

## **Minutes of the Meeting of 27<sup>th</sup> October 2007, held at Norton Lindsay Village Hall, Warwickshire.**

Present: Bryan Mayoh (Chair, Minutes), Allan Trigg (DCC), Ted Brearley (NHCC), Oliver Joyce (DRCC), Tony O'Neill (ESCC), Don Payne (CCC), Caroline Smith (RVCC), Nikki Matthews (CSCC), Joan Phillips (PVCC), Penny Bell (NACC), Ken Yates (NTWCC), Hugh Pashley / Ian Reynolds (RCC, only 1 eligible to vote).

1. **Apologies:** Nicola Hadley (Secretary / Treasurer), Simon Neesam (ACC, notes sent to Meeting)

2. **Minutes of the Meeting of 29<sup>th</sup> January 2007 (already circulated)**

All present agreed that the Minutes of the Meeting were a true record.

3. **Matters Arising from the Meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> January 2007 (and not on the Agenda)**

Mrs Matthews asked when the Council would review the way in which the Alpaca is being catered for by the PVCC, stating that, although the breed had gained many BIS, only two of the successful exhibitors were members of the PVCC. The Chairman replied that the meeting of the Council to be held in mid 2008 would be an appropriate time, and that he would schedule a discussion on the matter at that time.

He went on to suggest, however, that Mrs Matthews' comments on successful Alpaca exhibitors not joining the PVCC was to some extent a 'self-fulfilling prophecy', since she herself was the most successful such exhibitor and had long held the view that the PVCC should not have been given the Alpaca and so had not joined the club. He reiterated his previous comments that the CSCC and the PVCC should work more closely together for the interests of all Longhair breeds. Mrs Matthews and Mrs Phillips indicated that they were doing this, but Mrs Matthews suggested that the PVCC should ask Alpaca breeders that were not members of their club why this was the case.

It was agreed that all other Matters Arising were to be dealt within the body of the Meeting.

4. **Chairman's Opening Remarks**

The Chairman thanked all Councillors for devoting a day of their time to attend the Meeting. There were several important and some potentially controversial matters to discuss; and so, although it appeared that there was the luxury of plenty of time, he believed that this would not prove to be the case and that a meeting of several hours would be required. However, it was likely that the Council had now reached a position where only one such formal meeting would be needed each year.

In response to the Chairman's query as to whether any clubs had sufficient members that they could claim two votes, Mr O'Neill responded that the ESCC had over 200 members, so that this would apply.

## **5. Update of Financials**

A copy of the Financial information prepared by the Treasurer was circulated. This indicated that the Council had cash assets of £1,592.26 plus £60 owed by the RCC and the ESCC. However, this sum included £790 prepaid for advertisements in the Breed Standards booklet. The Chairman advised Councillors that these assets would largely be used up in publishing and circulating the Standards Booklet (see Item 6 below) and that it would therefore be necessary to rebuild Council funds to some degree. Mrs Smith advised the Council that the Prefix Scheme typically generates circa £200 - £300 per annum; but the Chairman suggested that this would be fully utilised in future to pay ongoing expenses plus the costs of issuing updates to the Standards Booklet.

## **6. Update on Publication of Standards Booklet**

Mr O'Neill circulated a draft copy of the Standards Booklet that he had produced. The Chairman explained that the production of the draft booklet had taken longer than expected; so that, with the imminence of this meeting, he had decided to delay production so as to incorporate the effects of decisions taken today.

The improved clarity of layout produced by Mr O'Neill had caused an increase in the number of pages required and so in anticipated costs. These would be £1,171.57 for printing 700 booklets, £324.24 for brass binders for the booklets and £50 for the labour to bind the booklets. CAVIES would bear the costs of mailing circa 500 of the booklets along with the December 2007 issue. Printing more or less booklets would increase / decrease costs by circa £120 per 100.

It was agreed that widespread circulation of the new Standards was essential in fulfilling the Council's remit. Councillors felt that sufficient additional copies should be produced so as to satisfy demand from new fanciers or those too cheapskate to subscribe to CAVIES. It was therefore agreed to increase the print run to 800, which would incur a total cost of circa £1,665, thereby using the entire funds of the Council.

