

## Minutes of the Meeting of 28<sup>th</sup> September 2019, held at Over Whitacre Village Hall, Warwickshire.

In Attendance: Bryan Mayoh (Chairman), Carol Payne (Secretary), Tony Cooke (TC - NFTCC), Graham Godfrey (GG - DCC), Amy Heale (AH - NACC), Oliver Joyce (OJ - DRCC), Mick Leigh (ML - NHCC), Nikki Matthews (NM - SVCC), Rex Matthews (RM - RCC), Simon Neesam (SN - ACC), David Oulton (DRO - NCC, non-voting), Don Payne (DP - CCC), Joan Phillips (JP - PVCC), Ken Phillips (KP - NTWCC), Pam Ramsden (PR – RVCC, entitled to additional vote), Ian Reynolds (IR - TCC), Evelyn Van Vliet (EVV – ESCC), Bernard Wiles (BW – ESCC).

### 1. Meeting Administration

- a) **Apologies for Absence:** All Clubs were fully represented so none required.
- b) **Record of the Meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> September 2018:** The record of the meeting had previously been agreed before being published in CAVIES. However, it was further agreed that a list of attendees would be appended to the record.
- c) **Matters Arising from the Meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2018** (not otherwise on the Agenda): None.
- d) **Chairman's Opening Remarks:** The Chairman welcomed Councillors to the Meeting, particularly those that were attending for the first time, noting that all Clubs were represented. He explained that DRO was attending as a non-voting NCC Representative since various matters of interest to the British cavy fancy, including welfare, needed to be considered by both the NCC and the BCC.

He further stated that the 'Statement of Expected Behaviours of Councillors and Senior Officials of Member Clubs' had been agreed by a majority of the Council so that its principles would apply from this meeting. However, he considered it very unlikely that any of the 'conflict of interest' provisions would apply today.

The voting procedure in regard to this document was then challenged by OJ and NM but the Chairman replied that it had been agreed by a clear majority of 11 For, 3 Against, 2 No Votes Received and so would apply to the meeting, with further discussion being postponed to Item 6 of the Agenda.

At that time OJ proposed, and it was unanimously agreed, that the 'Statement of Expected Behaviours' would be included as a Council Rule but with the modification that a Club Representative that is determined by the Chairman as having a potential conflict of interest in regard to a matter under discussion should be able to speak on the matter in question but not vote on it. Rule 3.15 will now reflect this 'Statement of Expected Behaviours'.

In order to ensure transparency in the discussions to be held, the Chairman asked Councillors to state the names of any Specialist Clubs in which they held the position of Chairman or Secretary in addition to any positions in the Club they were representing today. It was then established that the following additional roles applied: GG – NTWCC, KP – PVCC, JP – NTWCC, IR – RCC, RM – TCC, AH – DCC, NM – RVCC.

## 2. Administration of BCC

- a) **Financial Report:** The Chairman presented the Financial Report for 2018/19, which indicated a small excess of income over expenditure (£40.60) and a C/F Balance of £1,372.26. Income was overwhelmingly derived from Prefix Registrations (£333.50) along with a small sum of bank interest, with expenditure being incurred on Hall Hire / Refreshments (£115.11), Prefix Certificates (£82.00) and Web hosting (£100.00).
- b) **Prefix Scheme** –Mr Trigg, who was unable to attend, had reported an increased number of prefix registrations, many by non-fanciers. He was sorry to report that Alan Waspe was unable to continue producing registration certificates. The Council agreed with his proposal that Amy Heale take up the task and be provided with appropriate recompense for the time and cost involved. It was further agreed that in future the fee for prefix registration would be increased to £10 and that a small gift could be purchased for Mr Waspe in thanks for his efforts over the years. Mr Trigg would also have been thanked effusively for his efforts as Prefix Registrar but as he wasn't present there was no point in doing so, so he wasn't.
- c) **Website** - SN reported on the number of hits to the website and that it continued to be a source of requests for stock, which were currently being forwarded by the Secretary to appropriate Specialist Clubs or fanciers. It was agreed that all Clubs should advise SN of contact details of people able to help find stock of their various breeds in different parts of the country.

