assistance to members to compete in the Nationals with the remaining \$5,000.00 to be discretionary spend by the IPRAA Executive Committee to either promote or manage the category.~~

The proposal the each state/territory receives 3 discounted entries/tyre discounts as a minimum, and that they can be used for normal entrants should rookie "come and try" entrants not materialise.

Clarify with Yokohama the IPRAA will receive any underspend of funds from the "come and try" elements.

7. Revised block submission to Motorsport Australia attached. Please advise any changes by Thursday 3rd of September 5pm

VC 7

Rule changes

Rear Hatch Spoiler for EM 3.7 a (iv)

Clarification required for existing vehicle with rear hatch spoilers mounted aft of the glass e.g. RX7 and Toyota Corolla AE86

Picked up error in rule set

3.6 (ii) and (iii) need to be recombined to make sense change appeared in the 2016 to 2017 rule update.

Turbos

4.5 (b)(v) amend line to Where an eligible automobile

Steering

9.13 (b) (i) wording needs to be amended from "original type" to "original model"

Wheels

Change maximum wheel diameter from 18" to unlimited as alternate tyre tenderers may have larger diameter tyres available

Add note 265mm width tyre limit to be added in where aspect ratio was.

Carpet and interior trim

B Pillar trim, kick panels and carpet door trim covers to be able to be omitted

Additional item to be added

Nuts and Bolts and fasteners are free

Safety Cages no changes

Body Work 17.3 It is permitted to remove plastic stone shields from within the wheel arch to be retained.

4.2 Block

The restriction options were discussed. It was theorised that we are only looking at affecting a maximum of 20 competitors with the introduction of some form of restriction.

VIC had to leave the meeting

It was discussed that Motorsport Australia is checking that the Suburban would meet the requirements of a touring car. Motorsport Australia was going to action this. To be followed up by NA.

The use of a RPM limit was discussed and ruled out due to the ongoing cost of data management and interpretation at state level events.

The prescribing of a particular fuel for use in particular blocks was mentioned. The NA contacted Motorsport Australia (MSA) to check what testing options were available. MSA had looked at purchasing a fuel test rig but found it too expensive. It was indicate the test is not cheap and sample storage and transport complex as it is a flammable liquid and can't be posted. It was ruled out as an option.

Weight additions were discussed with numerous supporters of it a method of balancing performance in blocks identified as having a performance advantage. There were differing opinions of the affect on tyres and further input from Yokohama requested. SA raised concerns that a weight addition would adversely affect competitors running affected vehicles which are not achieving peak engine performance compared to other competitors achieving optimal output for a particular block.

VIC had raised earlier that fitting a restrictor to an under developed engine not achieving peak airflow would not have an effect on power developed.

TAS was concerned about cost to competitors of fitting a restrictor.

Three states supported using a theoretical restrictor airflow to decide restrictor size to complete rule amendment quickly. WA had concerns about accuracy of calculation.

Motorsport Australia has requested a quotation from a dyno tuner on a high powered engine to examine airflow restrictor size effects. To be followed up by NA.

SA and NT proposing a theoretical restrictor be sized slightly smaller to allow increases in size at a later date rather than a future reductions in size.

There was majority support to allow competitors to run either run single or multiple throttle bodies with a restrictor.

The majority of states (VIC absent and QLD to provide further feedback) support using WA points table to determine the line in the sand whether a block has an advantage and requires a balance measure.

NSW preferred a family rule and wanted further Family rule of rule below rather than listing blocks with no restrictors. WA supported this.

4.4 BLOCK

- a) The block must have the same number of cylinders/rotors, made from the same core material e.g.(aluminium, iron) ,same processing method e.g.(cast or machined) and the same configuration as was standard or available as a manufacturer's option for that particular model of automobile (e.g. in line, horizontally opposed).
- b) The block type must be clearly identifiable
- c) The cylinder block must be:
 - i. From an eligible Automobile as detailed in Article 1.1 and from the same manufacturer (e.g. Ford, GM, and Nissan) as the Automobile that the block is being used in. (refer also to 1.4); or
 - ii. From the same family of engines as an eligible Automobile using the **same cylinder configuration** (with differences only in transmission mounting pattern, **VVT modifications**, minor external casting differences etc.). The block type must be clearly identifiable, i.e. Nissan SR20DE, SR20DET, Holden Family II, Toyota 4AG series etc. The block must be identifiable as being from a production Automobile, **not aftermarket and/or** not exclusively developed for sporting evolution models produced for homologation purposes in small numbers for competition use only. CAMS will be the final arbiter in determining the eligibility of a block.
 - iii. Any block that does not comply with 4.1 (c) (i) or (ii), but has been recommended for approval for IPRA, approved by Motorsport Australia, and is listed in the table below. These engines can only be raced in a vehicle of the brand listed in the Vehicle Manufacturer Approval column.