It was further agreed that surplus copies should be sold both directly by the Council and via Specialist Clubs, the NCC and the SCC. The recommended price for each booklet would be £7; but copies would be sold to these other clubs for £5, thereby compensating them for the effort involved in selling the booklets. These £5 charges would be the principal means of rebuilding the Council's assets.

It was agreed that, in order to maintain the accuracy and consistency of Standards issued to fanciers, henceforth only the Council would publish Standards Booklets; so that the present arrangements whereby the NCC and the SCC had been granted permission to do so would be terminated.

Council Rule 4.1 will be modified to reflect these arrangements for publication of Standards, to state that: *"The Council will maintain an up-to-date register of all breed standards; will publish new standards or modifications to existing ones in official cavy publications as defined by the Council; and will from time to time publish a booklet detailing all Full and Guide standards. For an appropriate charge copies of this booklet will be made available to, and may be sold by, all Specialist Clubs that are members of the Council and by the National and Southern Cavy Clubs."*

## **7. Consideration of Additional Details of Disqualifications**

Various suggestions had been made as to how the Disqualifications applying on the grounds of 'Physical Deformities' and 'Evident Ill-Health' might be expanded or clarified.

In terms of the former, the consensus was that 'Missing Testicles' should not be added to the list; and, for the sake of clarification, the rider should be added that: 'Neutered boars may be shown'.

As regards the ill-health disqualification, it was agreed that the guidelines originally suggested by Mr Oulton, via the ESCC, should be added, to read: 'Evident Ill-Health, such as obvious, visible breathing difficulties; significant evidence of mucus or other abnormal discharges from the eyes, nose, mouth, ears or reproductive or intestinal openings'.

## **8. Proposal from RVCC for Full Standards for Fox and Tan**

The Chairman stated his view that the most fundamental issue as regards the proposed Standards for the Fox and Tan was that, although they described the markings accurately, these markings were possessed by the overwhelming majority of Tans and Foxes; and the Standards said little about what constituted an appropriate quality of markings. Mrs Smith accepted this point. The Chairman suggested that this could be resolved, but that it was only worth doing so if Councillors agreed the principle that these breeds should be given Full Standards. This was agreed unanimously.

Councillors then debated how the proposed Standards might be clarified and improved so as to allow sufficient guidance to judges and exhibitors. Eventually Standards were defined that satisfied such requirements, and these were agreed unanimously. It was further agreed that Tans and Foxes should each be recognised in four colours, these being Black, Chocolate, Lilac and Beige. These Full Standards will be included in the Standards Booklet, and will come into effect on January 1<sup>st</sup> 2008.

The so-called 'Otter' cavy was discussed; and it was the overwhelming view of the Council that this was an appropriate name for tan-type cavies based on lemon ticking colour. As these are colour variants of a (now) Full Standard breed, by implication such cavies now have a Guide Standard; but the RVCC was encouraged to clarify colour requirements.

It was further agreed that, at the same time as the Tan and Fox achieve Full Standard status, English Crested and Satin Tans / Foxes would also be granted Full Standards. The situation as regards Dalmation and Roan Dalmation Tans and Foxes was discussed; and the general principle was agreed that, as the effects of different markings frequently compete with each other (Dalmation Tans would actually be tricolours with red spotting confined to the underside of the cavy, other than eye circles, whilst Dalmation Foxes would lack spotting on the entire underside of the body), varieties based on combinations of different markings will not be regarded as having (Full or) Guide Standards unless such have been specifically defined or agreed.

Finally, the Council agreed with Mr Trigg's suggestion that Himalayan, Tan and Fox cavies should be collectively regarded as 'Marked Pattern' cavies, this category covering short-haired, normal-coated cavies that have markings occurring in a defined pattern, the clarity and definition of which are most important.

#### **9. Proposal from NTWCC for amendment to points for Colour (to 20) in TW Standard**

Mr Yates argued for this proposal, stating that NTWCC members had voted overwhelmingly for such a change to the BCC Standard that was agreed in June 2006 and that has since been enhanced after further discussions with the NTWCC. The TW standard had included 20 points for Colour for many years, and members saw no reason for this to change. He agreed that there should be similar Standards for TWs as for Tris, Torts etc., but argued that Dutch and TWs should not be compared.

