

FVAA Board of Management

Final Minutes

Extraordinary Meeting

Teleconference, Thursday 20th September, 2007

Commenced 8.15pm AEST, closed 12.00am AEST

Present:

→ Scott Wythe – President, Paul Corcoran – NTD, Derek Burns – WA, Ben Rebbeck – SA, Pip Welch – TAS, Ian Chivas – NSW, Tom Cameron – Qld, David Frith – VIC

→

Apologies: None

Item 1 – Introductions

- SW welcomed the Directors and explained that this meeting had been called as an extraordinary meeting to review the outcomes of the National Technical Face to Face Meeting held on the 9th September 2007. This would be the only agenda item for this meeting.
- PC provided a briefing on the outcomes of the NTC Face to Face Meeting where the NTC agreed on the majority of rule changes to be submitted to CAMS. There were several items on which the NTC could not reach agreement and therefore referred to the BoM. These items would be considered at this meeting. The updated CAMS Manual Revision document which has been supplied to BoM members contained a number of items shaded in green which were agreed to by the NTC. These items are referred to the BoM for endorsement prior to submission to CAMS.

Item 2 – Discussion on Green Shaded Items agreed to by the NTC

- 2.5 (v) Crankshafts – DB stated that he would like to see an overall width and thickness of the ring gear specified. PC noted that under the text there will be a dimensional drawing showing where metals can be removed precluding metal in the ring gear area.
- 2.5 (xii) b – DB questioned no modification of rockers. Could there be a control rocker? PC stated that all existing rockers would need to be thrown away and that only unmodified original rockers would be permitted. Other options for a control rocker had been looked at previously and nothing suitable had been found.
- DF suggested that the changed rules regarding maximum lift height and the reversion to standard rockers be separated by a few months to allow time for competitors to change over their rockers. PC agreed that prior notification for competitors would be needed but they could both be one at once.
- DB questioned whether maximum lift would be specified for both 1200 and 1600 engines? PC stated yes. DB asked whether this would slow down 1200s? PC replied that on a plot of flow versus lift, at any lift height greater than 9mm the

valve was fully open anyway and that 1200s were similar to 1600s in this respect with little extra flow.

- 2.2 (ii) - DB questioned whether the inlet manifold should be defined as standard and whether an internal coating could be used to prevent corrosion. PC replied that there was no need for this as Article 1.1 should be sufficient and that internal coatings were not permitted.
- DB noted that different size copper tube (vacuum feed) was used for automatics and asked whether this should be specified. PC noted that there were some dimensions on this but as long as it was blocked off it shouldn't make any difference. DF suggested that between g) and f) should be added that all vacuum tube holes must be plugged. PC agreed. DB suggested that another sentence could be added to g) for this. All agreed. **Action: PC to add suggested wording to g).**
- Regarding the cutting of the manifold, PC suggested that the rule be enforced immediately if there was no reason for it, but that if it was required to be cut to fit a car's chassis, a 12 month moratorium is given. BR asked why were manifolds cut? PC stated that for some cars the 8mm of the cross bar needed to be cut out to fit inside the chassis and that this was originally not enforced to encourage the conversion of cars to 1600s. TC noted that it needed to be done for Concepts but that it can fit inside most cars without work. PC noted that there was no performance advantage in cutting the manifold. PW asked whether we needed a rule to cover this? PC stated that time was needed to change the chassis bar work if required. DF suggested that wording could be added stating that competitors the rule would be enforced unless a certificate of exemption was obtained from the FVAA where the relevant STD could make the call. This would be for a minimum period of 12 months. PW stated that an end date should be included to avoid confusion. This was agreed and PC noted that it would be put to CAMS in this way.
- 2.7 (x) - DB asked if an electric fuel pump was fitted, wouldn't there be a finite amount put out through the standard pump anyway? PC stated that the change was made based on maintaining uniformity. TC noted that a crankshaft sensor would need to be fitted to automatically switch off to pump in an emergency. DB stated that at least one WA car has this fitted.
- DB stated that a competitor wanted to manufacture carbon fibre cylinder covers for looks. PC stated that this would fail the same material clause as per the technical manual.
- 5 – DB queried the inclusion of painting and plating of specified components as this may affect the same material clause. PC said the inclusion of this was because many competitors had painted these components and up to now were not strictly legal and that this did not change material.
- BR noted that the rules do not state that that the circumference area of the hub cannot be lightened. PC replied that originally standard components couldn't be machined but the rules did not state what a standard disc brake component was. The rules originally specified rotors and callipers but CAMS queried this as Formula Ford left them open. It was then proposed to use proprietary components but there was no definition of what proprietary components were allowed. Most people now use standard VW components.
- BR questioned whether the Bosch 009 distributor was still being made? PC answered yes and that two copies were available of good quality.
- BR queried whether allowing distributors to be free could give some competitors and advantage. PC noted that the advance curve was specified in the rules. DB asked whether the cam profile could be changed to change the dwell time on

