

Australian National Cavy Council

Standards Review Panel.

Report 2007

Karen Nichols (Chairman)

Ken Hart

Robert Brown

Peter Wright (Standards Book Co-ordinator)

2007-08 ANCC ADM Annexure 1
Australian National Cavy Council
Standards Review Panel.
Report 2007

Introduction

It has been a very busy year for the Standards Review Panel (SRP), with much of the time spent on investigating the two items delegated to the panel by the States at the Annual Delegates Meeting.

This year the SRP puts several proposals before the delegates: upgrading of the PE Creams; reviewing of the Australian standards in the light of the release of revised British Standards; setting up of the Judges Assistance Scheme.

The Panel presents the results of its investigations into adopting a change to the Dutch standard, and the formation of the Judges Panel, as requested at the 2006 ADM.

Ridgeback.

The SRP have had no feed-back from breeders this year.

In future, breeds with Guide Standards, **Harlequin**, **Magpie** and **Slate** will become part of the review process. In conjunction with breeders the SRP will begin to assess their progress toward a full standard.

Sheba

Discussion continues with breeders around the development of these animals. Breeders are at a point where they need to collect and submit data to the SRP on the cavies they are breeding and the subsequent development of the coats of these individuals. The points of contention remain:-

1) the required length of coat in the adult cavy, with breeders continuing to describe a length that does not fit with known coat length genes. The breeders need to provide evidence to support that the coat length they are aiming for can be achieved.

2) the conflicting nature of density/lift/texture characteristics of the coat. More thought about the way these characteristics interact is needed by breeders to produce the coat they describe.

Breeders have been encouraged to keep records on the rosette placement and its effect on coat lift, length at a range of ages, texture and its effect on coat lift, and are requested to exhibit the same individual animals over a period of time to allow judges and panel members to see the development breeders are describing in their correspondence.

Dutch

The SRP have reviewed the 2005 amendment to the Dutch standard. Our review in 2005 was comprehensive. We have again considered our deliberations and remain completely satisfied with our previous recommendation, which was accepted unanimously by the 2005 ADM.

2007-08 ANCC ADM Annexure 1

Proposal 1

The SRP recommends that the PE Cream be upgraded to a Developing Breed:

Rationale: The SRP continues to be encouraged by the presentation of this breed at the 2006 National Show, and various shows in NSW, SA and WA. The breed continues to develop, and now is being exhibited with a similar colour range to those animals exhibited in the DE Cream classes. The breeding results provided by the breeders have clearly demonstrated that it is genetically similar to DE Creams other than the presence of two copies of the recessive allele *p* at the eye colour locus.

There has been little use of the Judges reporting forms this year, with a few Standard Progress Reports submitted from NSW, SA and WA. The SRP suggest that all exhibitors of unstandardised breeds take responsibility for providing judges with forms and sending them to members of the Panel by post or email.

Developing Breed Guidelines for the Self Cream Pink Eyed

Feature	Description
Colour	Top colour to be lustrous and of even shade all over the head and body. Under colour to match top colour down to the skin giving an appearance free from flakiness. Hair on feet to match body colour.
Type	Broad roman nose with good width of muzzle rounded at the nostrils, short and cobby body with deep broad shoulders.
Coat	To be short and silky with a glossy sheen.
Ears	Rose petal shape set wide apart, large and drooping.
Eyes	Large and bold.
Presentation	(ie Condition cleanliness and grooming).

Should be a pale even colour, free from lemon or yellow tinge. Eyes pink. Ears pink/cream pads flesh pink.

Faults

As per Self standard.

Disqualifications

As per Self standard.

Proposal 2

The SRP review the Australian Standards in relation to the recently published British Standards.

Rationale: The British Standards cover a range of changes that the SRP has already instigated or has begun to consider. Permission to use and/or alter the British standards has been sought from the British Cavy Council, and approval received provided relevant acknowledgement of the source is published with

2007-08 ANCC ADM Annexure 1

them. A full review of all standards melding the best of both standards can only make the application of standards more understandable and consistent.

Proposal 3

A Committee to run the National Judges Assistance Scheme be elected and begin administering the scheme from September 2007.

Rationale: After much discussion it was determined that this scheme is a viable one, offering opportunity for new judges to obtain experience they might otherwise not obtain, as well as the opportunity to become known outside their state. For clubs hosting the judges it will increase the variety of judges they are able to offer their members at a reasonable cost. For clubs sending the judges it will give their new judges wider experience that will benefit their own club.