The Chairman suggested that one of the reasons that NTWCC members did not wish to agree to the BCC Standard was that the arguments for change had not been properly put to them. He had written to the Secretary of the NTWCC asking to address the AGM on the NTWCC on the matter; but this request had been rejected. He noted that neither Mrs Bell nor Mr Neesam, who were each successful TW breeders in favour of the BCC Standard, had been able to attend the meeting. Mrs Bell further gave it as her view that the ballot had not properly put the issues to the membership and so could not give a valid result.

The Chairman reiterated the reasons why the Council had determined the appropriate Standard for TWs, Tricolours, Bicolours, Tortoiseshells and Dutch as incorporating 60 points for Markings and 15 for Colour, and on which he had written several times to the NTWCC without receiving a reasoned response. He argued that it was not logical for the TW to carry

fewer points for Markings than do Dutch, Dalmations & Roans, since the importance of markings in the breed is at least as great. Additionally, as the TW is a complex breed with many requirements contained within the Standard, 15 points represents a very significant allocation to a single factor - more than are (by implication) contained within the new Standard for Line, for having at least 3 patches on each side of the body and for having all 3 colours on each side of the cavy.

However, he believed that the most significant issue was that the NTWCC had not taken into account the very important point originally made by Mr Trigg, namely that the original TW Standard quoted 20 points for Colour to include the stipulation that: "Each colour must be clear and distinct without being intermixed one with another." The BCC Standard included 15 points specifically covering the quality of Colour within the patches; but within 25 points for 'Shape and Clarity of Patches' included the requirement that 'Patches to be clean-cut and distinct from each other, with no intermingling of colours'. If these 25 points for Shape & Clarity were viewed as giving as much as 10 each for 'Patches to be square-cut with straight edges' and 10 for 'Patches to be of equal size', then 5 were still available to cover 'Patches to be clean-cut and distinct from each other, with no intermingling of colours', one of the requirements that was contained within the 20 points for Colour in the original NTWCC version.

He therefore stated it as the BCC's position that the new Standard in no way suggests that Colour is any less important than it has ever been in the TW (indeed it includes for the first time a statement that 'cavies showing excessively light, 'washed-out' colour should be severely penalised'); and he offered to publicise this statement in CAVIES so as to emphasise the point.

A vote was then taken on the NTWCC Proposal, which resulted in one vote being cast for the Proposal, nine votes being cast against, with two abstentions. The Proposal was therefore rejected.

#### **10. Discussion on which Breed Clubs cater for various Guide Standard (GS) Cavies**

The Council considered inconsistencies between which Specialist Clubs cater for particular Guide Standard and Unstandardised cavies. The general principle underlying current responsibilities is that, where such cavies are colour or ticking variants on a Full Standard breed, then the Club catering for the Full Standard breed also has responsibility for the Guide Standard or Unstandardised variant, e.g. NACC for Solid Agoutis, DCC for colour variants of Self or Ticked Dutch. Where the variety is not a colour or ticked variant on a Full Standard breed, e.g. Belted, Ridgeback, Teddy, then the RVCC caters for the breed. However, anomalies do exist, particularly that Selves in Slate, 'Caramel', P.E. Cream etc. do not come under the remit of the ESCC.

It was agreed that the general principle described above should be upheld; and that ideally the ESCC should assume responsibility for GS Selves, by putting on GS classes for them at its Stock & Area shows, and to then control the potential development of such breeds to Full Standard status. Mr O'Neill will put this proposition to the ESCC Executive. In the meantime the RVCC will continue to cater for these varieties.

### **Status of Certain Marked Varieties**

The discussion then broadened to consider why certain Marked varieties, based on standardised Self or Ticked colours, do not have Full Standards whereas others do. For example, Beige Dutch do not have a Full Standard whereas Lilac Dutch do; ditto Chocolate Agouti and Lemon Agouti Dutch do not have Full Standards but Cinnamon and Cream Agouti Dutch do. All of these colours are recognised as having Full Standards when applied to Tricolour or Bicolour cavies. Similarly, American Crested Self colours have a Full Standard but American Crested Agoutis or Argentes are not even recognised as having a Guide Standard.