points. PC stated that under the current rules yes and that the rules could specify the 009 distributor as suitable substitutes should be available into the foreseeable future.

- DF noted that dimensions need to be put on air cleaners. These should be made so as to specify only a few air cleaners to prevent people experimenting. Height and width should be specified. PC and TC both agreed that this was difficult to specify. PC agreed to draft a rule specifying area, height and width and will advise the BoM on wording. **Action: PC to advise wording on air cleaner dimensions.**
- TC stated that specifying the use of swivel foots would prevent experimentation with rockers. PC agreed but noted that with swivel feet, the proposed maximum 9.6mm lift would be difficult to achieve. He also stated that the proposal was originally put forward to address durability. DF stated that he would like to see the introduction of a control cam for 1600s along with swivel feet in future. This was agreed to be considered by the BoM at a later date.
- A motion was put forward by DF to accept the changes proposed in green shading with the few modifications discussed above. PW seconded. All agreed.

Item 3 – Proposed rule changes referred to the BoM for voting

Allowing the use of an Aluminium Crankcase

- PC stated that the proposal didn't fit under the same material provision. He noted that aluminium was probably more durable, it was more expensive generally and was 9-11kg heavier.
- DF noted that there were no durability issues with the current magnesium alloy case.
- PC agreed that there were no issues with the current case but as an engine builder found it more economical to use new componentry rather than reconditioned old.
- TC stated that the aluminium cases were about \$800 new and that there is some aluminium content in the current case.
- PC argued that allowing the aluminium case would introduce another variable due to the significant weight difference which would then introduce a performance variable.
- DB stated that if the current case was abundantly available and cheaper then we should stick with it and perhaps consider the aluminium case at a later date.
- TC noted that the magnesium case need machining at some cost while the aluminium cases do not.
- DF noted that if introduced he would need to change to nullify any potential performance difference but then his car would be too heavy.
- TC stated that the aluminium case lasted longer.
- PC stated that if the rule was not changed then the aluminium case would probably be illegal as it was not substantially of the same material and because of the weight difference. If agreed it would need to be moved out of non-genuine parts and into the specifications.
- TC moved that aluminium crankcases be allowed under the rules and if not then an eligibility ruling would need to be sought through CAMS. BR seconded. DF, PW, IC and DB voted against. Motion disallowed. **Action: PC to seek an eligibility ruling on aluminium crankcases through CAMS.**

Allowing the use of a cylinder head other than that specified currently

- PC noted that the NTC had been looking at the MOFOCO head but that the first set obtained had been hand finished. A new unfinished set had been obtained but

the accuracy and consistency of the machining of these heads was poor and it may have been a different casting. Valve heads were not centred in bores of barrels and lips had been left in exhaust ports.

