

AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY
OF VITICULTURE AND
OENOLOGY



The 2015 ASVO Wine Show Best Practice Recommendations

Cover image: Wine glasses on a judging table.

Photo: Donated by the Royal Agricultural Society of New South Wales.

AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY
OF VITICULTURE AND
OENOLOGY



**The 2015 ASVO Wine Show
Best Practice Recommendations**

22 November 2015

Edited by

Dr Tony Jordan, Dr Anthony Robinson and Nick Bulleid, MW.

© Copyright Australian Society of Viticulture and Oenology Inc. 2015

Australian Society of Viticulture and Oenology
Cnr Botanic & Hackney Road
Adelaide SA 5001
Australia
www.asvo.com.au

ISBN 0 9775256 8 6

Copyright: Reprints and quotations of material published herein are permitted on condition that full credit is given to the Australian Society of Viticulture and Oenology Inc.
The Australian Society of Viticulture and Oenology Inc. accepts no responsibility or liability of any kind for any statement, opinion or other material contained in this publication

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 PAST AND CURRENT ASVO REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON WINE SHOW BEST PRACTICE	5
1.1 Reviews of the Australian show system.	5
1.2 The 2004 ASVO Wine Show Recommendations.	5
1.3 The 2015 ASVO Wine Show Best Practice Recommendations (BPRs).	6
1.3.1 Objective of 2015 review.....	6
1.3.2 Participants in the ASVO Technical Advisory Group (TAG)	7
1.4 Comments on the structure of the final document.....	7
1.5 Future ASVO Reviews of Wine Show BPRs	8
2 PREAMBLE TO 2015 BPRS	9
2.1 Variability in judging outcomes.....	9
2.2 Maintaining differences between wine shows.....	9
2.3 Purpose of wine shows in 2015.....	9
2.3.1 The wine industry	9
2.3.2 Individual producers.....	10
2.3.3 The consumer.....	10
2.3.4 The Agricultural societies and others who organise wine shows	10
2.4 The Australian wine show system - 2015.	10
2.4.1 Proliferation of shows	11
2.4.2 Pyramid structure	11
2.4.3 Regional shows.....	11
2.4.4 State shows	11
2.4.5 Capital city shows.....	11
2.4.6 Niche shows	12
2.4.7 Regional "national" shows.....	12
2.4.8 International entries	13
2.4.9 Industry's preferred show system structure.....	13
2.4.10 Accreditation of Shows.....	13
2.5 Other observations.....	14
2.5.1 How many producers enter Australian wine shows?.....	14
2.5.2 Many of Australia's domestically and internationally respected wines are not shown.....	14
2.6 Recommendations	15
3 IMPARTIALITY	16
3.1 Recommendations	16
3.1.1 Perceived Conflict of Interest.....	16
3.1.2 Professional Conduct.....	16
3.1.3 Social Media	17
3.1.4 Managing Judging Prejudice.....	17
3.1.5 Ethical Standards for Stewards.....	17
3.1.6 Exhibit Randomisation	18
4 GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING A WINE SHOW	19
4.1 Introduction.....	19
4.2 Recommendations. Roles and responsibilities	19
4.2.1 Role and Responsibilities of Wine Show Organisers and Societies.....	19
4.2.2 Role and Responsibilities of an Exhibitor.....	20
4.2.3 Role and Responsibilities of a Chair(s) of Judges.....	20
4.2.4 Role and Responsibilities of a Panel Chair	21
4.2.5 Role and Responsibilities of a Judge (including Panel Chair and Associate Judges).....	21
4.2.6 Role and Responsibilities of a Steward	21

