

# **Minutes of the Meeting of 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2010, held at Norton Lindsey Village Hall, Warwickshire.**

Present: Bryan Mayoh (Chairman), Jan Alston (Secretary), Allan Trigg (DCC), Ted Brearley (NHCC), Ann Rolph (DRCC), Tony O'Neill (ESCC), David Oulton (ESCC), Don Payne (CCC), Caroline Smith (RVCC), Nikki Matthews (CSCC), Joan Phillips (PVCC), Penny Bell (NACC), Ken Yates (NTWCC), Rex Matthews (RCC), Simon Neesam (ACC), Steve Wright (NFTCC).

## **1. Meeting Administration**

a) **Apologies for Absence:** None were required.

### **b) Minutes of the Meeting of 17<sup>th</sup> October 2009**

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

### **c) Matters Arising from the Meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2009 (not on the Agenda)**

All Matters Arising were dealt with on the Agenda.

### **d) Chairman's Opening Remarks**

The Chairman thanked everyone for ensuring that there was a 100% attendance. He commented that there were several issues on which strong views were likely to be expressed but hoped that this would be done in a spirit of trying to ensure the best outcome for the whole of the cavy fancy.

## **2. Administration of BCC**

### **a) Financial Report**

The Secretary produced a set of accounts from October 2009 to October 2010. These indicated a cash balance of £922.91 and a cash surplus of £386.46, although £102.00 of the latter had resulted from the sale of assets (Standards Books) not shown in the accounts.

There was a discussion of how to utilise cash not required by the Council; and it was agreed that, whilst it would not be normal policy to pay expenses, a payment of £250 was appropriate in the case of Mr Neesam's efforts in producing the website.

This aside, funds would be built up to permit republication of the Standards Book at some future date, which is becoming increasingly necessary due to the significant number of changes that had occurred since the last publication. Councillors confirmed that this book is widely utilised by fanciers in general and judges in particular, so that this would be well-justified expenditure. A sum of circa £1,000 will be required for this (last time costs for rather more books than we would require in future were £1620 offset by £760 of adverts).

In regard to Standards Books Messrs Mayoh, O'Neill and Matthews confirmed that they still hold a sufficient quantity to cover several years of demand. The major problem in selling these Books is that several pages of new and revised Standards have to be printed out at the same time. It was agreed that the website would provide a means of accessing / printing changes to help this process; and that fanciers requiring Standards Books but willing to print out the changes themselves would be offered Books at a reduced price of £5.

### **b) Prefix Scheme**

Mrs Smith reported that 98 registrations, including amendments to registrations, had been received during the last year, generating gross income of £572.00 against costs of £104.94. Due to other commitments she was standing down as Prefix Registrar.

The Chairman stated that he had asked Mr Trigg to undertake the role and Mr Trigg confirmed his agreement to do so. However, concerned that his action might seem an undemocratic means of choosing a Registrar, the Chairman asked Councillors if any of them might also wish to be considered for this prestigious role. All agreed that Mr Trigg was the ideal man for the job and that they would therefore put aside their own ambitions for the greater good.

Mr Trigg informed the meeting that he had liaised with Mrs Smith in regard to handover, and, subject to his mastering the Excel spreadsheet on which names and addresses were kept, there seemed to be no issues. Mr Trigg stated that whilst the certificate would continue to be printed on photographic quality paper, the size would be reduced slightly to lower postage costs.

The Council briefly discussed the workings of the Scheme and it was agreed that:

- Henceforth Stud Names including Prefixes should not exceed 18 letters, so as to reduce the effort that might be required in having to write excessively long stud names on prize cards.
- Should any Councillor feel that a Stud Name is being used in an inappropriate way (e.g. as a claim of BCC approval or by someone selling covies at an excessively young age) they should advise the Registrar. If he and the Chairman confirm inappropriate use then the person concerned will be warned, and if necessary the prefix registration will be cancelled.
- If, in support of a commercial activity, any person claims use of a BCC registered prefix that has never been approved or that has been withdrawn, then they will be warned that Trading Standards Officers may be advised.
- Any appeal against decisions made by the Registrar and Chairman may be made to the full Council

Mrs Smith was thanked for her efforts and Mr Trigg wished every success in his new role.