Mr Brearley pointed out that sometimes the variant colours affect the fundamental characteristics of the breed, such as Lilac Himalayans' having indistinct points and Agouti Himalayans' having 'peppered' points. It was agreed that in these situations it is not appropriate for the colour variant to have a Full Standard. However, this scenario does not apply to the situations described above, although Messrs Trigg and Payne argued that the Guide Standard variants were yet to be proven as desirable additions to their respective breeds.

In response the Chairman suggested that these situations had arisen as a legacy of a former approach to Standards, with which most Councillors had grown up in the Fancy, in which the status quo was highly prized and obstacles were put in the way of new varieties as a way of delaying their acceptance. He did not think that this was the current approach of the Council, and could not see why perfectly reasonable combinations of features should not have Full Standards when very similar combinations did have.

Mr Trigg agreed to consider these points and to discuss the situation of 'colour variant' Dutch within the DCC. Mr Payne stated that the position of American Crested Ticked cavies had been debated by the CCC AGM, and he could see little point in discussing the matter further unless there was evidence of members actually breeding and wishing to exhibit them.

It was reiterated, however, that varieties based on combinations of markings should only be given Full or Guide Standards when these have been explicitly defined and agreed, as the various markings frequently 'work against' each other, e.g. Dalmation / Fox, Himalayan / Dutch

### **Breed Clubs Catering for Full Standard Varieties.**

Finally, the Chairman broadened the debate yet further by asking if some of the traditional allocations of breeds between Specialist Clubs

were appropriate in today's environment, in which ever-more breeds were arising without a similar increase in the numbers of cavy fanciers, thus meaning that the numbers of people keeping individual breeds were likely to decline.

He asked if the NACC should not cater for Argentes as well as Agoutis, given the similar requirements of the two breeds despite Mr Gammie's former attempts to pretend otherwise; and whether the NTWCC should cater for all patched varieties, such as Tricolours, Bicolours and Tortoiseshells as well as TWs. In addition, given the similarities between Rex and Teddies, might not the RCC assume responsibility for the Teddy as a Guide Standard cavy?

He did not intend these suggestions to undermine the RVCC in any way, for there was likely to be a constant stream of new varieties requiring its attentions; but simply to ensure that all breeds had the most appropriate homes for their future development.

Councillors generally agreed with these sentiments; and Mrs Bell stated that she had already considered raising the subject of the Argente with the NACC and would now do so. Similarly, Messrs Pashley and Reynolds will consider the Rex / Teddy issue. Mr Yates was uncertain as to whether the NTWCC would wish to cater for the other patched varieties, but agreed to think about the matter. On behalf of the RVCC Mrs Smith stated that the constitution of the Club had always envisaged the development of breeds such that in time they might move to other clubs, and the continuation of this process should not present a difficulty to the club's ethos.

Any proposals for changes that might result from the consideration of these matters will be dealt with at the future meetings of the Council.

## 11. BCC Megashow

Steve White, representing Fred Holmes' Show Organisation Team, attended for this item. Mr White stated that Moulton School remained the preferred venue for a Megashow, being able to cater for over 1,000 cavies; but that other venues might be appropriate if a smaller, less ambitious show was the aim: the Council needed to be clear what its objectives were.

Mr Holmes and his team were willing and able to put on a show, ideally in March; but they would require certain undertakings in order to ensure success. These included:

- A schedule with 5 classes for each cavy and 20p per class entry fees, paying 75% prize money;
- Stock Shows to be held by all Specialist Clubs, also with 5 classes per cavy;

- One person to be provided by each club to help with the erection and dismantling of pens;
- Help from each Specialist Club with Tombola /Raffle prizes;
- A sum of £50 per Club to underpin the costs of running the show.

The idea of a Megashow was discussed and each Councillor expressed their enthusiasm for the concept. Several indicated, however, that their respective Specialist Clubs were less enthusiastic. The concept of giving major awards to the various Best of Breed / Best of Section winners, rather than of paying prize money for all classes, was widely agreed to be the best means of ensuring the show's economic viability.

