



1001VELA^{cup} DESIGN CONTEST 2020

Entry:
FördeKyle-R



The team :

Team Captain Team Förderacer Oliver Willuweit

Design team

Jan Casper Mense
Birk Stoewer
Tobias Merkel
Leon Kilian
Richard Langer
Dennis Wipprecht
Oliver Frank Willuweit

The jury evaluation:**Grado di innovazione****Innovation degree**

<<The project shows the following design innovation: deck in combination with the wave piercing bow; the use of a rudder foil.>>

<< There are four "inventions" relative to the standard R3 class. The gybing centerboard will increase performance and so will the rudder foil. The wave piercing bow might not be needed in the low wind speeds of Gargnano. Since AWA is 60-70 degrees downwind, a symmetric spinnaker may not work very well. >>

<< 8 su 10 – 8 on 10>>

<<Classic approach to the nautical design. A spinnaker is preferred to a Gennaker. A rotating centreboard will be construct.>>

<< 5/5 - Waterlines are quite extreme, because of the wave piercing bow coupled with such wide planing surface. The self tilting centerboard is also an interesting innovation for the R3 class as the lifting rudder. Completely unexpected is also the choice of the symmetrical downwind sail.>>

Completezza e livello di approfondimento progettuale**Thoroughness level of the project**

<<The achieved project result shows that the team has worked thoroughly based on product design methodology. However, the presented project documentation does not contain enough information to get a deep view in the project management of the Team.>>

<<The design appears reasonable, but was it done entirely by feeling? There is no mention of any modern design tools in the supplied material. VPP?, CFD?, FEA? No numerical optimisations?>>

<<Il lato estetico non è stato tralasciato, curato quanto l'aspetto innovativo nell'utilizzo di bio materiali e l'armo velico non convenzionale.>>



the aesthetic side was not overlooked; it has been treated as the innovative aspect in the use of bio materials and the non conventional rigging (translated by the editor).>>

<<More details should be given about the construction and analyses.>>

<<3.5/5 - Given drawings are quite detailed about the parts they refer to, but no evidences are described about how design choices have been taken. >>

Qualità della rappresentazione del progetto

Project's quality of representation

<<the project documentation is pretty Poor.>>

<<The presentation is extremely brief, without any technical details. The supplied drawings are clear, but how were they obtained? There is no list of main parameters.>>

<<Impaginazione troppo tecnica, alcuni disegni sono poco chiari.

Too technical layout, some drawings are unclear (translited by the editor).>>

<<The report is too synthetic. Good documentation in terms of pictures and videos. More figures should be attached to the text to better explain what is written in the text. >>

<<3/5 - The presentation is pretty minimal, despite by consulting the whole given material a good idea of the boat and the project can be recognised.>>

Ranking :

3rd

1001VELAcup®

1001VELA
cup