- PC suggested a two pronged strategy. The FVAA could introduce the 375 head which uses the original casting of the 375.2 head and is made by the original manufacturers who had lost the VW contract but continued to make them. They are identical but without the 375.2 markings and so might need additional markings.
- TC stated that they have 375H markings which would be suitable.
- PC noted that they were readily available. TC could supply sets for testing in NSW and Vic. If they flowed similarly then they could be introduced ASAP. Long term the MOFOCO heads should still be pursued as they had a cost and supply advantage.
- DB asked what the price of the 375H heads were. TC stated that they were \$350/set. PC noted that MOFOCO heads would be about \$400/set but they came with stainless valves.
- PC and DF suggested that tests continue on the 375H head, MOFOCO heads are further investigated and the Board could cast its net wider for a suitable source.
- DB questioned the timeframe for introduction. TC stated that back to back flow tests were being conducted at the moment. He would get a set to PC for further testing next week. He also stated that the heads are new and are brought in by the pallet load.
- DF stated that we should test up to five sets. TC said he would get as many as he could. **Action: TC to supply 375H head sets (up to five if possible) to NSW and Vic for flow testing.**
- DB stated that if the flow testing was satisfactory then the 375H heads could be put to CAMS as a stand alone item as a priority.
- PC proposed the motion that if the 375H heads performed substantially the same as the current 375 head then they should be allowed under the rules. DB seconded. All in favour.

Electronic Ignition

- PC summarised the NTC discussions on electronic ignition. The proposal was that due to issues encountered and variations seen in electronic ignition systems the rules should be changes to allow only contact breaker points and disallow electronic devices in the ignition system. He noted the counter argument that electronic ignition was introduced as a progressive step and that going back to points would be seen by many as a retrograde step. There was a significant problem in policing though with electronic ignitions. If electronic ignitions were to be retained then the FVAA would likely need to go to tender to introduce a control part which met its requirements.
- TC argued that the FVAA can still ensure compliance by specifying a selection of authorised units. If the options of 3-4 units was given then the tender process would not be required.
- DF stated that one electronic units are difficult to distinguish from one another and that this option would not provide a solution to this issue.
- DF put forward the motion that only contact breaker points be allowed in the ignition system. IC seconded. PW and DB agreed. TC and BR disagreed. Motion passed.

Item 4 – Rule Change Implementation

- DF proposed that for the changes that would directly affect competitors notification of when and how they would be introduced would be required. He proposed that changes be grouped into those that would have no direct impact, those that would have minimal impact but would need to be completed by the next engine change and those that will have an impact and would require a 6-12 month moratorium. It was agreed that this would be a useful approach. **Action: PC to provide a list of changes classified as above.**

Item 5 – Other Business

- DB discussed the need for training of sealers by for example a visit by the NTD to all states. This idea was generally agreed as necessary. PC stated that designated trainers could be appointed by the NTC.
- BR stated that sealers should have a copy of the rules when they have been approved by CAMS. PC stated that the Technical Manual was now a CAMS controlled document and was available on their website.
- SW suggested that a list of approved sealers be maintained by the NTD. **Action: SW to contact NTC members to request a list of current sealers in each state.**
- SW noted that he would be out of the country during October. All BoM members agreed that if necessary PC could submit items for consideration directly to CAMS. **Action: SW to advise CAMS of absence and authorisation for PC to deal directly if required.**

Extraordinary Meeting Action Item List

Action Item #	Action Item	Actionee	Raised	Due
1	Add suggested wording to 2.7 ii g) regarding the plugging of vacuum tube holes	PC	20 th Sept	30 th Nov
2	Advise the BoM of wording on proposed air cleaner dimension rule	PC	20 th Sept	30 th Nov
3	Seek an eligibility ruling on aluminium crankcases through CAMS	PC	20 th Sept	30 th Nov
4	Supply 375H head sets (up to five if possible) to NSW and Vic for flow testing	TC	20 th Sept	ASAP
5	Provide the BoM with a list of proposed rule changes classified as no impact, minimal impact and significant impact requiring moratorium	PC	20 th Sept	30 th Nov
6	Contact NTC members to request a list of current sealers in each state	SW	20 th Sept	30 th Nov
7	Advise CAMS of absence and authorisation for PC to deal directly if required	SW	20 th Sept	Completed