### **c) Website**

Mr Neesam reported that the site had attracted considerable numbers of visitors, many of these new to the fancy. It is therefore fulfilling its objective of being a means of both informing existing fanciers and attracting new ones. It was agreed that to further improve the site:

- A means should be provided of printing the new or revised Standards agreed at each meeting, so as to allow update of the existing Standards Books.
- Specialist Clubs for whose breeds there are no articles on the site should in their own interests attempt to provide such articles. If these are not forthcoming within two weeks of these Minutes Mr Neesam will 'name and shame' the clubs / breeds in question by writing to all Councillors.
- The Health Notes by Mr Trigg and the new Animal Welfare Guidance (below) should be featured prominently.
- Advertisements should be sought from more fanciers, clubs and CAVIES. Mr Hudson, who was successful in obtaining a large number of adverts for the Standards Book, will be asked to undertake this same activity for the website, at Harrogate.

## **3 Breed Standards**

### **a) Presentation of Texels**

- Mrs Matthews reported that there had been a decline in the numbers of Texels being shown, possibly due to the difficulty of preventing wear and tear on the parting, which is not required in the related Sheltie cavy. It was agreed that, so long as CSCC judges and exhibitors are consulted on the change, a clear majority favour it and no valid reason

emerges as to why the original decision to show Texels with a parting was made, the Council would be likely to agree to a change in the Standard to state that Texels should be shown without a parting if this is proposed by the CSCC at the 2011 Meeting.

**b) Full Standard for the Otter**

Mr Wright proposed that the Otter be granted a Full Standard, given that attractive examples of the breed are being produced and shown in considerable numbers and that the requirement was the simple one that the Standard would be based on that of the Tan. He stated that the colour requirement was to be 'cream', based on the guidance for the Self Cream. In response to a question from the Chairman, Mr Wright confirmed that this is definitely the Cream rather than the Buff, and that therefore the Otter would not breed true. Mr Neesam stated that this would bring the Otter in line with the cream variants catered for by the NACC. The Club believed that buff was too dark a colour and that it provided a less attractive variety. Mr Wright agreed that no more novel names would be requested for any further colour variant of the Tan cavy. Mr Wright also stated that the specialist breed club would continue to be the NFTCC and the word Otter would not be incorporated into the name. This proposal was agreed unanimously and the Full Standard will take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011.

**c) Proposed Change to Points Allocation for Fox, Tan and Otter**

Mr Wright then proposed that the Points allocation be changed for the Fox, Tan and (now) Otter, to increase the points for Belly and Legs by five and correspondingly reduce those for Nostrils, Jowls, Chest and Throat. The purpose was to emphasise to judges that they should pay more attention to the colour of the cavy, which is particularly emphasised by its belly. This was to counter a tendency of several judges to put up Tans in particular that are too light in colour as these have slightly more pronounced markings.

After some discussion on whether points should be redistributed, Mrs Smith rather belatedly raised the somewhat fundamental issue that the points being discussed were for Markings, whereas the problem seemed to be that judges were disregarding an already significant number of points (25) allocated for Colour. It was agreed that in the Colour description for Tans should be strengthened, to state that 'Colour to be rich mahogany' rather than the present 'Colour ideally to incline to red / mahogany', which is rather less emphatic. The FTCC will seek to publicise the importance of Colour in its breeds and of this requirement for the Tan in particular, perhaps by producing an article for CAVIES.

**d) Full Standard for PE Cream**

Mr Oulton proposed that the PE Cream, being shown in adequate numbers and having an obvious basis for standardisation, namely that it is a Cream but with pink eyes, be granted a Full Standard. This was agreed unanimously and will become effective on January 1<sup>st</sup> 2011. When standardised, the PE Cream will move to the ESCC and no longer be jointly catered for by the ESCC and RVCC. It was also agreed that, despite misgivings by some established Self Cream breeders, the present variety would have to be known as the DE Cream, following the precedent set when the original Self Golden became the PE Golden when the dark-eyed version was standardised.

Secretaries should ensure that classes aimed at the 'Self Cream' variety are re-titled 'Self DE Cream' and if possible should put on discrete Self PE Cream classes. If this is not practical then PE Creams should be exhibited in the same Self AOC Challenge as Buffs, Saffrons etc. PE Cream will also be regarded as a standardised colour in all Breed Standards that recognise all ESCC colours.

Mr Oulton advised that the ESCC and RVCC are giving joint consideration to the standardisation of the **Slate**. In response to a question from the Chairman, Mrs Smith confirmed that some Slate exhibits tend to show an undesirable 'browny' cast. This may be either a result of their carrying a 'chocolate' allele or be a side effect of selecting for a dark slate colour. The

Chairman suggested that key aspects of any decision on Standardisation should be that there is clear guidance on a true slate colour that does not have such a cast, along with assurance that covies meeting the colour requirement are being produced in sufficient numbers to establish its validity. Not least due to his regard for the two fanciers that had long promoted the Slate, he hoped that the two Clubs would be successful in this undertaking.