It was also agreed that details of Club website addresses and Facebook pages should be passed on to SN, both to help promote Clubs themselves and to increase the relevance of the BCC website in Search algorithms.

## 3. Cavy Fancy Issues

- a) **Welfare** - DRO reported that, on behalf of the NCC, he had attended a meeting in Parliament to which various livestock breeding and 'animal welfare' bodies had been invited in order to discuss possible future legislation in this area. Whilst it is unlikely that new laws would come into being whilst Parliament is otherwise occupied with more important matters such as the language used by parliamentarians to describe each other, one day this may pose a challenge to the viability of the cavy fancy, in the form of inappropriate regulations for the keeping, showing and selling of livestock that are influenced by people whose motives are rather different from ours.

EVV confirmed that a similar situation is developing in Europe and the Chairman commented that a new EU Animal Welfare Act is to be introduced in 2021 that will affect the UK even if 'Leave' actually does mean we have left by then. Since this Act seems to have adverse implications for the transport of thoroughbreds regardless of the best efforts of major breeding organisations in France and Ireland as well as the UK, adverse 'unintended consequences' for the cavy fancy could easily arise similarly.

It was agreed that DRO would be appointed as welfare advisor / representative to the BCC in addition to the NCC in order to give him additional weight in any governmental discussions, and that he will report back to the Council on future developments.

### b. Judging Tuition

It was agreed that the efforts of the NCC to improve judging tuition / selection by such means as the existing Annual Seminars would be aided if Specialist Clubs ran their own judges' training schemes, even if only on an informal basis in order to educate promising newcomers. Presently only the ESCC and DRCC have formal Judges Training Schemes and the Chairman suggested that the RVCC at least should follow suit given the complexity of the various Standards, Guide Standards and Guidance Notes for the breeds for which it is responsible.

In a discussion of the matter, it was agreed that education of judges and fanciers in breeds other than those in which they specialise would be an excellent approach, with the recent 'seminar' given by Andrew Sparkes when judging an Abyssinian Cavy Club show being cited as an excellent example. All Clubs were asked to arrange similar such sessions at appropriate events.

In addition it was agreed that a suggestion by DRO to seek to arrange similar events for several breeds on the second day of the Bradford Championship Show would be likely to prove beneficial, in terms of education, interest and incentive to attend the event. It was agreed that the Council would look favourably on any future request by the NCC to part-fund this or similar events.

#### **4. Breed Standards**

There were no proposals for changes to the Standard, Guide Standard, Guidance Notes or status of any breed of cavy.

- (a) Status of various breeds and breed / colour combinations: in regard to SN's request for clarification on this matter, the following indicates the present position as detailed in the Standards documentation:

##### **DEFINITION OF BREEDS AS GUIDE STANDARD, NEW / EMERGING OR UNRECOGNISED PENDING ASSESSMENT**

(1) The only breeds that may be shown in **Guide Standard** classes are those for which a specific Guide Standard has been agreed by the Council as above.

(2) In addition to breeds for which detailed **New / Emerging Breed** Guidance Notes have been defined as above, a cavy containing a Self colour or an Agouti or Argente pattern that has a Full or Guide Standard, but belonging to a Non-Self variety whose Full or Guide Standard does **not** recognise that particular colour / pattern, is deemed to be a New / Emerging Breed.

The general requirements will be as stated in the Full or Guide Standard for the Non-Self variety but with colour requirements as in the Full or Guide Standard of the specific Self, Agouti or Argente. Examples might be American Crested Agouti, Slate/Golden Californian, Blue Himalayan.

(3) A new colour variation of a Self cavy (e.g. the partial or full pink-eyed versions of the Self Blue, or Self versions of the blue-dilution gene with red or chocolate base colour) will be treated as an '**Unrecognised Breed Pending Assessment**' until such time as Guidance Notes for the colour can be agreed.

- (4) Likewise, a Non-Self cavy (other than Solid Satin) containing a colour that as a Self would be regarded either as a 'New and Emerging Breed' or as an 'Unrecognised Breed Pending Assessment' will be treated as an '**Unrecognised Breed Pending**

**Assessment'**, since efforts should first be concentrated on defining the colour to at least Guide Standard level.

(5) A Non-Self cavy containing a combination of features that are likely to interact in an inappropriate or unpredictable way will be treated as an **'Unrecognised Breed Pending Assessment'**.

