

Minutes of the meeting held at Keighley 10th April 2004

Present: B Mayoh (Chair), N C Hadley (Minutes), E Brearley (NHCC), J E McCormick (NTWCC), B Crick (CCC), P Avery (RVCC), A Rolph (DRCC), B Emmett (CSTCC), A Trigg (DCC), P Bell (NACC), F Holmes (deputy PCC), H Pashley (RCC) latter part of meeting as a result of judging duties.

1. **Apologies:** A Sparkes (ACC), M Mahoney (PCC) and B Wiles (ESCC).

The Chairman extended his welcome to new Councillors Mr E Brearley on behalf of the NHCC and Mr J E McCormick on behalf of the NTWCC. He also welcomed Fred Holmes 'back to the BCC' representing the PCC today in his role as Deputy Rep.

2. **Agreement to Minutes of Meeting of 17th January 2004:** Brian Emmett proposed the minutes as a true and correct record. All present agreed.

3. **Matters arising from the previous minutes:** The minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed and the matters arising not covered on the agenda were:

- **The Ridgeback.** Allan Trigg requested that the BCC clarify the position regarding the Ridgeback when being shown as pets. All present agreed that **Ridgebacks should be considered as 'rough' when exhibited in pet classes.**
- **Agouti Cavy Club.** It had been noted that the NACC had been advertising the solid agouti as having a full standard. Further confusion had been caused by the Guide Standard presented for discussion at today's meeting having been published with points allocations (only Full Standards have points allocations). The BCC requested that the NACC clarify that, subject to approval at today's meeting, that the **Solid Agouti has a Guide Standard only.**

4. **Chairman's Report:** The Chairman extended his thanks to the Secretary for the secretarial support given so far and pointed out the considerable efforts that had been necessary in dealing with BCC issues following the meeting in January and in preparation for this one.

5. **Proposed Guide Standards:**

- **Solid Agouti - paper 2004/02/01.** Penny Bell confirmed that the NACC would remove the points allocations from the Guide Standard in order to maintain the principle of publishing Guide Standards without points. She also confirmed that the application under consideration today was for a Guide Standard only. After some discussion it was agreed to add the following to the 'notes for guidance' in the Guide Standard: "**Some of these cavies are born solid coloured and develop ticking later so darkness on face and feet in under five month exhibits should not be**

unduly penalised". The rest of the standard was to be maintained as presented. A unanimous vote was returned agreeing to the **Solid Agouti being granted a Guide Standard**

- **Galloway - paper 2004/02/02.** Pauline Avery made a brief presentation of the proposed Guide Standard. A great deal of discussion ensued about both the standard itself and the proposed name, especially in the context of similar patterns occurring in other animals, e.g. pigs and cattle. The discussion indicated that **It was unclear as to whether the 'preferred' position of the belt should include the shoulders and front feet, as found on present examples of the breed, or should be situated around the middle of the cavy.** Councillors expressed genuine uncertainty about what the cavy should look like, indeed whether there would be two breeds with different belt positions, and what it/they it should be called. **It was agreed by a majority of the Council that the Galloway would NOT be granted a Guide Standard.** It was further agreed that the RVCC would consider the outcomes of the discussions, particularly whether the cavy presently being produced could be given a name such as 'Saddleback' that does not imply a belt around the middle, as 'Galloway' does, and take a decision as to whether they would seek to present a revised Guide Standard for discussion by the BCC again at its next meeting. The RVCC agreed in any case to re-order the Guide Standard to take into effect recently agreed standards for the sake of consistency, as was agreed at the January meeting.
- **P E Cream - paper 2004/02/03.** The Chairman pointed out that the P E Cream did not require a Guide Standard because of the latest rule change passed at the January meeting regarding non-recognised colours of standardised covies being eligible to be shown in Guide Standard classes. It was therefore agreed that **the P E Cream could be shown in classes for 'A V Guide Standard'.**
- **Teddy - paper 2004/02/04.** Pauline Avery made a brief presentation of the proposed Guide Standard. A lengthy discussion ensued, which was largely concerned with the issues of whether the Teddy should have a soft or harsh coat and **the need for judges to be able to clearly tell the difference between a Teddy and a Rex.** The Best Rex and the Best Teddy from the Yorkshire Championship Show were brought for examination by Councillors, and the consensus was that it was almost impossible to distinguish them as representatives of different breeds. Fred Holmes stated that he believed that the Teddy was not yet ready to receive a Guide Standard and that this was demonstrated by the fact that a) no councillors present could tell the difference between the two animals under examination in the context of the Guide Standard presented for discussion today; and b) those being shown around the UK were inconsistent in quality and presentation. He felt, though, that in time, in the right hands, professionally groomed and of a good standard, they could be distinguished from Rex and were a serious prospect for a Guide Standard. **It was agreed by a majority of the Council that the Teddy would NOT be granted a Guide Standard.** It was agreed that the RVCC would consider the outcomes of the discussions. Councillors asked the RVCC to continue to work with the Teddy but to wait to present

the Guide Standard for agreement again until they had been developed to be consistently clearly distinguishable from the Rex breed. The RVCC also agreed to re-order the Guide Standard to take into effect recently agreed standards for the sake of consistency, as was agreed at the January meeting; and to discuss with their members the timing for re-presentation of the application for Guide Standard.