**e) Changes to Colour of Ears and Pads in PE & DE Goldens**

The Council agreed to the ESCC Proposal that:

- The following be added to the Guidance Notes for Self covies. “The ears of PE Goldens and DE Goldens should match the body colour. Ears whose colour deviates from the body colour should be penalised according to the extent of the deviation.”
- The following be added to the ‘Specific Disqualifications’ in the Self Standard: “Goldens showing black ears and pads should be disqualified.”

Following discussion it was further agreed that an additional Fault should be defined in regard to dark pigmentation, stating that: “Obvious areas of dark pigmentation on the skin around the eyes or on the vent of PE and DE Goldens should be penalised.”

It was noted that these changes would implicitly apply to all breeds whose colour requirements are based on those for ESCC varieties. They will take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011.

**f) Full Standard for Teddy**

Mrs Smith and Mr Matthews described changes to the Guide Standard for the Teddy aimed not only to better describe what is sought in the ideal Teddy but that would also clarify differences between Teddies and Rex. This should overcome objections that had been raised privately by some Councillors that the two breeds are difficult to distinguish from each other. Principal amongst the differences are that:

- The coat of the Teddy should tend to lie forward, particularly when it is brushed in this direction, whereas the coat of the Rex should return to a more erect orientation after it has been brushed forward. The Teddy will tend to have a small fringe or ‘cap’ due to the forward orientation of its coat.
- The coat of the Teddy should have a plusher feel, although possessing a touch of harshness, in comparison with the harsher coat of the Rex.
- Whereas the coat of the Rex will have a certain springy resilience when it is brushed forward, that of the Teddy should show a more ‘bouncy’ characteristic.

These assertions were then tested by each Councillor’s being asked to follow these Guidelines and determine which of six covies were Teddies and which Rex. Two of these were judged by ‘feel’ alone. When results were compared it was established that the overwhelming majority of assessments were accurate, thereby supporting the guidance given.

The Council therefore debated the exact wording of the revised Teddy Guide Standard and agreed this. It was agreed that this was a substantial improvement on that previously produced, but that there were some significant differences. The Chairman therefore asked if it was reasonable to move from one set of guidance as regards a breed to another and simultaneously grant a full standard. He questioned whether a period of assessment of the new guidance should be undertaken, to allow it to be validated and judges to become familiar with it, before a Full Standard was granted.

This was debated and the consensus was that judges should be able to assimilate the new guidance readily – indeed many were already following it; and that the Teddies being exhibited

were well able to compete as a fully standardised variety. The points allocations for the Teddy Standard were then discussed, and it was eventually agreed that, as the initial appearance of the coat is more important than it is for the Rex, this should carry an overall 30 points as against 20 for the Rex (and 45 for the Abyssinian). The points for 'Coat Feel' should correspondingly be reduced to 35 (15 for Density, 10 for Bounciness and 10 for Texture) as compared with 45 for the Rex (and 20 for the Abyssinian). The Full Standard will take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011.

It was further agreed that, in the interests of clarity, whereas the Guidance Notes in the Teddy would emphasise the tendency for the coat to lie forward when brushed, those for the Rex would be changed to emphasise that it should have no such tendency.

Judges should be advised that in judging Rex or Teddy cavies they should simply assess the cavies placed in front of them against the Standard for the Breed class in which they have been entered, rather than speculating as to whether any cavies are or are not examples of the appropriate breed.

#### **g) Guide Standard for Swiss**

Mrs Smith presented a proposed new standard for the Swiss. This required that the cavy should have an erect coat, circa 6cm long and even in length. Mrs Smith further advised the Council that the Swiss is inclined to moult from the shoulder backwards. This explains why Swiss have sometimes been seen with much longer coats around the rump than on the rest of the body. They should not be shown in the moulting phase, but only before the moult or after the coat has fully regrown. The other issue affecting the breed is that many of the best ones possess a rosette on the forehead; but they should not be shown until this is completely covered over.

The detailed wording of the proposed Guide Standard was discussed and a final version agreed. This will take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011, after which time Swiss cavies should be shown in Guide Standard rather than New & Emerging Variety classes or sections.

#### **h) Guidance Notes for Lunkarya**

Mrs Smith presented Guidance Notes for the Lunkarya that made clear that the cavy was to be kept clean and regularly brushed, combed or groomed by hand, but that it must be shown to emphasise an untidy effect of random ringlets. This meant that Lunkaryas must not be shown 'brushed out', and brushes and combs should not be taken to the judging table. The Guidance Notes, which are considerably more detailed than is normal for a New & Emerging Variety, were agreed by the Council in a slightly modified form. They will take effect from 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011.