(b) **Lack of Beige, Fox, Tan and Otter varieties at shows:** TC raised this issue on behalf of the NFTCC and asked what ideas other Representatives had. In response to questions regarding possible actions, TC confirmed that the NTFCC were already using the usual methods of breed / colour promotion, e.g. points competition awards, separate Challenge classes for the breeds concerned, but to no avail.

The Council concluded that the key issue is one of viability. If the NTFCC believes that it is possible for these breeds to meet the stated Standard then it is inappropriate for them to be returned to Guide Standard or NEB status. If the Club deems this not to be the case then a proposal might be made to the Council to return them to NEB status. At present it appears that the former is the case and that the issue is therefore one of popularity not viability.

(c) **Report by relevant Specialist Clubs on Blue varieties of Agouti, Fox and Himalayan cavies**

AH reported that no Blue / White Agoutis have been shown so that the breed should continue to have NEB status.

ML gave a similar report of the Blue Himalayan, and further expressed doubt as to whether in reality such a cavy might be distinguishable from a poor Black Himalayan. The Slate Himalayan might have better prospects.

AC and PR both reported that a good example of the Blue Fox has been shown, meeting the expected standard in most major features. The one issue was that the colour of this cavy was actually 'bluer' than is found in the Self Blue; this appeared to be very attractive to the eye but might require some modification to the normal requirement in Foxes to match ESCC colours. The NTFCC will continue to monitor Blue Foxes and make a recommendation to the Council in due course.

(d) **Report by ESCC on progress of Self Caramel**

BW reported that the ESCC had held classes for Caramels on the second day of the ESCC Chairman's show in August. EVV and BW had judged the show but with open discussions amongst the judges and fanciers about the qualities of the cavies concerned. Although only two fanciers had provided stock, both had shown Caramels very successfully at major shows and there was a significant number of different cavies to assess.

Whilst all of the cavies were clearly darker in colour than Self Beige, thus eliminating any complaints that it might be impossible to tell the difference, two shades of colour had been evident – a darker, duller shade whose cavies carried generally better type, size and ears, and a brighter, 'orangey' shade that reflected the 'real toffee' colour required by the Guidance Notes but with inferior size, head type and ears. Clearly more work was required in outcrossing and selection to achieve a combination of the 'toffee' colour with requisite type; and a proposal to move the breed to Guide Standard should await at least some of the necessary improvement, along with further evaluation.

The Chairman congratulated the ESCC on its work to date and on an excellent report by EVV in CAVIES that might be a model for future evaluations by this and other Clubs. In response to concerns expressed by PR that some Self Caramel breeders were unwilling to participate in ESCC events because of ill-feeling about the transfer of prime responsibility to that Club, ESCC officials agreed to host future similar events at NCC Stock or other well-attended events, rather than at 'all-ESCC' shows; whilst the Chairman suggested that fanciers who really cared about the development of their breed would consider this as their prime objective rather than continuing to complain about alleged injustices resulting from carefully considered Council decisions in the past.

**(e) Report by RVCC on Guide Standard Rare Varieties**

**Lunkarya:** PR stated that the RVCC Standards Committee considered that the Lunkarya was ready for a Full Standard, with some excellent examples being shown this year. The Club had held discussions with the PVCC, which had also agreed that this was the case. The two Clubs had agreed points allocations for the present Guide Standard to form a Full Standard and that the breed would transfer to the PVCC at that time.

However, the RVCC had needed to consult its members and vote on the proposal being put forward; and PR suggested that it had not been possible to do this since the Council meeting had been brought forward this year, which meant there was insufficient time. Accordingly, a proposal for a Full Standard for the Lunkarya could not be brought to this meeting but such a proposal would be made in 2020.

The Chairman welcomed the constructive discussions that had evidently taken place between the two Clubs but expressed disappointment that, this being the case, a Full Standard had not been proposed at the present time. The date of the meeting had been agreed several months in advance (N.B. It was confirmed on February 28<sup>th</sup> 2019) and it was held on the same weekend as in 2018, so there appeared to have been ample opportunity for Clubs to hold any necessary consultations and obtain appropriate internal approvals.