- **Sable - paper 2004/02/05.** Pauline Avery made a brief presentation of the proposed Guide Standard. Discussion ensued and it became clear that exhibitors and judges needed to be 'clearer' on the description for the Sable. A number of Councillors felt that not enough were being bred and exhibited and that further time was needed to assess the breed before acceptance of the Guide Standard. There was particular difficulty in distinguishing them from bad Chocolates in non-optimal lighting conditions. The Chairman suggested that a number of Sable cavies be brought together at Doncaster as part of a display for Councillors to enable clearer and more informed discussion. It was agreed by a majority of the Council that the Sable would NOT be granted a Guide Standard.

Following the extensive discussions regarding the applications for Guide Standards further dialogue was held regarding how cavy breeds not granted a BCC Guide Standard could be exhibited in open shows. Clearly the emphasis will remain for the RVCC to cater fully for the breeds; but, to enable them to become more widely known and for knowledge to be developed amongst non specialist rare variety judges, it was also deemed desirable for these 'new varieties' of cavy to be adequately catered for at open shows. However, the Council felt strongly that this should be done in a 'managed' way. It was agreed that:

- If local, area and national clubs wished to put on classes for cavies not possessing a Guide Standard that such classes would be referred to as: "New Varieties as approved by the RVCC".
- That where this was done exhibitors would be required to specify the breed being entered into the class to the show secretary at the time of making the entry, so that the judge can be informed of the breed on the judging sheet.
- No duplication would be allowed beyond the "New Varieties as approved by the RVCC" class.
- Before putting such a class on the schedule club secretaries would be required to apply to the RVCC for permission. Exhibitors would be encouraged to persuade Club secretaries to seek permission from the RVCC for other new varieties not yet approved, if sufficient numbers allow and reasonable consistency of stock is evident.
- Upon such permission being granted, show secretaries would be advised by the RVCC which new variety breeds would be permitted to be exhibited in the "New Varieties

as approved by the RVCC" class. Secretaries should only allow entries from such breeds.

- In the interests of the avoidance of doubt, the RVCC would publish in CAVIES the breeds currently possessing BCC Guide Standards, together with copies of each of the standards, and a list of non-Guide Standard breeds that it would recognise as eligible for the above classes.

The proposal for the "New Varieties as approved by the RVCC" class was made by Allan Trigg and seconded by Brian Emmett. All present agreed unanimously.

- Guide standards agreed today will become as effective as Guide Standards on 1st August 2004.

6. Proposed Alterations to Guide Standards:

- a. Fox - paper 2004/02/06. Following discussion a number of modifications were proposed and agreed as alterations to the presented Guide Standard for the Fox. These are as detailed in the published Fox Guide Standard below.
- b. Tan - paper 2004/02/07. Following discussion a number of modifications were proposed and agreed as alterations to the presented Guide Standard for the Tan. These are as detailed in the published Tan Guide Standard below.

Alterations to Guide Standards agreed today will become as effective on 1st August.

Proposed Alterations to Full Standards:

Satin - paper 2004/02/08. Following discussion a number of modifications were proposed, and agreed as alterations to the presented Full Standard for the Satin. These are as detailed on the published Satin Guide Standard below.

Further discussion ensued regarding the application of the Full Standard for the Satin to coated breeds such as Abyssinian, Longhaired varieties and Rex, given that satinisation affects some of the fundamental requirements of the non-satin versions. Councillors unanimously asked the RVCC to discuss the matter and to report to the next meeting of the BCC regarding the application of the revised full standard for the satinised breeds where coat has additional relevance. The RVCC is to advise any alterations necessary to the standard as agreed today when applied to these breeds, as clearly a number of

anomalies could be identified with regard to requirements for coat quality.

It was mentioned that some shows are allocating the judging of Satins to the Marked & Ticked judge. This may be simply to spread the number of entries evenly between the Non Self judges and that, of course, is allowed. However, Satins should NOT be duplicated into any Marked or Ticked Challenges as they are a Coated variety and any crest, marking or ticking is of secondary significance when it comes to classifying the breed.

Coronet - paper 2004/02/09. A short discussion was held and it was agreed to rectify a previous error in the Coronet standard.

Alterations to Full Standards agreed today will become as effective on 1st August.