### **4. Cavy Fancy Issues**

#### **a) Welfare Guidance for Cavies**

The Chairman reminded Councillors that Welfare Guidance Notes were being produced in consultation with the NCC and SCC so that reasonable standards of care, rather than excessive ones that might be proposed by other bodies, were suggested by the most important organisations representing the cavy fancy. These should not only be helpful to new cavy keepers but, if followed, ought to present a defence of following 'reasonable' practices if a fancier were to face action under the Animal Welfare Act.

Mrs Alston and Mrs Bell had produced draft notes on which many Council members had commented. Councillors agreed that these were an excellent basis for a joint BCC / NCC / SCC document, although everyone had their own ideas on what should or should not be included. Rather than spend several hours discussing the notes line by line, the Chairman suggested that

Mr Oulton, Mrs Alston and Mrs Bell should agree a final version on behalf of all of the cavy organisations involved.

This would take a rather more positive stance than some aspects of the current draft and would remove the emphasis on aspects of cavy keeping that are irrelevant to the Fancy, such as 'free-range keeping of cavies'. As regards Health issues it would refer to the guidance available on the BCC and NCC sites, rather than itself going into too much detail. However, it would have to incorporate ideas that some traditional fanciers find difficult. Principal amongst these was the issue of minimum cage sizes, which Mr Oulton confirmed would have to use the minima specified in the current draft.

This approach was agreed, and a final version will be produced by Mrs Alston and agreed with Mr Oulton and Mrs Bell, to be published on the BCC, NCC and SCC websites by 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011. This will be entitled 'Welfare Guidance for the Proper Care of Cavies (Guinea Pigs)', and should be viewed as the initial version of an evolving work.

## **b) Cavy Book by Myra Mahoney**

The DRCC had written to the Council requesting help in countering what it regarded to be certain misleading references to the Dalmation and Roan breeds in Myra Mahoney's books 'The Really Useful Guinea Pig Guide' and the 'Mini Encyclopaedia of Guinea Pigs'. The Chairman read out the relevant passages to the Meeting.

The Chairman suggested that it was accepted by the DRCC that cavies exhibiting spotting or roaning did so because they possessed a single copy of a gene allele that in the heterozygous form causes the markings in question but in the homozygous (double dosage) form creates a cavy that is white, microphthalmic and of dubious viability. Accordingly, this has been termed a 'lethal gene', although in the heterozygous condition it produces no detrimental effects on the individual carrying it.

He stated that the DRCC has been scrupulous in pointing out the dangers of Dalmation to Dalmation and Roan to Roan breeding in regard to the condition produced in some of the offspring; although, of course, the same dangers exist in spotted or roaned versions of other breeds, such as Abyssinian, Rex, Satin, Longhaired etc.

The problem with Mrs Mahoney's book was that the way in which the relevant information was phrased unfortunately appears to imply that anyone that sold Dalmation or Roan cavies as pets was acting irresponsibly and that these cavies themselves, rather than some of the offspring produced by Dalmation to Dalmation or Roan to Roan breeding, had a problem of health and viability.

Mr Oulton, who had assisted with the book, had discussed the matter with Mrs Mahoney and obtained an undertaking that the relevant passages would be rewritten in any future editions of the books, and revised wording agreed in advance with the BCC Chairman. The Chairman suggested that this was all that could reasonably be done to correct the books themselves.

However the Chairman suggested that the Council should also assist the DRCC in allaying fears that the pet fraternity may feel in regard to these breeds by publishing a statement along the following lines in CAVIES and in the Health Section of its website. This might also be used by the DRCC in support of their breeders when selling spare stock to cavy pet keepers

*"Statements made in Myra Mahoney's books 'The Really Useful Guinea Pig Guide' and the 'Mini Encyclopaedia of Guinea Pigs' in regard to the breeding of Dalmations and Roans have been incorrectly taken by some readers as implying that there are inherent genetic weaknesses in Dals and Roans per se. This is not the case: animals of both breeds can be expected to live normal, healthy lives if properly cared for. In her book Mrs Mahoney intended to advise people that Dals and Roans should not be bred to other Dals and Roans because of the possibility of*

*producing non-viable offspring in this way; and because of this risk these covies should only be sold as pets if the breeder is able to warn the end purchaser of this fact. Both of these policies are strongly recommended by the DRCC.*