Furthermore, he had made it clear that, with the agreement of the Council, he would have attempted to facilitate a decision on proposed Standards changes even if the proposals were made less than 28 days before the meeting. This would have given the RVCC a final opportunity to submit a proposal in regard to the Lunkarya, which it might then have withdrawn if its AGM had failed to endorse it. However, he questioned whether it was really appropriate at all for Clubs that had elected Standards and Executive Committees to discuss such matters further at General Meetings. It was unfortunate that discussion of a Full Standard for the Lunkarya had been delayed for 12 months because of the timing of a Club AGM.

(N.B. Subsequent to the Council Meeting it has been confirmed that the present RVCC Rules do not require agreement at the AGM as a pre-requisite for submission to the Council. The appropriate Rule (13) states that: 'The Standards Committee will consider all potential changes to Guidance Notes, Guide Standards and Full Standards, this being the purpose for which (it) exists. Guide Standards and Full Standards will be formulated by the Standards Committee, after appropriate consultation with breeders of the variety, and then presented to the Executive Committee before submission to the BCC.')

**Swiss:** PR reported that there were significant differences in the quality of the Swiss being exhibited, some being shown without the required 'puff-ball effect', with coat

length differing from the requirements of the Guide Standard or in moult. The issue appears to be that a number of new exhibitors are failing to focus on the required coat appearance and length, and to understand that moulting is an inevitable aspect of the breed, from which cavies must recover before being shown subsequently. It is therefore unlikely that a change to the Swiss's status will be recommended within the next two years. It was further agreed that an article in CAVIES might help educate Swiss fanciers on what is required.

**Argente:** PR also reported inconsistencies in the quality of Argentes being exhibited. In a discussion on the breed it emerged that good examples of the requisite 'sharp, level ticking' were being shown but usually these are incorrectly described as 'Solid Argentes', which they are most unlikely to be. Those cavies described as 'Normal Argentes' often show the eye circles, severe bonnet strings and light bellies indicative of AA agoutis; these are more properly described as Chinchillas and should not be shown as Argentes.

The RVCC should educate breeders and judges to select for the former and not exhibit or award prizes to the latter. If the animals being shown can be improved along the lines of the specified Guide Standard, a proposal to move to Full Standard may be made in 2021, following a period of consultation and assessment in collaboration with the NACC similar to that carried out for the Lunkarya with the PVCC.

**Chinchilla:** PR stated that the breed had made good progress since the development of the revised Guide Standard two years ago. The expectation was that the Chinchilla might well be ready for movement to Full Standard next year. The Chairman asked that this step be discussed with the NTCC since Foxes were a breed with similar phenotype and the Club was suggested by breeders as a possible future home for the Chinchilla when he had helped them develop the present Guide Standard in 2017.

**Californian:** PR suggested that Californians carrying two 'Californian' genes were too excessively marked to be show pigs and that heterozygous pigs were required for showing. The Chairman responded with the information that a leading Californian breeder had always told him that the homozygote was the best show specimen as an U/5 but that these became excessively marked later on, favouring the heterozygote as the adult show specimen. PR agreed with further information imparted to the Chairman that dark markings behind the ears were becoming less pronounced than formerly.

PR stated that it was unlikely that the Californian will be ready for Full Standard in 2020 but may be the following year. Efforts should continue to concentrate on black and chocolate versions, although these could be found in combination with red, golden, buff and cream. It was agreed that it was undesirable to encourage other colours of points or white body colour at this stage. ML confirmed that, although the NHCC would like to be consulted as regards any proposed Californian standard, it was unlikely to ask for responsibility for the breed.

**Tricolour:** PR reported that interest in the Tricolour had not been stimulated by the move to Guide Standard two years ago, when requirements were modified to be less rigid than those applying to the T/W, these steps being aimed to encourage breeders to persist with the breed. The RVCC will monitor the situation and consider whether to request the return to Full Standard using either the more rigidly defined T/W standard or the present Guide Standard that emphasizes the key aspects of tri-coloured pigs whilst encouraging judges to be more forgiving of examples that fall short of perfection. The Chairman

commented that if the T/W were to be considered for a Full Standard today this would be the probable approach, since no examples approaching perfection had been sighted in at least the past 40 years.

