

## **Minutes of the Meeting of 24<sup>th</sup> October 2015, held at Norton Lindsey Village Hall, Warwickshire.**

Present: Bryan Mayoh (Chairman), Jan Alston (Secretary), Jane Betts (NACC), Ted Brearley (NHCC), Rosemary Freeman (NFTCC), Nikki Matthews (CSCC), Rex Matthews (RCC), Tony O'Neill (ESCC), David Oulton (ESCC), Don Payne (CCC), Joan Phillips (PVCC), Ken Phillips (NTWCC), Ann Rolph (DRCC), Caroline Smith (RVCC), Allan Trigg (DCC).

(N.B. In order to save time both for those reading them as well as the person producing them, these Minutes are largely confined to documenting the decisions reached rather than the deliberations used to reach them.)

### **1. Meeting Administration**

- a) **Apologies for Absence:** Simon Neesam (ACC), Bill Seymour (TCC).
- b) **Minutes of the Meeting of 18th October 2014:** It was agreed that the word 'impoverished' should be removed from the Official Archives of the Minutes available for scrutiny by future historians. These were otherwise agreed as a true record.
- c) **Matters Arising from the Meeting held on 18th October 2014** (not otherwise on the Agenda): None
- d) **Chairman's Opening Remarks:** The Chairman welcomed Councillors to the Meeting, which would deal with some interesting issues in regard to newer varieties in particular. Being an optimist by nature, he looked forward to a constructive debate.

### **2. Administration of BCC**

- a) **Financial Report:** The Secretary reported that, although income from Prefix Registrations was significantly down (see below), which was likely to produce a slight loss (forecast to be £12.69) on the year, the bank balance was circa £1,257. Since annual costs were under £200, giving a cover of Bank Balance to Costs of over six years, Councillors agreed that this was a satisfactory position.
- b) **Prefix Scheme:** Mr Trigg reported that the number of prefixes registered was only 27 YTD, compared with at least twice this number in previous years. Following discussion of the matter, Councillors concluded that this was not only a function of declining numbers of new fanciers but also a reduced tendency for fanciers to register Championships for which Stud Prefixes might be required.
- c) **Website:** SN reported by letter that there were between 3,000 and 5,000 unique visitors per month. The most popular pages were in regard to Breeds, the RVCC and Novice Husbandry. He repeated a plea made in previous years for articles on a number of breeds (Fox / Tan / Otter, Agouti, Crested, Dalmation, Roan, T/W, Satin, all Longhairs and all RVCC breeds). These should cover judging and breeding and could also be used in CAVIES. He would provide editing / ghost-writing if required.

The Chairman reiterated, in terms that are not repeated here for fear that they might stimulate the sort of time-consuming deliberations on terminology that these Minutes aim to avoid, that Clubs really should make the effort to produce

information on breeds that they are meant to be promoting, making use of the opportunity provided by the BCC website to reach prospective fanciers.

### **3. Cavy Fancy Issues**

#### **a) Modification of BCC Rules 1.6, 2.9 and 4.1:**

It was agreed by a majority of 9 For to 0 Against, with 3 Abstentions, that Rules 1.6, 2.9 and 4.1, regarding the bodies that are responsible for Show Regulations, should be modified to refer to the National Cavy Club only, rather than to the National and Southern Cavy Clubs as previously. It was further agreed to modify Rule 4.1 to remove the requirement to publish a booklet of Standards. Instead, changes will be publicised in CAVIES and a complete listing maintained on the website.

#### **b) The need for Specialist Clubs to follow BCC Recommended Rules**

The Chairman referred to situations that had occurred within the last year in regard to the running of at least one Specialist Club and a prominent Area Club. He reminded Councillors of the need to protect the viability of their Clubs by following the best practice guidelines in the BCC Regulations.

In particular, Club Accounts and Records should be properly audited by an independent person annually; and copies of Membership Details should be held electronically and copied to a person other than the Secretary at regular intervals. The ideas that it wouldn't do that or it couldn't happen in this Club should not guide the way that Clubs are run.