*The Dalmation & Roan Cavy Club and all Specialist Clubs represented on the Council recognise that when covies carrying the spotting (Dalmation) or roaning gene are mated together this introduces the possibility that some (on average one in four) of the offspring will suffer from a debilitating genetic condition. In order to avoid this possibility:*

- Fanciers should not mate Dalmation or Roan covies together, whether these are recognisably Dalmation or Roan covies or Dalmation or Roan variants of other breeds. Instead, future generations of spotted or roaned covies should ideally be bred by pairing a spotted or roaned cavy with the non-spotted or non-roaned offspring of a spotted or roaned parent.*
- When selling Dalmation or Roan covies, or Dalmation or Roan variants of other breeds, the vendor must ensure that the purchaser, or the end purchaser if a third party is involved, is informed of the risks of a Dalmation to Dalmation or Roan to Roan breeding programme. So long as the vendor ensures that this is done then there is no reason not to sell such covies, including as pets.*

*The fact that a cavy is a Dalmation or Roan, or a Dalmation or Roan variant of another breed, does not mean that it possesses any genetic weakness that will affect its health or viability; and the owners of these covies need have no special concerns in this regard. It is only a percentage of the offspring of Dalmation to Dalmation or Roan to Roan matings that will possess such weaknesses; and in these any adverse effects will be evident at birth.*

*The Council understands that Mrs Mahoney accepts that the above represents the appropriate advice in regard to the breeding of Dalmation and Roan covies, and that the Dalmation and Roan Cavy Club has at all times acted responsibly in issuing guidance on the matter to its members and to the public at large. She has agreed to change the statements made in regard to this topic in any future versions of her books, using a form of words to be prepared by her advisor on veterinary matters, Mr Oulton, and agreed with the Chairman of the Council.”*

The Council agreed this approach.

- 5. Correspondence:** The Chairman reported that the only external correspondence that he had received during the year was from two Skinny / Baldwin breeders who had objected to certain comments made on an Internet Forum by a member of the Council. The Chairman had dealt with the matter with his usual tact and diplomacy.
- 6. Motions of Urgency (accepted at the Chairman’s discretion):** None received.
- 7. Any other business:** None raised.
- 8. Date and location of next meeting:** To be arranged by the Secretary at a similar time / location in 2011.

## CAVIES NOTICE

### BRITISH CAVY COUNCIL: CHANGES TO BREED STANDARDS

The following changes to Breed Standards were agreed at the Council Meeting on 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2010. These will take effect on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2011.

#### **Modification to English Self Standard**

The following is to be added to the **Guidance Notes**:

“The ears of PE Goldens and DE Goldens should match the body colour. Ears whose colour noticeably deviates from the body colour should be penalised according to the extent of the deviation.”

An additional Specific **Fault** is to be added that:

“Obvious areas of dark pigmentation on the skin around the eyes or on the vent of PE and DE Goldens should be penalised.”

A Specific **Disqualification** is to be added that:

“Goldens showing black ears and pads should be disqualified.”

It should be noted that these changes implicitly apply to all breeds whose colour requirements are based on those for ESCC varieties.

The changes have been introduced in order to reduce confusion on what ear colour is desirable in Self Goldens, as well as to specify when a deviation from the ideal requirement for colour of ears and pads is sufficient to justify disqualification.

#### **Modification to Tan Standard**

Within the **Colour** section of the Standard the definition of the desired colour is to become:

“Tan to be rich mahogany, with minimal base colour showing.”

This replaces the current requirement stating “Tan ideally to incline to red or mahogany.” This change has been made to emphasise the importance of the correct colour in the Tan, which accounts for 25 points in the Standard and which the NFTCC feel has been given insufficient weight by some judges. This colour is best assessed by looking at the belly of the cavy.

#### **Modification to Rex Standard**

The following is to be added to the **Guidance Notes**:

“When the coat is brushed forward, there should be no tendency for it to lie in that direction. Instead it should return to its original erect appearance.”

This is so as to emphasise one of the key differences between the Rex cavy and the Teddy.

When judging Rex or Teddy cavies, judges are advised that they should simply assess the cavies placed in front of them against the Standard for the Breed class in which they have been entered, rather than indulging in speculation as to whether any cavies are or are not examples of the appropriate breed.



### **Full Standard for Pink-Eyed (PE) Cream**

The PE Cream is to be recognised as a fully standardised variety. Within the **Description of Colours** in the English Self Standard the notes for Cream should read: “Eyes ruby (DE) or pink (PE).”

Given the standardisation of the PE Cream the present ‘Self Cream’ will become known as the Dark-eyed (DE) Cream, following the precedent set when the original Self Golden became the PE Golden when the dark-eyed version was standardised.