4.3	Recommendations. Judge numbers, appointment, term and assessment.....	22
4.3.1	Number of Judges to be appointed and timing of appointment.....	22
4.3.2	Selection of Judges, Associate Judges, International and Specialist Judges	22
4.3.3	Register of Judges	23
4.3.4	Term of Appointment for Judges.....	23
4.3.5	Rotation between Panels	24
4.3.6	Performance Assessment of Judges.....	24
4.4	Recommendations. Development of show schedules.....	25
4.4.1	Show Class Structure	25
4.4.2	Entry Volumes	26
4.4.3	Blends.....	27
4.4.4	Mixed Varietal and Blended Classes.....	28
4.4.5	Museum / Aged Wines	28
4.4.6	Unfinished Wines	28
4.4.7	International Entries	28
4.4.8	Entry Criteria for Exhibits.....	28
4.5	Recommendations. Wine judging process	30
4.5.1	Judging environment.....	30
4.5.2	Wine Temperature	30
4.5.3	Wine Glasses and Pouring	30
4.5.4	Presentation and Randomisation of Exhibits.....	31
4.5.5	Classes Sizes, Split Class Judging, and GI Split within Class	31
4.5.6	Class Judging	32
4.5.7	Trophy Judging.....	33
4.6	Recommendations. Communication and promotion	35
4.6.1	Communication of Results.....	35
4.6.2	Promotion of the Show System and Use of Show Awards.....	35
4.6.3	Sourcing of Wines for Promotional Purposes.....	36
4.6.4	Enforcement of the Winemakers Federation of Australian <i>Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice</i> (WFA CoP).....	37
4.7	Auditing	39
4.7.1	Introduction.....	39
4.7.2	Objectives	39
4.7.3	Recommendations. General	39
4.7.4	Recommendations. Wine show regulations to enable the audit process.....	40
4.7.5	Recommendations. Auditors, Auditor remuneration, audit costs.....	41
4.7.6	Recommendations. Auditing	41
4.7.7	Recommendations. Consequences of Breach.....	42
4.7.8	Recommendations. Penalties.....	43
4.7.9	Recommendations. Communication of Audit results.....	43
5	GLOSSARY	44
6	APPENDICES	48
	Appendix A. Supporting information for recommendation 4.3.2 Selection of Judges, Associate Judges, International and Specialist Judges.....	48
	Appendix B. Supporting information for recommendation 4.3.5 Performance Assessment of Judges	50
	Appendix C. Supporting information for recommendation 4.4.1.d in relation to Sparkling Wine and Carbonated Wine Class Structure.....	53
	Appendix D. Supporting information for recommendation 4.4.1.e in relation to Fortified Wine Class Structure.....	62
	Appendix E. Supporting information for recommendation 4.5.5.d in relation to GI Splits in Class Judging.....	65
	Appendix F. Supporting information for recommendations 4.5.6.b and 4.6.2.d in relation to Use of Medals / Trophies versus points.....	68

1 PAST AND CURRENT ASVO REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON WINE SHOW BEST PRACTICE

In 1822 Gregory Blaxland shipped 136 litres of wine to London, where it was awarded the silver medal by the forerunner of the Royal Society of Arts. Five years later a larger shipment of Blaxland's wine won their gold Ceres medal. This was to be the first of many international medals won by Australian wines.

The first referenced Australian wine awards were in 1826 when the Royal Agricultural Society of NSW awarded Gregory Blaxland with a medal for the best sample of Australian wine. Since then, and particularly in the last 30 years, there has been a proliferation in the number and types of Australian wine shows with the common objective of encouraging improvement in wine style and quality. Wine shows were initially run by various agricultural societies but more recently regional wine industry associations and commercial groups have become involved.

1.1 REVIEWS OF THE AUSTRALIAN SHOW SYSTEM.

Over the years the agricultural societies have worked closely with the wine industry on the structure and conduct of wine shows. In more recent times there have been a number of committees and seminars that have sought to express an overall industry view of best practice for conducting a wine show.

In 1986, an Australian Society of Viticulture and Oenology (ASVO) Wine Show Committee, chaired by Alan Hoey, published the *Australian Wine Show Model Standards*, which covered class description, judge accreditation, judging conditions, judging systems, and using shows as educational forums. Specific recommendations included that shows should: move away from class descriptions such as "Claret" and "Burgundy" and towards varietal nomenclature; introduce the ISO XL5 wine glass as standard glassware; and it recommended judges should cease the practice of "culling" "faulty" wines prior to judging a class. The model standards were circulated to Australian wine shows and were well adopted over time.