PR confirmed that a similar situation applied to the Bicolour. The RVCC will consider whether the continuation of a Guide Standard for a patched Bicolour is serving any useful purpose, given the ongoing absence of any examples of the breed, or whether its removal (as for the Brindle and Tortoiseshell) might be appropriate.

**Harlequin & Magpie:** PR reported that Harlequins of a reasonable quality had continued to be shown, matching the Harlequin Guide Standard modified two years ago (and based on the Tricolour rather than T/W framework), so that a proposal to move to Full Standard might be made in 2021. The situation for the Magpie was similar and consideration would be also given to taking the same step at that time. N.B. The previously agreed guidelines for such a move are that the NTWCC should provide assistance in assessing the quality of what are effectively tri-coloured pigs in which one of the 'colours' consists of areas of brindling.

**(f) Report by RVCC on NEB Rare Varieties**

**Ridgeback:** PR and NM stated that the Ridgeback has shown considerable progress since the new Guidance Notes, calling for Self, Agouti or Argente colouration, were introduced two years ago. NM also noted that the two year period in which small patches of other colour were tolerated has now expired. (N.B. This step was taken despite vocal complaints from long-standing breeders of the variety in whose hands the breed had failed to progress previously.) It is possible that a proposal will be brought forward to move to Guide Standard in two years time.

The Chairman suggested that, in considering any move to Guide Standard status, the RVCC should determine what points might be allocated to each feature in a Full Standard, since this will focus attention on the key requirements of the Guide Standard. In the case of the Ridgeback the principal issue to consider is whether the large number of points (65) for coat appearance and feel in other Coated Short-haired breeds can reasonably be replicated in the Ridgeback or whether a lesser number of points (say the 20 allocated for crest in the Crested or to satinisation in the Satin) might be more appropriate, with additional points being allocated to type and colour.

**Belted:** PR stated that good examples of the breed (recognized at this stage only in the black / white version) had been exhibited. There is a possibility that the RVCC may recommend a move of the Belted to Guide Standard in 2021.

The Chairman reiterated his suggestion that, in considering the matter, the Club should consider the points allocations that might be appropriate in a Full Standard. It was suggested that the main possibilities are either to follow the 60 points for markings used in Marked breeds such as Dutch and T/W or the 50 points employed in Himalayans, Foxes and Tans, in which case very tight requirements for the exact positioning and shape of the band are likely to be required; or to utilize the approach followed in the American Crested of awarding 20 points for Crest markings and the remainder for other important features including type, colour and coat.

**Minipli:** PR reported that there was considerable inconsistency in the quality of Miniplis being exhibited, with some approaching the present Guidance Notes but many others too

long in coat and with significant length of chops, whilst lacking the required curly coat quality. She believed it is unlikely that the Minipli will progress to Guide Standard within the next two years. NM concurred, also commenting that many pigs appeared to have frontals more like those of a longhair rather than the short fringe expected by the Guidance Notes. Comments were made by other Councillors that the cavy's coat appears to grow indefinitely, so that older pigs have quite long coats rather than those expected. (N.B. However, the Guidance Notes do not suggest that the coat will stop growing, merely that it will grow more slowly).

In contrast, OJ and AH reported that they had each judged cavies that appeared to be good examples of the breed and with the features called for by the Guidance Notes; whilst the Chairman had recently been told by an RVCC Panel Judge that the best examples of the breed were very attractive examples of the requirements specified in these Notes, having far shorter coats than the Lunkarya but more profuse, tighter curls.

The RVCC will continue to monitor the breed in order to assess its potential as 'a distinct and desirable addition to the cavy fancy.'

**5. Correspondence:** None.

**6. BCC Processes:** OJ's proposal that a slightly modified Statement of Behaviours' be incorporated into the Rules was agreed as described in 1 (d).

The Chairman proposed that Rule 3.2 be modified to permit only 14 days notice of the Council Agenda rather than the 28 previously allowed in an era of post rather than email. This would allow the possibility of Club meetings at Real London to formulate items for the Agenda. However, since this was not an Agenda item he believed that the change could only be made if all Councillors agreed the change.