Next meeting proposed for Thursday the 24th of September 2020 to avoid the school holiday exodus.

Action items prior to meeting
 Family rule tweak
 WA points table fine tuning

Any block that has evolved from the same family of OEM engines and manufactured by the same associated parent company as the OEM product may be considered for use subject to the following conditions and approval by IP and MA after evaluation.
 Any block accumulating over 20 points can only be considered as acceptable subject to a MRW being enforced. (sticker with car MRW & Rim size to be placed bottom left corner windscreen.)

1600 9.5 LM.

Differences between OEM and Evolved

Blocks manufacturer etc.	Points	Evolved block is still same
CC increased by more than 2% over OEM		10
Does not accept production heads without modification.		12
Main caps increased e.g. (2 to 4) over OEM		5
Bell housing pattern does not match OEM		5
Sump bolt pattern does not match OEM		5
Oiling system has improved function		5
Cooling system has improved function		5
Engine mounting points do not match OEM		5
Minor ribbing improvements		2
Major ribbing improvements		5
Externally Visually appears different to the same OEM		5
All accessories such as oil filters, alternator, water pump, covers etc		
Line up and attach to the OEM mounting points		5
Only available in an older car than the car it is fitted to *		5

* is there a reason to select an older style block over newer available blocks?

Reliability, availability, cost, or performance?

If it were the genuine older OEM block and not the evolved later version would this choice still be the same?

VC8

1. Finances

It was proposed to lower capitation fee given the current economic environment, the reduced level of racing, the meeting being online rather than a usual national conference. NA to check the last increase which was \$5-\$10.
 It was requested that clubs finalise a members list so invoices can be sent.

2. Rule set

Front spoiler wording needs below change to above.
 Query raised about front mount intercoolers
 Clarification of nominal tyre size of 265mm as nominated on tyre wall

Rule intent documents from Motorsport Australia to form basis for advice to members
NT, VIC and NA to prepare copies for review by delegates

3. Fuel tank rules. Concern was expressed that the rule set as currently written may exclude the fuel tank arrangements in cars currently competing. It was unanimously voted to defer the rule change until further implications of the rules be examined.
4. The rule as per the agenda was discussed as was WA revision 7&8, QLD rule that had been received and read by delegates was briefly discussed. A vote was taken to whether to run an expanded comprehensive list or use the word family to cover front cuts and grey imports. NSW, NT, WA, SA TAS, preferred the word family, VIC preferred family but in the current rules wording. QLD preferred a chart as per their document.
5. Further discussion was had with an alternate wording shared by SA, this was amended further on a shared screen between delegates.
The rule was voted on with VIC, NSW, NT, SA & TAS, WA supported it on the provision of working on it further. QLD abstained.
SA, VIC and WA will undertake an email discussion about further refining the rule for submission back to the delegates.

Rule as meeting concluded

BLOCK

The block must have the same number of cylinders/rotors, and the same configuration as was standard or available as a manufacturer's option for that particular model made from the same core material e.g. (aluminium, iron), same processing method e.g. (cast or machined) and the same configuration as was standard or available as a manufacturer's option for that particular model of automobile (e.g. in line, horizontally opposed).

- a. The block must be from the same manufacturer (e.g. Ford, GMH, and Nissan) as the original Automobile.
- b. The cylinder block must either be:
 - (i) from or derived from an eligible Automobile as detailed in Article 1.1; or
 - (ii) from or derived from the same family of engines as an eligible Automobile using identical block height, bore spacing (with differences only in transmission mounting pattern, minor external casting differences etc.). The block type must be clearly identifiable. The block must be identifiable as being from a mass produced Automobile, not exclusively developed for sporting evolution models produced for homologation purposes in small numbers for competition use only. Motorsport Australia will be the final arbiter in determining the eligibility of a block.
 - (iii) Where a block is a derived block it requires approval from IPRA, and approved by Motorsport Australia, and is listed in the table below. These engines can only be raced in a vehicle of the brand listed in the Vehicle Manufacturer Approval column.
- (d) Motorsport Australia reserves the right to add any engine block at its discretion.