#### **c) Criteria for awarding Standards**

It was agreed that the following criteria would define the Council's approach to determining when a breed will receive a Full Standard and how this Standard will be defined:

1. A Breed Standard should be challenging but achievable.
2. Features required by a Breed Standard should be capable of clear definition.
3. Any new breed for which a Standard is granted should have either Colour, Coat-Type or Markings that are manifestly distinct from any other breed.
4. A reasonable number of examples of cavies able to lend credence to the validity of the Breed Standard should be available. This is not a matter of breed popularity but of evidence that the Breed Standard is credible.
5. Where possible a new Breed Standard should be based on the Structure, Wording and Points Distribution of existing Standards for similar breeds.
6. There should be no presumption to standardise or promote every possible combination of Colour / Markings. In order to be standardised a new breed should, in the opinion of the Council, represent a desirable addition to the cavy fancy.

#### **d) Movement from New / Emerging to Guide Standard to Full Standard** (expansion of Agenda Item 3c)

It was agreed that:

1. New / Emerging Breed classes should permit competition between breeds both for which the RVCC has produced Guidance Notes and for which brief Guidance Notes have been produced by the exhibitor (the exhibitor's notes should not normally exceed six lines).

2. Given that such classes are principally intended to permit assessment / development of new breeds, with relatively informal judging criteria, there is no need for the RVCC to present proposals for initial Guidance Notes for new breeds to the BCC, although it should present these to the Council when the likelihood is that a move to Guide Standard status will be sought in 12 months time.
3. Once such Guidance Notes have been presented to the Council, the RVCC (and /or such other Club as is likely to take responsibility for the breed in due course) should assess examples of the breed prior to any submission to the Council for Guide Standard status. In some cases, particularly where the Guidance Notes are based on an existing Full Standard breed and the assessment supports belief in their accuracy in describing the qualities needed by the breed, this process may take no more than 12 months.
4. The status of Guide Standard breeds will be reviewed annually by the Club(s) responsible for them and proposals may then be made to the Council to upgrade them to Full Standard or to return to New / Emerging Breed assessment. Breeds will only be promoted to Full Standard status when the Council considers that the criteria described in 3c above have been met.

e) **Redesignation of Full Standard Breeds as Guide Standard and of Guide Standard Breeds as New / Emerging** (expansion of Agenda Item 3c)

It was agreed that:

1. Where, for a period of several years, insufficient examples of a Full Standard Breed are seen at shows to warrant continued belief in the viability of the Breed or its Standard, the Council may decide to redesignate the Breed as a Guide Standard. In this case, 12 months notice will be given of the Meeting at which this step is to be considered, to allow the relevant Breed Club to consider the situation in consultation with any known breeders.
2. In the event that a Full Standard Breed is redesignated as a Guide Standard the Breed Club concerned will review whether the stipulations of the previous (Full) Standard are still appropriate, and will recommend to the Council within 12 months whether a modified (Guide) Standard should be adopted. The breed would then be treated as any other Guide Standard variety.
3. Where the evidence is that either insufficient examples of a Guide Standard Breed are seen at shows to warrant continued belief in the viability of the Breed or the Guide Standard, the Council may decide to redesignate the breed as a New / Emerging Variety. In this case the breed would be treated as any other New / Emerging Variety. The Council may, but is not required to, give notice of such intention.

After considering advice from Mrs Smith, the Council decided to place the following breeds on notice of being transferred from Full to Guide Standard:

- Tricolour
- Bicolour
- Tortoiseshell
- Brindle

The RVCC will advise any breeders of these varieties of this possibility and the Council will consider the position of each breed in 12 months time.

The Chairman stated that a move from 'Full Standard' to 'Guide Standard' should not be portrayed as a 'demotion' but as an opportunity for the Specialist Club concerned to reconsider whether the previous Standard had been inappropriate to the genetic possibilities of the Breed and to give the Breed a chance to be redeveloped outside the strictures of the Standard. In the case of the patched cavies above, the difficulty might be in meeting the strict geometric pattern that has long been required by the T/W Standard as a fundamental tradition of the breed, rather than the less prescribed Tri and Bicolour Standards required in some countries. The RVCC was asked to consider this possibility.

#### 4. Breed Standards

##### a) Lunkarya: Modified Guidance Notes for Judges and Exhibitors

It was agreed that The Guidance Notes for Lunkarya should be modified to:

**LUNKARYA:** A longhaired cavy in the Peruvian model (having a frontal, chops and two hip rosettes), but with significant differences due to the harsh and coarse coat texture and the tendency of the coat to form ringlets. The hair on the frontal, chop furnishings and belly is rexoid but not ringletted.