In August 2001, at the suggestion of Brian Walsh, the ASVO held a seminar *Who's Running this Show? – Future Directions for the Australian Wine Show System* convened by Nick Bulleid to debate the strengths, weaknesses and ways ahead for Australian wine shows. Many issues and options were discussed by representatives of the wider industry and the seminar was seen as a positive step towards improvement of the system.

1.2 THE 2004 ASVO WINE SHOW RECOMMENDATIONS.

The 2001 seminar led to the establishment of an industry-based ASVO Wine Show Committee (WSC) chaired by Nick Bulleid to address the issues raised. In 2004, the ASVO presented five recommendations at a workshop at the 12th Australian Wine Industry Technical Conference in Melbourne. These five recommendations covered four key issues, Judge Impartiality, Audit Protocols, Trophy Judging (including use of the Borda count) and Use of Medals. The fifth was an updated and expanded 1986 Wine Show Standards.

These recommendations, and especially the Wine Show Standards, provided an up-to-date guideline for use by wine shows when compiling regulations and planning the conduct of shows. The Standards also addressed many issues identified as challenges within the current wine show system, including class sizes, numbers of entries, judge fatigue, varying regulations between shows, judge training and entry criteria.

The general adoption of many of the best practice recommendations (BPRs) produced more robust and uniform practice in Australian wine shows. The only recommendation that was not widely adopted was audit protocols.

In 2012 the ASVO held a meeting, in conjunction with the 10th anniversary of the establishment of the Len Evans Tutorial. The meeting was convened by Iain Riggs and Samantha Connew to discuss *Wine Shows in the 21st Century* and topics included the current relevance of shows to exhibitors and consumers, pointing systems, communication and promotion of awards, emerging niche styles and categories, judge training and succession and evolving wine show standards.

A number of wine show representatives attended this meeting and engaged in a wider discussion exploring common standards and structures across the wine shows in Australia. This resulted in the formation of the *Capital City Wine Shows Committee (CCWSC)* that meets biannually to discuss measures to ensure that the Australian wine show system remains robust, transparent, engaged and relevant.

1.3 THE 2015 ASVO WINE SHOW BEST PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS (BPRS).

1.3.1 Objective of 2015 review

Ten years on from the 2004 ASVO BPRs, in the light of the continuing debate about many aspects of the wine show system and the evolution in the practice of conducting wine shows, the ASVO proposed that it was time to again establish an industry committee to review, update and expand the 2004 BPRs as well as address new issues that have arisen since 2004.

The objective set by the ASVO was to produce a single document for consideration by the agricultural societies, regional bodies and others that conduct wine shows in which the industry would express its current view on what constitutes best practice in the Australian wine show system.

Through this document, the industry seeks to encourage practices in the organisation and judging of all shows that are robust and have integrity and yet leave the shows with flexibility to express their own 'personality' or 'character'.

A robust approach, with shows cooperating with each other to achieve this, can produce the wine quality and style evolution objectives common to all shows. It would also establish a platform for the shows and the industry to communicate to trade and consumers in local and global markets the rigor of the show system and the quality of the wines that receive awards. The goal with trade and consumers is to have them respect the show system as one of the best sources of reliable information about the diversity and quality of Australian wines.

1.3.2 Participants in the ASVO Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

The wider industry readily agreed with the ASVO proposal and in 2014 the Society established a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) chaired by Dr Tony Jordan with Dr Tony Robinson, a board member of ASVO, as secretary to carry out the review. As the TAG has to express an industry view, members were chosen to represent a wide range of industry interests. Members were drawn from large and small companies, a wide range of geographic origins, trade, and press, those who have experience as wine show chairs and wine show judges, are members of wine show committees or have links to the 2004 ASVO committee.

The TAG members were:

Chair: Dr Tony Jordan, Oenotec Pty Ltd, Yarra Valley, VIC.

Secretary: Dr Tony Robinson, Treasury Wine Estates, SA.