6. There was a discussion about the points table from WA being part of a separate inhouse document for evaluating if block had performance advantages or in the rule set. It was comment that having it in the rule set limited the flexibility that may be required as blocks are examined and unthought of issues arise. WA and NSW to further develop a document with the points table.

7. The form of restrictions should it be determined any are required was discussed. An airflow restrictor was discussed. The quote for restrictor testing for a price of \$7850+GST was shared on the screen and read out aloud. It was queried if engine rent was include, NA to check. The option a quote for a University to undertake theoretical airflow calculations. NA to arrange. The use of airflow restrictors with cars of varying weights was discussed. The option of having three different sized restrictors for each engine for different weights was raised.
The option of weight as the restriction method was discussed. It was discussed that it would adversely affect vehicles which hadn't optimised engine performance. WA's belief is that the cars that hadn't optimised engine performance also hadn't stripped out weight as other had and the weight restriction would mean no ballast was added to the lower powered vehicles.

VC9

1. There was some confusion with start times due to NA miscalculating day light saving time changes for some.
2. The QLD delegate was did not connect to zoom conference nor was contactable despite several attempts.
3. The front spoiler/airdam rule was discussed. It was unanimously decided by attendees to revert to the 2013 rule.
4. The distributed rule was screen shared. Victoria outlined the structure of the rule. The rule proposal was read. The SA delegate had prepared a substitute paragraph for part (d). The paragraph was substituted, and it was agreed to use it as an amendment to 4.2 (c)(iii). A number of other rewordings additional and subtraction were made.
5. It was agreed unanimously by the 6 delegates attending the VC that the final rule set as attached would be forwarded to Motorsport Australia for their review and submission to the AMRC and return.
6. The OEM Replacement Derived Block application form was screen shared and discussed. Additional changes were identified due to revisions made to the final rule intent under 4.2(c)(iii). It was agreed by all attendees that the document would be the basis of an internal administrative tool. Changes are to be made and document to reflect the agreed intent and then be circulated to delegates. The intent is for members to submit any blocks the would now fall in 4.2(c)(iii) rather than internal evaluation of theoretical compliance of derived blocks.
7. NA to reformat letter to delegates in regard to survey, rule amendment intents as a common resource for informing members. Rule intents for members to be completed by the end of the week and watermarked preliminary (as requested by WA).
8. Restriction options. The WA delegate understands there may be cost effective RPM limit options. NA to further investigate restriction options including air restrictor(pricing for theoretical calculations) and rpm limiters(technology options for stand-alone limiters) to further inform for delegates.

Attachments:

VC Block new to old rule set intent for submission to Motorsport Australia

OEM Replacement Derived Block Replacement Application IPRA 3J

VC10

1. IPRAA-NTC-F1 was discussed. Bumpers with mesh cannot have mesh removed. Rule could be further amended at a later date to add from “a fixed viewing angle” to further clarify.
2. Motorsport Australia advised club responses required by the third week of November.
3. States current meeting schedule
 - VIC AGM the 28th of October voting in two weeks later
 - NSW waiting on venue dates, will look at VC option if required
 - NT TBC
 - WA 10th of November
 - TAS TBC
 - QLD 2nd of November
4. Discussion was had about the DBA form. Restriction was discussed in parallel.
5. Additional restriction options were discussed:-
 - Removing downforce but it would mean additional instability in high speed heavy cars
 - Increasing ride height which also introduces more instability
 - Ignition timing limits, but it is hard to manage
 - Fuel flow limits but the equipment required is expensive and complex to monitor
6. A vote for the DBA form was taken
 - QLD no to points table, yes to format
 - NSW abstain, but had additional/alternate table to discuss
 - VIC Yes
 - TAS No to points, Yes to format
 - SA Yes
 - WA Yes
 - NT Yes
7. A preliminary vote on preferred restriction option was taken which was inconclusive.

8. Restriction preference vote was undertaken as per table below

State	Weight	RPM	Air Restrictor
TAS	3	2	1
VIC	1	2	3
SA	1	2	3
WA	3	2	1
NT	3	1	2
QLD	3	2	1
NSW	3	2	1
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	17	13	12

VC11

1. Yokohama Rookie Monies & registration Management
Monies to be administer by IPRA VIC until new bank arrangements are conluded for IPRAA
2. Tyre Tender sub-committee
QLD Delegate to take the lead of sub-committee TAS and NA to support along with NA
3. Delegate voting/meeting status (including QLD run through of attachment)
4. AMRC reply.