

Proposals to change the Monotype XV specifications in order to clean up mistakes/ inconsistencies with the plans /ambiguities.

(published January 24, 2018).

The first ten proposals (part 1) are tiny clarifications, no effective changes:

Proposal number one: 3.1.2, current specification is:

3.1.2 Distance from bow to mast step pivoting point (edge holes of the ball) 1430 1300

why the words edge holes of the ball are there is a mystery, could mean they meant measure to the edge of the holes

Or somehow they wanted edge hole to mean first and last hole... it is clear what the intention is; if the words between brackets are changed to "center of the ball" nothing changes, but the specification is no longer ambiguous, so proposal one is to change 3.1.2 to:

3.1.2 Distance from bow to mast step pivoting point (center of the ball)1430 1300

No more than three fixed ball positions are allowed

Proposal two: 3.1.12

Current specification is very clear: .

3.1.12 Deck stringers are reinforced in cockpit part with stringer, but the thickness of deck stringer and reinforcement should not be less than 60 mm

: The problem is that the plans available show different sizes;

	Specifications	plans1937	plans 1959	plans 1991	plans1999
Cockpit stringers	60	48	48	54	60

So all the old plans show the stringers including side walls. .

The easiest and clearest solution is to change the wording to include the side walls to stringers and change 3.1.12 to:

3.1.12 Deck stringers are reinforced in cockpit part with stringer, but the thickness of deck stringer, reinforcement and sidewall should not be less than 60 mm

Proposal three:3.1.15, written in 2014 was intended for bulkhead 4:

3.1.15 The outer 60 mm ring of the bulkhead shall be as in the official plans. The dimensions interior of that ring are optional.

If we want to remove any doubt that this only applies to bulkhead 4 we should change it to:

3.1.15 The outer 60 mm ring of the bulkhead four shall be as in the official plans. The dimensions interior of that ring are optional.

Proposal four: to remove inconsistency with the boom sail mark and to clear up the lower measurement point we need to change 3.3.4 from:

3.3.4 Distance from mast heel to sail mark 7000 6990 into:

3.3.4 Distance from mast heel to underside of sail mark 7000 opt

While at the same time adding to the interpretations document :

For all measuring purposes, a removable/interchangeable mast socket shall be in the position that makes the mast as long as it can possibly be.

Proposal five:

3.4.1 Length overall 4500 4480

Is clearly (from the plans) intended to be measured without fittings. So to get this correct the proposal is to change 3.4.1 to:

3.4.1 Length overall without fittings 4500 4480

Proposal six:.

3.4.2 Width (in the area 800 mm from the front edge on 3200 mm towards bow) 123 117

Is a bit unclear..... It is better worded like this:.

3.4.2 Width (in the area 800 mm from the front edge back to 4000 mm from the front edge) 123 117

Width may be tapered outside this area

Proposal seven: to change 3.5.5 from:

3.5.5 The front upper edge of the runner should have a 15 mm radius

That could be argued to only apply to the wood runners to:

3.5.5 The front upper edge of all runners should have a 15 mm or bigger radius

In order to clearly apply to all runners.

Proposal eight: To solve the following (tiny) problem: Sail material 3.6.1;.

3.6.1 Material may be nylon, cotton or dacron

The writers clearly meant woven polyester here, Dacron is a brand name. a better wording would be:

3.6.1 Material may be nylon, cotton or woven polyester (dacron)

Proposal number nine: Sail window in the specifications instead of in the sailing instructions. This really is a matter that should be in the specifications, not in the sailing instructions. If I steal from the DN class and fill in our kind of measurements I get to:

3.6.15 A window in the sail is required. The window may be any shape and placed in several sections. Sizes in square centimeters 9000 2000

If we adopt this we can scrap it from the sailing instructions.....

Proposal number ten; where it says chock depth they really meant height; the plans make that clear. So for

3.8.1.2 Depth of chock 103 97

3.8.2.4 Depth of steering chock 95 opt.

We should put in:

3.8.1.2 Height of chock 103 97

3.8.2.4 Height of steering chock 95 opt.

Proposal number 11:3.8.2.9

3.8.2.9 Constructions and dimensions of fittings not fixed in these rules are optional

They clearly meant:

3.8.2.9 Constructions and dimensions of fittings not fixed in these specifications are optional

Part 2, proposals to change the Monotype XV specifications in order to clean up the specifications in the intent of the class rules that represent a real change, a choice.

The mast sail mark does not restrict anything without a restricted mast ball height. Therefore, proposal 12:

3.1.2.1 Distance from top of the deck at mast step to top of the pivoting point (top of the ball) 65 opt

Number should be reviewed once more measurement forms are in.

Proposal 13 is to allow more glass fibre on the luff groove of the mast, change :

3.3.17 Luff groove material is optional 25 mm from aft edge of the mast.

To:

3.3.17 Luff groove material is optional 30 mm from aft edge of the mast. The luff groove can be reinforced with fiberglass taping, 40 mm from the aft end.

Proposal 14 to solve the boom profile issue.... The wording in 3.4.8:

3.4.8 The profile of the boom cross-section must assume a reasonable fair and continuous curve.

Can mean many things; it either means we have to stick exactly to the 1937 plans or it can mean we just have to keep to the width and thickness...or anything in between.... If we want to allow all current booms we might as well make it optional; option A:

3.4.8 The profile of the boom cross-section is optional.

If we want to go back to the old boom shape like I hear many of the Swedish want, we would need to make templates to check the shape to a minimum and a maximum to be agreed later; option B.

Proposal 15: to change 3.4.9 from:

3.4.9 Fibreglass is permitted for repairs of mast, boom and runner plank, it should be with less length than 500 mm

To allow for more structural repairs by making it:

3.4.9 Fibreglass is permitted for repairs of mast, boom and runner plank, it should be With a total area less than 0.25 square meters per mast, boom or plank.

Proposal number 16; Prisma runners rules; wording on the tapering of the front 350 and back 100 is terrible, although the intention is clear (also from the 1994- 1995 yearbook). 3.5.4.2 now:

3.5.4.2 Runner section profile is optional 350 mm from the front edge up to 100 mm from the back Edge

A formulation that covers the intention would be option A:

3.5.4.2 Runner section profile is prismatic; of essentially constant height and thickness. But may be tapered below the minimum height and/or thickness over the front 350 mm and/or the aft 100 mm of the runner.

A formulation that covers a runner design that is also in use would be option B:

3.5.4.2 Runner cross section profile is prismatic; of essentially constant height and thickness. But may be tapered below the minimum height outside the chock area with a maintained cross section, to a minimum height of 90 mm. The cross section can be further tapered in height and thickness over the front 350 mm and/or the aft 100 mm of the runner.

We need to combine this with an official plan for the wood runner that also defines the steel part, to be presented at the annual meeting 2018

Daan Schutte