Secretaries should ensure that classes aimed at the present ‘Self Cream’ variety are re-titled ‘Self DE Cream’ and if possible should put on discrete Self PE Cream classes. If this is not practical then PE Creams should be exhibited in the same Self AOC Challenge as Buffs, Saffrons etc.

PE Cream will also be regarded as a standardised colour in Breed Standards that recognise all ESCC colours (or all excepting the DE Golden).

### **Full Standard for Otter**

The Cream version of the Tan, known as the Otter, is to be recognised as a fully standardised variety. It will be catered for by the National Fox and Tan Cavy Club.

The Standard is exactly as for the Tan other than that references to ‘tan’ are replaced by ‘cream’ and the **Colour Description** is: “Cream to be pale and free from yellow or lemon tinge.”

It should be noted that the Buff variant of this cavy does not have a Full Standard, being regarded by the NFTCC as providing a less attractive variety.

### **Full Standard for Teddy**

The Teddy is to be recognised as a fully standardised variety. It will continue to be catered for by the Rare Varieties Cavy Club.

Judges should take particular note that this Standard differs from that for the Rex in several important respects. These are:

- The coat of the Teddy should tend to lie forward, particularly when it is brushed in this direction, whereas the coat of the Rex should return to a more erect orientation after it has been brushed forward. The Teddy should have a small fringe or ‘cap’ due to the forward orientation of its coat.
- The coat of the Teddy should have a plusher feel, although possessing a touch of harshness, in comparison with the coarser coat of the Rex.
- Whereas the coat of the Rex will have a certain springy resilience when it is brushed forward, that of the Teddy should show a more ‘bouncy’ characteristic.

### **Guide Standard for Swiss**

The Swiss is to be recognised as a Guide Standard variety.

### **Guidance Notes for Lunkarya**

Revised Guidance Notes have been agreed for the Lunkarya.

## TEDDY

<b>Head, Eyes &amp; Ears</b>	Head to be short and broad, with a gently curving profile. Muzzle to be of good width and rounded at the nostrils. Eyes to be large, bright and bold and set with good width between. Ears to be large and drooping, with lower rim parallel to the ground & set with good width between.	<b><u>20</u></b>
<b>Body Shape</b>	To have short, cobby body; thick-set, with good width across shoulders. To be fit and of good substance, with plenty of firm flesh covering shoulders. To have good size appropriate to age.	<b><u>15</u></b>
<b>Coat Appearance</b>	To have a short, raised coat of even length, with a definite lie from the rump towards the head. There should be a visible fringe ('cap') due to the forward orientation of the coat. To appear dense and even all over the body, with no areas of flatness. Guard hairs to be removed. Coat on the belly to be well-covered. Coat length to be no more than 1.2 cm (0.5 inches) in length, with a shorter length preferable.	<b><u>30</u></b>
<b>Coat Feel</b>		<b><u>35</u></b>
of which		
<b>Density</b>	To have thick, dense coat all over the body.	(15)
<b>Bounciness</b>	To have a bouncy feel when brushed with the hand.	(10)
<b>Texture</b>	To be plush but slightly harsh to the touch. To be clean and free from grease.	(10)

---

**100**

## DESCRIPTION OF COLOURS

The following notes define the main colour groups recommended as the basis for division of Teddy classes at shows.

<b>Teddy Solid Colour</b>	A cavy that is <u>totally</u> of a single solid colour. White Teddies that show colouring of hair on nose and feet similar to the Points on a Himalayan should be shown as AOC.
<b>Teddy Agouti / Agouti Bicolour</b>	A cavy that is either of completely agouti colouration or that has a combination of agouti and one other colour.
<b>Teddy Tricolour</b>	A cavy that is a combination of white and any two other solid or agouti colours.
<b>Teddy Bicolour</b>	A cavy that is a combination of any two solid colours, one of which is usually white.
<b>Teddy Roan</b>	A cavy having roan colouration on at least part of the body.
<b>Teddy AOC</b>	Any other Teddy cavy that does not conform to the above categories.

## **GUIDANCE NOTES**

The **Teddy** is a short-coated cavy with a rexoid-type coat that should appear raised from the body, lying with orientation from the rump towards the head. This should be particularly evident when the coat is gently brushed forward.

The forward lie of the coat should form a short fringe, or cap, on the head of the cavy.

The coat should be dense and even all over the body.

The coat should be plush but with a touch of harshness, having a bouncy feel when brushed with the palm of the hand.

The Teddy may be shown in any colour or combination of colours.

No points are awarded for colour or coat markings, although these may be used to divide Teddy classes at shows.