The Lunkarya's coat is its most important feature and on the body should be curly in a ringletted fashion, giving a corkscrew effect that needs to be present from the base of the coat to the tips, which should be intact. The coat should have harsh texture and be full and dense, with even lengths of ringletted curls sticking out from the body in a naturally untidy fashion. Therefore the Lunkarya should not be presented with a central parting.

Frontal and chops should be strong, with hair of one length and no gaps. The frontal and chops should be curly; the belly should show the presence of dense curls.

Judges must be able to run their fingers through the coat to check for coat quality and presentation, being able to pull their fingers up and out through the coat without encountering tangles, knots or matting.

A Lunkarya may be shown in any colour or combination of colours. It should be shown on a board of appropriate size.

In an older Lunkarya the weight of the hair will tend to make the outer coat fall towards the body, but the innate tendency for the coat to grow out from the body should still be evident and there should be no tendency to a parting.

The RVCC will monitor the qualities of the Lunkaryas that are shown against these revised Guidance Notes before deciding whether to recommend a 'Guide Standard' at the next Council Meeting.

##### b) Californian: Guidance Notes for Judges and Exhibitors

Guidance Notes for the Californian were agreed as:

**CALIFORNIAN:** The Californian is a smooth, short-coated cavy with smut and feet of one colour and body of a different colour, the pattern of markings being similar to those of the Himalayan cavy.

The smut and feet may be either Black, Chocolate, Lilac or Beige. These should have good density of colour with the smut being oval-shaped and carried up between the eyes, whilst the feet should have the same density of colour carried up

to the hock. There should be a clear demarcation between the smut and feet markings and the body colour.

Body colour may be that of any fully standardised Self from the red / yellow series, i.e. Red, Golden, Buff, Saffron, Cream or White. Colour should be even and carried well down. However, any cavy with black or chocolate smut and feet, bright red eyes and white body colour must be treated as a Himalayan.

Colour of eyes, ears and skin pigment should correspond to those of the smut colour as defined by the Self Standard.

When judging U/5 exhibits it should be remembered that the smut and feet will still be developing and will not reach their full colour development until they reach the age of 5/8 months.

In common with Himalayans, colour density of the smut and feet varies with temperature, being more intense in colder seasons.

It was further agreed that:

- Whilst clearly there can be no proscription against showing Agouti Californians in a New / Emerging breed class, this should not be encouraged, likewise the showing of Satin or Crested Californians.
- Coated breeds with Californian markings are to be treated as Bicolours rather than AOV until such time as the Californian is fully standardised.
- The major issue to be resolved by the RVCC is whether identical markings to those of the Himalayan are to be sought, or whether genetic differences are inevitable in terms of shape and clarity of markings and in terms of such as colour above the ears and around the vent. When it has resolved these matters, a proposal for a Guide Standard might be brought to the Council, possibly in 12 months time.

#### **e) Silver (Agouti) Himalayan: Guidance Notes for Judges and Exhibitors**

It was agreed that the following Guidance Notes for Silver (Agouti) Himalayans should be considered by the NHCC as the basis for determining whether this breed is to be recommended for Guide Standard status at a future Meeting.

**SILVER (AGOUTI) HIMALAYAN:** The Silver (Agouti) Himalayan is a Himalayan cavy in which the black smut and feet of the Black Himalayan are replaced by Silver Agouti markings. It is to be judged as per the Himalayan Standard except for its colour requirements.

The Silver (Agouti) Himalayan should have Silver Agouti smut and feet. The ears are black on the outer surface. Ticking on the inner side of the ear means that whiteness in the ear persists, never clearing as it does in the Black Himalayan. Pads and nostrils are black.

Ideally, ticking should be even all over the points but as the hairs are shorter near the nostrils and toes these areas may be darker.

Like all Himalayans colour density varies with temperature, being more intense in colder seasons.

#### **d) Self Slate: Modified Guide Standard**

It was agreed that the Guide Standard description of the Self Slate should be modified to require: "A mid slate-grey colour with no tendency towards a brownish hue. Eyes ruby".

It was further agreed that the Slates exhibited over the next year would be monitored for consistency with this Guide Standard. On the basis of evidence that significant numbers of Slates comply with its requirements, the ESCC and RVCC will consider whether to bring forward an application for a Full Standard to next year's Meeting.