OJ suggested that this might be acceptable so long as the revised Rule still required 28 days notice where a proposal by one Club would have a particularly significant effect on another one, in order that the second Club would thereby have sufficient time to give proper consideration to the matter.

This was agreed unanimously and the revised Rule 3.2 changes underlined) states that:

Rule 3.2: Items for the Agenda must be submitted to the Secretary in sufficient time for the Chairman to agree the Agenda and for copies of the Agenda and relevant papers to be sent to representatives at least 14 days prior to the date of the meeting. However, in the case of a proposal made by one Specialist Club that has a particular impact on another, for example to change the Standard of a breed covered by the Club or to redefine its responsibilities, this must be submitted to the Secretary in sufficient time that the Chairman is able to give the Club at least 28 days' notice prior to the date of the meeting so that it has sufficient opportunity to consider its response.

**7. Any other business:** In his excitement that the normal business had been concluded and that he could now concentrate on matters involving breeding thoroughbred horses for the next 11 months and 30 days, the Chairman inadvertently forgot to thank the Secretary for all her hard work and diligence during the past year. Having been reminded to do so by various Councillors, he paid an eloquent and heartfelt tribute that elicited a round of applause for the Secretary. Amidst all the pleasure generated by this happy conclusion to the annual meeting, no-one bothered to thank the Chairman for his own immense efforts. Fortuitously, he is unlikely to be unduly troubled by this unfortunate and not atypical omission.



**8. Date and location of next meeting:** To be arranged.

**Appendix: New Council Rule 3.15**

3.15 The Expected Behaviours of Councillors and Senior Officials of Clubs represented on the Council are:

- (1) When putting forward a proposal on behalf of a Specialist Club, or discussing a proposal that has significant implications for such a Club, the Club's representative must be careful to represent the Club's views as determined by the Club's Executive and not express personal opinions if these might undermine the Club's position.
- (2) However, Club representatives should remember that they are chosen on the basis of their knowledge and judgment, so, if during Council discussions suggestions are made that might improve a given proposal, they should use their judgment to decide if modifications to the proposal would be in the Club's best interests whilst still reflecting its prime intentions. If a representative feels so strongly about such an Agenda item that he /she is unable to reflect the Club's views as the Executive would wish, he should inform the Club's Chairman in sufficient time that another representative with no such difficulties can be chosen.
- (3) When discussing matters that have no significant implications for his Specialist Club (for example proposed changes to standards for unrelated breeds), the Club's representative should listen carefully to the arguments put to the meeting and offer any relevant knowledge and experience to the debate. In voting on any matter he /she must act in what he /she believes to be the best interests of the cavy fancy as a whole.
- (4) If the representative of a particular Specialist Club is also a senior official (defined for this purpose as Chairman or Secretary) of a second Specialist Club, he / she must make the Council Chairman aware of this at the start of the meeting. If the Chairman believes that an item on the Agenda has such significant implications for the second Specialist Club that it creates a serious conflict between the representative's duty of objectivity under (2) above and his duty to the second Specialist Club as a senior official, he may determine that the representative cannot vote in regard to the item in question.
- (5) It is the Chairman's responsibility to ensure that items discussed at Council meetings are clearly presented, so as to enable the Council to take the best decisions it can in the interests of the cavy fancy, considering any additional information on, for example, existing standards, rules and precedents that he / she believes to be relevant. He / she has the overriding responsibility at Council meetings to act in what he / she believes to be in the best interests of the cavy fancy.
- (6) In situations where representatives and senior officials disagree with decisions taken by the Council, they are at liberty to state their personal disagreement with such decisions but they must not do so in terms that may reasonably be viewed as derogatory to either the Council itself or the representatives at the meeting(s) where the decisions in question were taken.
- (7) When communicating with the fancy at large, in any situation where there is reasonable room for doubt on the matter Specialist Club representatives, senior Specialist Club officials and the Chairman and Secretary of the Council must make it clear when they are speaking in a personal capacity and when an official one. However, subject to (6) above, all of these parties are fully entitled to give their personal opinions even on matters relating to areas of the Council's responsibilities.