Susanne Bell (Bellwether Wines, Coonawarra, SA), Kim Bickley (Fine Wine Partners, Sydney, NSW), Nick Bulleid (Winemaking Consultant, Canberra, ACT), Tom Carson (Yabby Lake, Mornington Peninsula, VIC), PJ Charteris (Consultant and Charteris Wines, Hunter Valley, NSW), Jim Chatto (Mount Pleasant / McWilliams Wines, Hunter Valley, NSW), Samantha Connew (Consultant and Stargazer Wines, TAS), Chris Crawford (General Manager - Beverage, Crown Melbourne Limited, Melbourne, VIC), Jeremy Dineen (Josef Chromy Wines, Launceston, TAS), Andrew Hardy (Petaluma, Woodside, SA), Tyson Stelzer (Wine Press, Brisbane, QLD), Edward Tomlinson (Lenton Brae, Margaret River, WA) and Courtney Treacher (Accolade / Houghton Wines, Nannup, WA).

The TAG was given the objective defined above and met in multiple telephone conferences between November 2014 and November 2015. From time to time, the committee sought opinions from industry members and show societies. A draft was circulated to interested parties in the industry, the chair met with the CCWSC and their comments were considered by the TAG before finalising the document.

1.4 COMMENTS ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL DOCUMENT.

Section 2. Preamble to 2015 BPRs

This section covers various topics that are background to drafting the 2015 BPRs including:

- Variability in judging outcomes and why this is important.
- *Maintaining differences between wine shows* comments on the desirability of each show having its own character or personality.
- *The purpose of shows* defines what the various interest groups seek to gain from shows.
- *The Australian wine show system 2015* addresses the proliferation and types of shows, international entries in Australian shows, the industry's preferred wine show structure and the possibility of establishing an accreditation system.
- *Other observations* addresses the number of companies that enter wine shows as well as acknowledging the renowned wines that are not entered.

Finally, a number of recommendations follow from discussion of these topics.

Section 3. Impartiality.

This was an important section of the 2004 BPRs and remains a debated topic. The TAG therefore reconsidered this issue which has led to expansion of the recommendations broadly grouped as: conflict of interest (judges and auditors); managing judging prejudice; ethical standards for stewards; exhibit randomisation.

Section 4. Guidelines for Conducting a Wine Show.

This is the core of the 2015 BPRs document. This section attempts to be comprehensive in its recommendations about conducting a show. It significantly expands the topics covered in previous 'Standards' sections and expands and absorbs audit, trophy judging and use of awards that were separate sections in the 2004 BPRs. For completeness, Section 4 includes, in appropriate sub sections, nearly all of the recommendations of Sections 2, 2.4, and 3.

There are more than 200 recommendations.

Some seem minor, such as acceptable range of room temperature during judging, which glassware to use, tasting bench heights, remuneration of judges and stewards, the number of judges on tasting panels etc. However, the TAG was clear that these recommendations should be recorded.

Other recommendations record evolution in practice and thinking over the last 10 years - mix of judges, term of appointment of judges, selection process for judges, use of specialist judges, entries by brand and blend, relaxation on the number of entries per class, appointment and remuneration of auditors etc.

Still other recommendations reflect more contemporary debate. To mention a few, they include the suggestion that there should be consideration of a wine show accreditation system; that the chair of judges should not be an exhibitor; and advocate the formal assessment of judge performance. They also put forward the unresolved debate about whether regionality can be better recognised by grouping wines by region or whether this introduces bias. They encourage promotion of the show system and show awards; clarify the use of the Borda count system for split trophy decisions; and consider the greater use of computers to facilitate judging and recording comments for exhibitors. They recommend that awards can be used only on the brand and blend entered; that the ASVO has a role in maintaining an auditor register; and that penalties for breaches discovered by audit or disregard of the WFA Display of Award Code of Practice should be uniform across all shows.

Should readers wish to seek recommendations on particular topics they can be guided by the Table of Contents, which is well segmented.

Section 5. Glossary.

Provides definitions of many of the terms used in the document.

Section 6. Appendices.

Appendices A to F are provided to give supporting information to recommendations that may not otherwise be readily understood.

1.5 FUTURE ASVO REVIEWS OF WINE SHOW BPRS

The 2015 TAG observed that there had been considerable evolution in show judging since the last review in 2004 and feels that future reviews should occur approximately every five years.

2 PREAMBLE TO 2015 BPRS

2.1 VARIABILITY IN JUDGING OUTCOMES.

It is recognised that judging is a variable process. When different, but competent, judges look at the same set of wines or if the same judges look at the same set of wines on different occasions or in a different environment, they will yield different results, although there will be reasonable consistency.