#### **e) Self Caramel: Modified Guidance Notes for Judges and Exhibitors**

After a vote of 6 For and 6 Against, with the Chairman's casting vote being exercised against the proposition, a proposal from the ESCC that the Guidance Notes for Self Caramels should require eyes to be 'ruby' rather than the present 'light ruby' was rejected. The Guidance Note will state that: "All characteristics are as for a Self cavy but with the colour to be a rich, warm toffee, distinctly darker than the Self Beige. Eyes light ruby."

Dependent on evidence that sufficient numbers of cavies meet this Guidance Note, the ESCC and RVCC will consider whether to bring forward an application for a Guide Standard to next year's Meeting.

#### **f) Self Blue: Guidance Notes for Judges and Exhibitors**

It was agreed that the Guidance Notes for the Self Blue (black with double blue dilution gene) should be: "All characteristics are as for a Self cavy but with the colour to be an even dark blue/grey colour, similar to graphite, with no hint of brown. Undercolour to match top colour down to the skin. Ears and pads to match top colour. Eyes dark."

It was accepted that selection for a 'blue' hue might produce a slightly lighter shade than that of most cavies currently being exhibited, but it was felt that the above requirement would allow for this. Judges would be likely to favour a colour whose blue characteristics are most evident. Significantly lighter shades, most likely based on the cream-dilution and pink-eye dilution series of genes, might be produced in due course; but the nomenclature and required characteristics of these could only be agreed when sufficient numbers appear.

Based on evidence of sufficient cavies meeting this Guidance Note, the ESCC and RVCC will consider whether to bring forward an application for a Guide Standard to next year's Meeting.

#### **g) Eye Colours in Selves (expansion of previous Agenda Item)**

The Chairman's casting vote in the case of the eye colour of Caramels was exercised on the grounds both that it retained the status quo and also that he was concerned that describing the colour as 'ruby' might lead to confusion when breeds with much darker eye colour carry this same description.

Within the Self Standard the eye colour for both DE Creams and Buffs is described as 'ruby' as is now preferred for the Slate. However, the eye colour of Creams and Buffs is considerably darker than anything that is possible for Caramels, whilst the eye colour of Slates is also much darker.

A problem seems to have arisen in that in the past 'ruby' was taken to imply a dark red shade, whereas today the term increasingly implies a 'blood-red' colour (similar

to the 'bright red' eyes of Himalayans). A search of the internet indicated support for both definitions, although the 'blood-red' one is generally favoured since this is the colour of the most valuable cut and polished rubies.

In addition to referring to DE Creams and Buffs as requiring 'ruby' eyes the Self standard also states that Chocolates should have 'dark ruby' eyes, whereas DE Golden and DE Whites are stipulated as requiring 'dark' eyes, with no mention of 'ruby' even though these breeds have a genotype based on chocolate.

It was agreed that the ESCC should consider the eye colour of all Selves (whose Standards are also referred to in connection with many other breeds) and make recommendations on the appropriate wording to the next meeting of the Council.

#### **h) Update on Judging Criteria for Clipped Longhairs**

Mrs Phillips advised that the PVCC would discuss the criteria for judging Clipped Longhairs at its AGM. The likelihood was that these would follow those agreed by the SVCC (namely to allow a small amount of coat to rest on the board). The Chairman expressed the hope that this would be the case.

**5. Correspondence:** None

**6. Motions of Urgency** (accepted at the Chairman's discretion): None

**7. Any other business:** On behalf of the NACC Mrs Betts raised an objection to the use of the word 'Silver' by an exhibitor in connection with a New / Emerging breed, arguing that this term should be reserved to describe the Silver Agouti.

The Chairman replied that the word 'silver' is a commonly used adjective in the English language describing a colour similar to that of metallic silver; the NACC could not be deemed to have any form of copyright on its use to describe a cavy of another breed, just as it had possessed no right to prevent the 'Self Golden' from being called by this name even though it had appeared years after the 'Golden Agouti'. Should a Breed Club responsible for a New / Emerging Breed feel that a new variety should be known as the 'Self Silver' or 'Silver Whatever' and the Council concur with this view, then the NACC would have no power to prevent this, nor is it reasonable that it should be able to do so.

**8. Date and location of Next Meeting: TBA, October 2016**