Following a constructive discussion, the Chairman summed up the situation as being that:

- The concept of holding a Megashow remained attractive as a means of celebrating all of the Specialist Clubs within the Council and the breeds they support.
- However, the negative feelings about the Council within some Clubs meant that it would not be possible for all Councillors to gain approval for the expenditure of £50 on the event, or even to ensure that Stock Shows would be held. Therefore, if the Council was to hold such a show it would need to fund it from its own resources.
- These resources were quite properly being expended on the circulation of Standards Booklets. Therefore, further discussion of a show would need to await the rebuilding of the Council's finances.

He therefore suggested that discussion of the Megashow be postponed until the next Council meeting, at which time it should be possible to assess how well sales of the surplus Standards Booklets were going. He hoped that Mr White and the Show Team would still be willing to help at this time. The Council agreed this approach unanimously.

The Chairman thanked Mr White for his attendance and for his constructive suggestions. He asked Mr White to pass on to Mr Holmes the Council's best wishes for a full recovery from his recent health problems; and also to thank him for continuing to support the concept of a Megashow. All Councillors echoed these sentiments.

## **12. Draft Rules for Specialist Clubs**

These had been circulated to all Councillors. Mr Neesam had given some useful comments, pointing out that certain of the proposed rules were unnecessarily prescriptive. The Chairman stated that he agreed with these comments and would reflect them in the next version.

However, the fundamental principle was that the Draft Rules were not intended to be used in their exact form by all Clubs, but to form the basis for a clear and coherent set of rules that could be adapted to each Club's circumstances and needs. There was no intention to 'force' them on Clubs; but their adoption should ensure that Clubs were properly run



in an open and fair manner. Because of the necessary complexity of the rules, the Chairman suggested that Councillors should discuss them with their Executives and that, once an appropriate form of rules was agreed, a Proposal to adopt new rules should be made by the Executive to each Club's AGM.

### **13. Correspondence**

The only item formally raised by the Chairman was in connection with New / Emerging Variety classes, in regard to which complaints had been made in CAVIES that some judges were refusing to judge certain varieties that had neither Full nor Guide Standards. He reiterated the principle that such classes were open to all such covies, although judges were clearly free to decide how attractive the proffered covies were.

Mr Payne stated that he was aware that some CCC judges had refused to judge some Crested 'new and emerging breeds' but that he would make it clear to CCC judges that they were wrong to do this. He stated that he had judged these particular breeds himself but had sent them off the table because of their carrying running lice. He also felt that exhibitors in New / Emerging Variety classes frequently failed to provide to judges notes on the aims and objectives of the variety, as stipulated by the Council when the principle of these classes was agreed.

This observation was discussed, and it was agreed that show secretaries should be reminded to ensure that such notes are provided to New / Emerging Variety class judges. It was further suggested that it would be very helpful if the RVCC would prepare and publish outline 'Guidance to Judges' for all of the New / Emerging Varieties of which it was aware. Mrs Smith agreed to do this.

### **14. Motions of Urgency (accepted at the Chairman's discretion)** None.

### **15. Biennial Election of BCC Chairman & Secretary/ Treasurer**

The Chairman reminded Councillors that the Council's Rules called for the Chairman and Secretary / Treasurer to be elected every two years. An election was due in January. However, he had decided to change his previous position on the matter and would stand for re-election if Councillors so wished. The Secretary / Treasurer would do likewise.

Councillors agreed that both the Chairman and the Secretary / Treasurer should be re-elected for a further two year-period.

### **16. Any other business**

The issue of 'Skinny' covies, which have been recently publicised in the National Press, was raised. Several Councillors had been approached for stock from people seeking to produce such animals as a profit-making

activity, seeking to benefit from the £150 prices being quoted for such aberrations of nature. Council re-iterated its position that hairless cavies cannot be exhibited at any cavy show in the UK.

**17. Date and location of next meeting**

It was agreed that holding a meeting away from a show, to which at least half a day could be dedicated, remained the best approach, with matters arising in the interim being dealt with by correspondence (ideally via email). It was agreed that the ideal was to hold such a meeting in June or October (the former being preferred), with all changes to Standards being effective from 1<sup>st</sup> January of the following year. All Councillors should advise the Secretary at Harrogate of dates in June and October when they will be available for a meeting, so that this can be organised soon afterwards.

The Chairman then repeated his thanks to all Councillors for their attendance and for their constructive input, and closed the meeting.