

Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by Sterling Doc - 12 Oct 2015 19:03

OK guys, time to hear out RCR's for next years rules. We'll keep this open through the end of the month, and then get the new rules, if any, hashed out.

As always, please bear in mind that rules changes need to be cost effective to existing cars, as well as new builds, and the burden of proof is on why the new rule is needed, not justifying the existing rule - rules stability is key here!

Stay tuned for a big announcement in about a week, as well!

Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by BritRacer - 11 Nov 2015 12:26

This would be great, but what's wrong with using the current part he offers and stipulating that it must be connected in the top holes to keep the stock throw.

Also why is this part not covered under the following from 2.1. As in the stock configuration it is a direct replacement for the porsche part, with no performance impact as the throw etc remains the same.

"Aftermarket parts designed and sold as direct replacements for stock genuine Porsche original equipment parts with no change in performance or weight may be used and will be considered "stock" for the purposes of these rules"

Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by cgktexas - 11 Nov 2015 13:03

BritRacer wrote:

This would be great, but what's wrong with using the current part he offers and stipulating that it must be connected in the top holes to keep the stock throw.

Also why is this part not covered under the following from 2.1. As in the stock configuration it is a direct replacement for the porsche part, with no performance impact as the throw etc remains the same.

"Aftermarket parts designed and sold as direct replacements for stock genuine Porsche original equipment parts with no change in performance or weight may be used and will be considered "stock" for the purposes of these rules"

The only 944 rear shifter piece changes the fore/aft throw 30%, the side/side throw is unchanged using the lower slot and 30% decrease of throw in the top slot.

I believe the piece in the link I posted is covered, but the issue is that this currently available "direct replacement" piece is still plastic and as such, in a hard use scenario, probably only temporarily addresses the sloppiness issue. I believe that finding and using a direct replacement made of more suitable material requires no change in rules.

Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by FDJeremy - 11 Nov 2015 13:13

I personally think decreasing the fore and aft throw would be a great thing. I mean these are racecars, what's the big deal? There's even a free solution if you want to modify the stock part to do the same thing. Just allow a full on short shifter and we can just use the tried and true design if we are so inclined.

The throw on the shifter is the worst part of driving a 944 and it seems to me that we should take steps to fix the problem instead of worrying about not changing the rulebook. The \$90 isn't going to break anyone's racing budget and you don't have to have one to stay competitive. It's mostly a reliability mod.

It's not like someone with a short shifter is going to beat someone without just because they shifted a few milliseconds faster than the other guy. What they might do is keep their motor under the hood for a bit longer than the other guy.

Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by rd7839 - 11 Nov 2015 14:22

I disagree, the worst part of racing a 944 is when you crash into your buddy!!

=====

Re: Rule Change Requests for 2016

Posted by afonseca - 11 Nov 2015 14:38

BritRacer wrote:

This would be great, but what's wrong with using the current part he offers and stipulating that it must be connected in the top holes to keep the stock throw.

Also why is this part not covered under the following from 2.1. As in the stock configuration it is a direct replacement for the porsche part, with no performance impact as the throw etc remains the same.

"Aftermarket parts designed and sold as direct replacements for stock genuine Porsche original equipment parts with no change in performance or weight may be used and will be considered "stock" for the purposes of these rules"

Good points above so I'd like to ask for clarification as it relates to my previous post about the other two front shift levers (not the back transmission linkage).

www.lindseyracing.com/LR/Porsche/LRA-944-SSL.html

www.9xauto.com/porsche-944-968-custom-shifter

Would the two shifters above meet the "direct replacement" rule if adjusted to stock height?

I'm asking clarification because of this clause:

14.3.1

"The shift lever (only) from Only 944's is considered an acceptable factory alternative: only944.com/partscatalog/only/shifter/;"

Does that mean any others are not acceptable or is that just an example of one that is acceptable.

Please note I am not trying to be facetious here picking apart the language but am genuinely trying to understand what is and is not currently allowed in the rules as I participate in the discussion of proposals for next year.