## **SPECIFIC DISQUALIFICATIONS**

Rosettes, partial rosettes.

## **SPECIFIC FAULTS**

Extreme tendency for parting in centre of back.

Coat length over 1.2cm (half an inch).

Flatness anywhere on body.

Presence of guard hairs.

## SWISS (Guide Standard)

<b>Head, Eyes &amp; Ears</b>	<b>Head</b> to be short & broad, Muzzle of good width & rounded at the nostrils. <b>Eyes</b> to be large, bright and bold and set with good width between. <b>Ears</b> to be large and drooping, and set with good width between.
<b>Body Shape</b>	To have short, cobby body; thick-set, with good width across shoulders. To be fit and of good substance, with plenty of firm flesh covering shoulders. To have good size appropriate to age.
<b>Coat Appearance</b>	To stand erect from the body, being thick and even in length to give an overall ‘puff-ball’ appearance, with sufficient density that the skin is not visible without parting the coat. To be between 5 and 7 cm in length in the adult cavy. Belly coat to be wavy, well-covered and shorter in length than on the rest of the body. To have chops of length appropriate to age. Ideally to have longer hairs, known as ‘horns’, over the ears.
<b>Coat Feel</b>	To be soft, plush and of good density.
<b>Presentation</b>	To be clean, free of grease and unmatted.

N.B. Any Full Standard for this breed is likely to be based on those for:  
**The Rough Longhair breeds.**

## GUIDANCE NOTES

The Swiss is a rexoid, semi-longhaired cavy whose coat stands erect from the body to give a ‘puff-ball’ appearance.

The Swiss is inclined to moult at regular intervals, from the shoulder backwards. Accordingly, those in ‘mid moult’ have longer coats around the rump than on the rest of the body. They should not be shown during the moulting stages.

Some Swiss possess a rosette on the forehead. This usually fills out and disappears by 5 months of age. However, Swiss should not be shown with any visible rosette.

Swiss must be shown on a board. A brush or comb may be taken to the judging table in order to ‘tidy up’ the cavy after handling.

Swiss may be shown in any colour or combination of colours.

## SPECIFIC DISQUALIFICATIONS

None

## SPECIFIC FAULTS

The presence of any visible rosette in the coat (usually found on the head) is a severe fault.

Having coat of inappropriate length, or of differing lengths and texture (particularly extra length on the rump), is a severe fault.

Coat faults, where the coat direction visibly goes against the general lie of the coat, such as swirls (usually found in the hip area) should be penalised according to the extent of the fault.

## **LUNKARYA (Guidance Notes)**

A longhaired cavy in the Peruvian model (having a frontal, chops and two hip rosettes), but differing in coat texture, which should be as harsh as possible. The coat is curly in a ringletted fashion, giving a corkscrew effect that needs to be present from the base of the coat to the ends. The hair on the frontal, chop furnishings and belly is rexoid but not ringletted. A young Lunkarya may have a softer coat than an adult and this should be taken into account.

Due to the random corkscrew effect of the coat the Lunkarya cannot be presented with a parting. To maintain a clean coat free of knots and matting the Lunkarya should be regularly brushed, combed or groomed by hand. For presentation at the judging table the Lunkarya must be shown with a coat that appears naturally untidy so as to display the random ringlets. Although this can be assisted by brushing the coat out and then 'misting' it with water, which enhances the curls, the cavy must not be damp when presented to the judge.

It is essential that judges should be able to run their fingers through the coat to check for coat quality and presentation; but although the Lunkarya must be shown free of knots and tangles on a board, brushes and combs must not be taken to the judging table. A Lunkarya may be shown in any colour or combination of colours.

## CAVIES NOTICE

### **BRITISH CAVY COUNCIL: WELFARE GUIDANCE**

The Animal Welfare Act of 2006 has imposed strictures on the way that animals must be looked after by their owners. These must include the need for the animal to have a suitable environment, a suitable diet, to exhibit normal behaviour patterns, to be housed with or apart from other animals as required for its well-being, and to be protected from pain, suffering, injury and disease. It is expected that genuine fanciers will already be meeting these requirements.

However, the Act does not impose detailed guidelines on these matters, potentially leaving some of these to be determined by whatever a Court, hearing a case against an animal keeper, determines is 'reasonable'. However, some of the people who are typically active in 'Animal Rights' areas are interpreting the Act to suit their own objectives and stating their interpretations as if they were law. These include 'requirements' for 4x2 foot cages to house a pair of cavies, with separate bedroom facilities.

