

CARS Board Meeting Minutes

Nov 18th 2019

Item	Discussion
1	<p>The meeting was called to order at 7:10 ET</p> <p>Attendance included:</p> <p>John Hall (President) Simon Vincent (RSQ Director). Clarke Paynter (Atlantic Director) Martin Burnley (RPM Director) Chris Kremer (Sec/Treasurer & Rally West Director) Darryl Malone (RSO Director) Wim van der Poel (Competitor Rep) Graham Bruce (Tech Director)</p> <p>Absent:</p> <p>Terry Epp (Series Manager) Ross Wood (Organizer Rep)</p> <p>We have a Quorum with 5/5 directors present</p>
2	<p>The sole purpose of this meeting was for the CARS board to decide on the next steps with respect to Bulletin 2019-05 that dealt with the rules for FIA cars in O4WD and O2WD classes.</p> <p>John started the meeting by reviewing the agenda.</p> <p>The agenda was acceptable as presented.</p>
3	<p>Because the topic has been debated and there have been some differing opinions, John reminded all of the directors that their role is to make sure that the decisions being made are deemed in the best interests of CARS and the overall sport of rally, recognizing that sometimes this can conflict with others interests and it can be difficult.</p> <p>John briefly reviewed the key parts of the Vision and Objectives that apply to the decision making related to these rules.</p>
4	<p>Vision. "..... growing, inclusive and professional....."</p> <p>Objectives. "allowing for a complete cross section of participants from entry level, lower budget competitors, through to full budget, corporately sponsored teams." and "Encouraging competition between Canadian, US and other International competitors"</p>
5	<p>John summarized the feedback that was received from the 2-week rally community review.</p>

	<p>The primary feedback followed the same line of discussion that the board had been having, one of the overall philosophy and direction of the sport. Most respondents supported the direction outlined in 2019-05 while a few expressed a desire for the status quo.</p> <p>Some feedback regarding the specifics was limited to a couple of queries and a word change suggestion to help reduce potential confusion.</p> <p>All feedback had been provided to the board members in advance of the meeting</p>
6	<p>John had provided a tabulated summary showing the various positions, by individual, relative to the key items, including overall support, opinion on weight, restrictor size, ability to score points and general comments.</p>
7	<p>John outlined the process to be followed for the balance of the meeting which included the following steps;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the revised bulletin 2. Allow each board member to present their perspective 3. Have a question and answer period for clarification and understanding 4. John will summarize 5. Director will motion to adopt the revised rules and a board vote will be held.
8	<p>Graham reviewed the final rule proposal after considering the input</p>
9	<p>Each of the 5 directors and 2 extended board members at the meeting had an opportunity to present their perspective on the subject. There were 7 excellent presentations that proceeded in an uninterrupted manner, providing each of the board members with a good understanding of the various perspectives, ideas and opinions.</p> <p>Items and topics mentioned in the presentations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making sure that we look after existing competitors while continuing to encourage new competitors. • Recognizing that some competitors will want to spend bigger dollars while building a new car and how we increase the options available to them. • Encouraging dual sanctioned participation, while challenging existing teams can increase competition, entries and the future prospects for the CRC. • Existing rules already allow FIA cars but require approx. 85# ballast. Why not leave this. • Existing rules don't differentiate between the RC2 class and RC1 class FIA cars and yet there are significant differences in performance. The RC2 cars are a step down. • Working to smooth importation of FIA cars into Canada • Having more competition is better than a one man show. Status Quo offers good competition. • Vermont Subaru running at TP is example of top of O4WD spec, big performance gap above RC2 cars. • Concern for mid pack competitors if numerous R5's where to show up. • Should be open to adjusting O4WD rules in future if we see discrepancy in performance • Sportsmanship is important, it is exciting with close competition, 2019 was close competition with status quo. • Competition is exciting with top cars. • Smaller displacement, engineered rally cars are much more available now and are the future. • Embracing the RC2 class cars at a national level is what most other countries have done. • Consider reducing weight for all O4WD class • Shouldn't stop progress, this is the future. • Having a homologated car allows competitors to compete in both CRC and ARA and FIA events without having to change spec. • More will show up if we embrace them.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparing cost of building and developing versus buying, buying can be an overall more efficient approach. • Have been looking for interest from Ford Canada, R5's at Rocky got them interested in talking. • More young people needed to take up the sport, cars that they can associate the WRC with are favorable. • Concern about the relevance of the CRC • Up to 2008 Subaru's were a good rally car. Since more difficult, start to need engineering of suspension geometry. • Its good to start seeing modern cars on stage • The rules are a box within which we can play, at the full expression of the O4WD rules you can spend \$500K and build a fantastic car. The FIA rule box is much tighter and compromises are made to meet cost and performance targets. O4WD is wide open, RC2 cars fit easily inside that box. • Nice about rally is that anyone can run almost any car and compete against all levels of team. • Atlantic Canada recognizing similar issues have just opened up their regional championship to out of region competitors, have also approved use of sequential transmissions.
10	<p>During the question period a few items discussed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally, it is difficult to go back once a rule has been implemented. As an example, sequential gearboxes are allowed, they are expensive, but difficult to change rule to stop them. If RC2 cars are too far ahead, how can we go back. It was discussed that as always; we need to stay abreast of the trends and what is happening. If O4WD rules need to be changed again to address some future issue the board would need to look at that. It is always possible to change classes and specs. • Discussed why an R5 for example can't simply follow O4WD rules. It was pointed out that the car is engineered to run with a 32 mm restrictor and in gravel spec is approx. 2815#. Changing weight to 2900 and restrictor to 34 mm requires not only those changes and re-mapping it also reduces the service interval on the engine from 1800Km to 1300km approx. so a huge disincentive. • It was discussed that there is always a balance of cost. Does a competitor have an inexpensive car and get to more events or an expensive car and get to fewer events? This is actually a very personal situation that is different for everyone and as in all motorsport the more you can spend the easier it is to rise to the top. Do we set a bar that really limits what people can spend on a car or do we set a rule and provide the boundaries within which people can innovate, develop and play?
11	John took a few minutes to summarize the discussions and wrapped up the input part of the meeting
12	<p>A motion was made to adopt the proposed vehicle eligibility and FIA vehicle rule changes as per revised bulletin 2019-05 draft rev 6.</p> <p>The motion was seconded and after a vote by board members the motion was carried.</p>
13	The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 ET