7. **Proposed amendments to BCC Rules - paper 2004/02/10.** A number of changes to the rules of the BCC were presented for discussion and after some debate the following changes were unanimously agreed:

Rule 1: At the end of Rule 1 insert: "In Open shows the only cavies that may be exhibited are those having a Full standard agreed by the British Cavy Council, with the following exceptions:

- I. Cavies of breeds for which a Guide Standard has been agreed by the BCC.
- II. Cavies of non-standardised colours of standardised breeds, which shall be viewed as having a de facto Guide Standard, the guidance points being as for the standardised breed but with colour definition(s) remaining to be specified. Cavies in these categories I and II may only be shown in a class or classes specifically defined for Guide Standard cavies and are not eligible for awards in competition with fully standardised cavies.
- III. Cavies not satisfying the above conditions, i.e. new varieties, will only be permitted in a class entitled 'New Variety approved by the RVCC', subject to the associated rules being complied with, i.e. the RVCC having granted permission for the class to be put on and for the new variety in question to be exhibited in the class, that the exhibitor had declared at the time of making the entry the breed applicable and that no duplication would be allowed beyond the "New Varieties as approved by the RVCC" class.
- IV. Pet cavies, for which judging criteria are subject to individual opinion, but include cleanliness and health, and which are not eligible for competition with cavies in other categories.

Rule 2: Under Rule 2: insert: "The Secretary is not eligible to vote. The Chairman is not eligible to vote, other than in the event of a tied vote, where he/she may exercise a casting vote."

Alterations to Rules agreed today will become as effective from 1st August.

Further brief discussion followed on the BCC Rules in general. All present agreed that they should be redrafted, but, pointing out that this would be a difficult and time consuming exercise, the Chairman agreed to take on this responsibility so long as the entire membership of the Council would devote the time for a full and constructive discussion. This was agreed and a redrafted set of rules will be a major topic for the next meeting of the BCC.

The support of the NCC and SCC was considered as crucial in the enforcement and communication of the BCC rules and as such it was agreed that both clubs be asked to communicate them widely amongst their membership by whatever means considered appropriate.

It was further agreed that Specialist Club judges should be asked not to judge at venues where BCC rules are flouted and ignored. The responsibility for communicating this will lie with the specialist breed clubs themselves.

8. **Timing of implementation of New fully Standardised Breeds - verbal.**
It was agreed that as and when a newly standardised breed is agreed by the BCC an appropriate date be set for the standard to become 'live', bearing in mind the needs of club schedules.
9. **Standardising Specialist Club Rules - paper 2004/02/11.** At the British Cavy Council meeting on 17/01/04 it was agreed that the following Rule Change rule be accepted as a standard ruling for all specialist clubs: -

"No alteration, deletion or addition shall be made to these rules except by a majority of votes cast at an AGM of the Club or by any changes and additions decided by the British Cavy Council. Any existing or new rules of the Club must not conflict in any way with British Cavy Council Rules. Notice of any proposed change to the rules by a member must be advised to the Secretary in sufficient time to allow the membership to be notified through publication by the Club. On any matter of urgency that infringes this condition, the chairman has the discretionary power to include any such proposal on the AGM Agenda for discussion by the members present".

Discussion was also held on 17th January regarding uniformity in the subscription ruling for the specialist clubs. Allan Trigg was tasked with the responsibility to propose a new uniform rule covering subscriptions. The following was agreed:

"The annual subscription shall be payable in advance on the first day of January in each year unless a person or partnership joined the previous year after the end of September. In such a case, the

subscription will cover membership to the end of the following year.
There will be the following classes of membership:-

1. Individual Adult.
2. Partnership (limited to two).
3. Senior Citizen
4. Juvenile (7 years old to 16 years of age on 1st January, eligibility for juvenile classes to lapse on 17th birthday).
5. Family membership (Two adults and all Juvenile children)
6. Life Member (as decided by the members at AGM.)

The subscription for each class of membership (other than free life membership) shall be as fixed at the Annual General Meeting in the preceding year.

Membership shall be considered to have lapsed if not paid by the end of March and any member whose subscription is in arrears shall not be eligible to compete for any cup or special prize offered by the Club, or in any way enjoy the privileges of membership, or be eligible for election to any Club office or position”.

Specialist breed clubs will be required to action this at their next Club AGM with all clubs having the above two rules as standard uniform rules effective within one year from the publication of these minutes in CAVIES.

Further brief discussion followed after which it was suggested that **three further rules be considered by all specialist clubs**. The first would make it clear that it is the responsibility of specialist breed clubs to draft, develop and deliver standards for their breed. The second would consider a defined number of years of Club membership that is required before full voting and balloting rights are made available. The third should set out a standard disciplinary procedure in the case of alleged offences committed by members and officials. Obviously, any such rule changes that are introduced would not be retrospective in their effect.