This is a serious concern as it seeks to place genuine fanciers in a bad light as providing their animals with 'illegal' levels of care. There is therefore a danger that what we as fanciers might regard as 'reasonable' might be regarded as 'cruel' by those with somewhat different ideas on what animals require in terms of their well-being, leaving a Court to decide who is right with little, or inaccurate, practical guidance available to it.

In order to help define what are reasonable standards for the keeping of cavies, the British Cavy Council, in combination with representatives of the National and Southern Cavy Clubs, has drawn up notes on 'Welfare Guidance for the Proper Care of Cavies (Guinea Pigs)'. These are intended to give guidance to experienced and novice fanciers alike on the welfare needs of cavies in both the areas covered by the Act and in regard to other issues that arise in breeding and showing cavies.

Following this guidance should ensure that your cavies are happy and healthy. However, in addition, it should also ensure that, in the unhappy event that a third party seeks to challenge the way that you keep your cavies, you should be able to mount a defence that in keeping cavies in accordance with advice given by the major organisations responsible for the UK cavy fancy, and written by expert fanciers, you are behaving responsibly and reasonably.

The Guidance Notes are to an extent a 'work in progress', and they will inevitably evolve as we receive feedback from fanciers and interested organisations. In addition, not all fanciers will agree with all of the advice given, in particular with regard to such issues as 'recommended cage sizes'. However, we would serve no purpose by keeping the guidance vague. 'Cages should be big enough' might be interpreted by a Court as meaning 'big enough to allow the cavy to run flat out for 10 seconds without hitting a wall'. We simply had to be specific; and the advice given to us is that suggesting more restrictive conditions might mean that a Court would regard our advice as self-serving and biased, and therefore to be discounted.

Therefore, whether you agree with the Guidance Notes or not, if you keep cavies you are strongly advised to read them – and be prepared to give very good reasons if you believe that any part doesn't apply to you. The Notes will be posted on the BCC, NCC and SCC websites shortly. A notice will appear in CAVIES telling you when this has been done.

## CAVIES NOTICE

### **BRITISH CAVY COUNCIL: POTENTIALLY MISLEADING INFORMATION IN CAVY BOOKS**

Statements made in Myra Mahoney's books *'The Really Useful Guinea Pig Guide'* and the *'Mini Encyclopaedia of Guinea Pigs'* in regard to the breeding of Dalmations and Roans have been incorrectly taken by some readers as implying that there are inherent genetic weaknesses in Dals and Roans per se. This is not the case: animals of both breeds can be expected to live normal, healthy lives if properly cared for. In her book Mrs Mahoney intended to advise people that Dals and Roans should not be bred to other Dals and Roans because of the possibility of producing non-viable offspring in this way; and because of this risk these cavies should only be sold as pets if the breeder is able to warn the end purchaser of this fact. Both of these policies are strongly recommended by the DRCC.

The Dalmation & Roan Cavy Club and all Specialist Clubs represented on the Council recognise that when cavies carrying the spotting (Dalmation) or roaning gene are mated together this introduces the possibility that some (on average one in four) of the offspring will suffer from a debilitating genetic condition. In order to avoid this possibility:

- Fanciers should not mate Dalmation or Roan cavies together, whether these are recognisably Dalmation or Roan cavies or Dalmation or Roan variants of other breeds. Instead, future generations of spotted or roaned cavies should ideally be bred by pairing a spotted or roaned cavy with the non-spotted or non-roaned offspring of a spotted or roaned parent.
- When selling Dalmation or Roan cavies, or Dalmation or Roan variants of other breeds, the vendor must ensure that the purchaser, or the end purchaser if a third party is involved, is informed of the risks of a Dalmation to Dalmation or Roan to Roan breeding programme. So long as the vendor ensures that this is done then there is no reason not to sell such cavies, including as pets.

The fact that a cavy is a Dalmation or Roan, or a Dalmation or Roan variant of another breed, does not mean that it possesses any genetic weakness that will affect its health or viability; and the owners of these cavies need have no special concerns in this regard. It is only a percentage of the offspring of Dalmation to Dalmation or Roan to Roan matings that will possess such weaknesses; and in these any adverse effects will be evident at birth.

The Council understands that Mrs Mahoney accepts that the above represents the appropriate advice in regard to the breeding of Dalmation and Roan cavies, and that the Dalmation and Roan Cavy Club has at all times acted responsibly in issuing guidance on the matter to its members and to the public at large. She has agreed to change the statements made in regard to this topic in any future versions of her books, using a form of words to be prepared by her advisor on veterinary matters, Mr Oulton, and agreed with the Chairman of the Council.