The Panel suggests the ANCC contributes funds towards the scheme and:

- be administered by individual/s elected at the ADM
- have an allocated initial budget of \$700 per annum to meet the ANCC's contribution to participants, subject to review annually at the ADM
- report back annually to the ADM with full financial and administrative reports provided

Recommendations for administering the scheme include:

1. The judge must not be used for a top tier show. A top tier show is considered to be The National, or Major state shows (eg Shows that currently use/include an interstate judge).
2. The judge must only have officiated at a maximum of two top tier shows in their judging career to be eligible for assistance.
3. An eligible judge is limited to assistance to only one show per year.
4. An eligible judge is limited to assistance for a maximum of three shows
5. A state is eligible for assistance only once per year, forfeited if not used.
6. Assistance is only for return airfare between capital cities or regional airports where there is a direct flight to and from the destination, eg between Cairns and Sydney, or between Melbourne and Canberra, etc. It would be the responsibility of the host club to arrange travel.
7. Maximum contribution from the ANCC is limited to \$200 or 1/3 cost of airfare. The ANCC will make available \$700 per year for this scheme. Once this figure is reached the scheme is considered to be closed for the year. Any state that misses out in one calendar year will be considered as a priority in the following year.
8. The balance of the airfare to be shared between the judge's home state

2007-08 ANCC ADM Annexure 1

and the state using the judge. Any state that does not contribute to sending a judge when approached will not be eligible to receive assistance through this scheme. Each state will contract to contribute at the time of requesting assistance, or will be ineligible for assistance.

9. States that do not use a minimum of two interstate judges in one year for top tier shows will be ineligible. This is interpreted to mean at least one interstate judge per top tier show where the state has more than one major show each year. A state with only one major show per year is expected to use two interstate judges at this show to qualify for assistance at a local show.

10. The developing judge assisted will supply a written critique for the ANCC newsletter within 2 months of completing the appointment.

An application form and recording system to follow eligibility of judges and states will need to be developed by the individuals administering the scheme.

Applications should be made to the Assistance Panel up to a year in advance to allow the host state, the state supplying the judge, and the ANCC to coordinate funding and ticketing.

The SRP propose that the following two items be investigated by a panel specifically created to do so. The SRP will be unable to allocate time to these topics given the load of standards related items already allocated for the coming year.

Judges Panel

The original proposal states:

ANCC JUDGING ACCREDITATION

That a National Judging Panel be formed to perform the following duties:

- 1) Supervise at State level two (2) ANCC exams for trainee judges wishing to attain ANCC status. One exam is to be an all breeds theory exam, the other a practical judging exam.
- 2) Maintain all associated paperwork relating to these Exams.
- 3) Partake in an annual meeting (to be held on the weekend of the National show) to discuss standards, updating of exams and any other judging issues as deemed necessary.
- 4) Maintain a registrar of national ANCC accredited judges to be made available to the States or clubs upon request.

This panel is to consist of one nominated judge from each state who is to be elected by the state in the same manner that the state delegates are elected. Each panel member is to perform the duties of the panel in the state that they were elected to represent.

ANCC EXAMS

Theory Exam :

- The exam is to be drafted by the National Panel and updated annually as new or altered standards are passed by the ANCC.
- The exam is to have a National pass rate, as set by the National Panel, to maintain uniformity.
- The exam is to be sat by the trainee judge at the end of their training program and completed under supervision of the state National Panel member.
- The exam to be marked by the National Panel member and the results documented.
- The exam can be sat separately or in conjunction with each states training program.

2007-08 ANCC ADM Annexure 1

Practical Exam :

- The exam is to have the trainee judge complete an entire show under the supervision of the National Panel member.
- The National Panel member is required to observe the trainee in the handling of the exhibits and building of rapport with the exhibitors. The trainee is required to explain their decision making as/when requested by the National Panel member.
- The National Panel member is to either pass or fail the candidate, documenting the reasons.
- The exam can be sat separately or in conjunction with each states training program.

If passes are attained at both exams the trainee is then accredited with ANCC Judging status. Failed candidates will be eligible to re-sit the exam/s after a time that has been identified by the National Panel member as sufficient for the candidate to correct the shortcomings in the original attempt. The National Panel member is to instigate an appropriate training program, if deemed necessary, to assist the candidate to pass the ANCC exam.

New ANCC Affiliates and their judges.

Clubs accepted for affiliation with the ANCC who have their own judges will be required to have these judges meet the following requirements to be accepted by the ANCC :

- 1) Each judge will be required to sit both the ANCC Theory and All Breeds practical exams under the supervision of the National Panel member as detailed above.
- 2) If both exams are passed the judge will be accredited with ANCC status.
- 3) If one or both exams are failed the candidate will be eligible to re-sit the exam/s after a time that has been identified by the National Panel member as sufficient for the candidate to correct the shortcomings in the original attempt. The National panel member is to instigate an appropriate training program, if deemed necessary, to assist the candidate to pass the ANCC exam.

NB/The following conditions to apply at the commencement of this proposal :

- 1) Current ANCC judges are to gain automatic ANCC accreditation.
- 2) Judges to be a member of an ANCC affiliated club (per ANCC rule 5C)
- 3) If this proposal is passed the Panel members for 1995/1996 are to be elected at the 1995 ANCC annual general meeting.

AOC/AOV class allocation.

Proposal:

That during 2007/8 a process be developed to review breeds that presently have their own class at the National but no longer attract a large enough entry to justify remaining in their own class. The process to include a formula to ensure decisions become objective rather than subjective. A similar process be investigated to promote AOC/AOVs to their own class if they are worthy.