Further it was suggested by Fred Holmes that the ‘starter pack’ for new and existing secretaries be developed by the BCC as outlined some years ago; and that this pack should include copies of all the currently agreed breed standards. This would be considered further at the next BCC meeting.

10. **Financial Report and Accounts - paper 2004/02/12.** Councillors were presented with a written report from the secretary of the BCC Prefix Registration Scheme, Mr P E J Wilkins, who is acting in the role of unofficial Treasurer following the resignation of Sue Hindon as the previous BCC secretary. Currently the BCC has two separate accounting systems, one for the BCC main funds which is in debit of £75.28 (it must be noted that as yet specialist breed clubs have not been asked to contribute to the running of the BCC for 2003-04), and one for the BCC stud prefix system which is in credit £370.11. The following were agreed actions:

- To merge the two accounting systems and to use one bank account only
- The BCC secretary and treasurer Nicola Hadley, and the Chair Bryan Mayoh are to become signatories for the bank account, as per the BCC rules, to take effect as soon as arrangements could be made with Andrew Sparkes
- Mr P E J Wilkins to be authorised to pay in only
- The BCC secretary to speak to Mr Wilkins regarding a small anomaly in the daybook raised by Brian Emmett
- The BCC secretary to bring together a full statement of income and expenditure for discussion at the next meeting of the BCC.

11. **Stud Prefix Scheme - update and financial report.** Councillors were presented with a written report from the secretary of the BCC Prefix Registration Scheme, Mr P E J Wilkins. Briefly this updated members of the scheme's success in achieving initial objectives. Registrations are 'on the up' with the total standing at 490 with the full register having recently been published in CAVIES. The latter had provided good publicity and lots of new registrations had been received subsequently. Quarterly register updates are to be published in CAVIES.

A short discussion was held regarding the financial implications of the scheme and a decision was made to 'merge' the financial accounting for the scheme with the wider finances of the BCC. A few minor teething problems and issues with suggestions for improvements were discussed, and it was agreed that the BCC secretary would write to Mr Wilkins regarding these, which are briefly:

- Option required for format of register - ability to sort by postcode and perhaps by stud names alphabetically. Mr Wilkins' making the register available electronically could possibly do this: however, it would be necessary to operate strict quality controls to avoid anomalies and later difficulties.
- The print of the register was considered too small - again, something which could be altered on an individual basis if it were to be made available electronically.
- Regular updates to be made available on the NCC website.

Some dialogue was held regarding the importance of policing the scheme and for information sharing to ensure that show secretaries are able to monitor that stud names are registered BEFORE accepting entries under such stud name. It was suggested that Mr Wilkins publishes a notice in CAVIES as a warning to exhibitors, making it clear that **they may only show using a registered stud name**. It was agreed that this would NOT apply to pet exhibitors.

A vote of thanks from Councillors was extended to Mr Wilkins for all the work he has put in to make the scheme so successful. The secretary agreed to write formally with thanks.

12. **Correspondence.** All relevant items of correspondence had been dealt with under the above matters.

13. **Motions of Urgency.** None.

14. **Any other business.** The Chairman raised the issue of inconsistencies in existing standards that had arisen as a result of their being drafted by many different people over many years, and which result in additional complexity for judges and exhibitors in considering the requirements of an ever-increasing number of standardised and Guide Standard breeds. The Chairman suggested that he and the Secretary might present proposals for redrafting the format of the agreed breed standards to regularise the format, for example in ordering the description so that 'Head, Eye and Ears' is always first, followed by 'Body' and so on. The aim would not be to make changes to the Standards themselves other than to regularise them. Further, it was agreed that if anomalies or errors were found in standards that suggestions for changes should be made to Specialist Breed Clubs. The Chairman pointed out that this work would involve considerable effort and that he would only be willing to undertake this if Councillors fully supported the objectives and committed themselves to trying to get the agreement of their Clubs, both to format changes and in addressing inconsistencies and anomalies. All agreed to do this, and Mr Holmes further pointed out that if a particular Club proved unnecessarily difficult then the BCC Rule allowing a change of an existing breed standard by a 2/3 majority of Councillors could be invoked. It was agreed that the Chairman and Secretary would present proposals to the next meeting of the BCC and that, after discussion at the BCC, Councillors and Specialist Breed Club secretaries would be asked to take agreed changes to their AGM's with a recommendation for acceptance.

15. **Date and location of next meeting.** A date of 17th October at Loughborough was agreed in principle and the secretary was tasked with making the necessary arrangements. Subsequently, because of the impossibility of the Secretary's being able to commit to this date, it was agreed by the majority of Councillors to amend the agreed date to 25th September 2004 in conjunction with the show to be held at West Mercia.