Why? Wine judging is a human process involving the complex interaction of sight, smell, and taste. Wine judges have variable sensory acuity, experience and opinions (especially style interpretation). Also, the judging environment varies from show to show.

Stated another way, when assessing a wine there are factors about which a judge can be objective and others, particularly style interpretation, that are somewhat subjective.

This variability of results is not a weakness of the show system, it is a strength and should be encouraged. Recognising the legitimacy of different style interpretations and preferences leads to closer examination by exhibitors and consumers of the styles of wines that receive top awards. This in turn encourages evolution of style, one of the objectives of all wine shows.

2.2 MAINTAINING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WINE SHOWS.

Even though it is recommended that all shows should follow best procedural practices in organising and conducting a show they should, in other ways, differ - i.e. have their own 'character' or 'personality'.

Multi-regional wine shows achieve this through the chair and the mix of judges they choose (different employment, training and experience), the chair's guidance on style, different approaches to judging and the entries they attract (for instance the capital city shows attract a high proportion of entries from within their own state). Additionally, they attract a different entry mix owing to the timing of the show, use different class structures and often, a special focus achieved through their trophy structure (e.g. the Jimmy Watson Trophy).

Regional and niche shows, each having their own unique focus, necessarily have different personalities but, like the multiregional shows, their choice of judges and chair is a further influence.

The 2015 BPRS are framed with observations in section 2.1 and 2.2 in mind.

2.3 PURPOSE OF WINE SHOWS IN 2015

"Improvement of Breed" is a catchy but inadequate agricultural phrase to explain what the wine industry wants to achieve from shows. In 2015, who are the wine shows for? What do the industry, individual producers, consumers, the agricultural societies and others who organise wine shows want to achieve?

2.3.1 The wine industry

2.3.1.a Wine show competitions should:

2.3.1.a.i Lead to evolution of wine styles and the continuous improvement in quality and excellence within each wine style.

2.3.1.a.ii Encourage both the development and recognition of diversity within each style. For example, within a region (GI) recognise and encourage diversity of style within each variety or blend.

- 2.3.1.a.iii Recognise and reward excellence and diversity of regional (GI) character. This is another facet of diversity of style that, in 2015, is worth emphasising. A focus on the diversity of character arising from the same varieties grown in different regions (GIs) is an important platform for the re-imaging of Australian wines in world markets. The world still tends to view Australia as a single region with a single wine offer for each variety and blend. The wine show system can play an important role in changing this perception of Australian wine.
- 2.3.1.b A robust wine show system will establish a platform for the shows and the industry to communicate to trade and global consumers about the rigor of the show system and the quality of wines that receive awards. The aim is to have trade and consumers respect the show system as one of the best independent sources of reliable information about the diversity and quality of Australian wines. Refer to section 4.6.

2.3.2 Individual producers

- 2.3.2.a Show performance allows producers to assess the quality, regional character and style of their wines against a wide range of their colleagues' wines. This comparison then challenges producers to improve their quality and styles.
- 2.3.2.b Show awards give producers a simply understood means of publicising a wine's quality to consumers.

2.3.3 The consumer

- 2.3.3.a If wine shows, individually or as a group, communicate to consumers in Australia and export markets the rigour and impartiality of the judging process, the competence of the judges and the validity of the awards then this will build consumer confidence in the quality and excellence of Australian wines.

2.3.4 The Agricultural societies and others who organise wine shows

Agricultural societies seek to promote excellence in all areas of Australian agriculture. Wine shows are their platform for achieving this objective for the grape and wine industry. Other shows, many organised by industry interest groups, have similar objectives that may be focussed more regionally or on some niche aspect of the wine industry. The show is their platform for meeting these objectives.

2.4 THE AUSTRALIAN WINE SHOW SYSTEM - 2015.

There has recently been considerable discussion about what system of regional, special purpose or niche, state and capital city wine shows the industry believes is ideal. When considering this issue, it has to be noted that the industry has no say in whether an agricultural society, an individual, or any enterprise can establish a wine show.

Ultimately the exhibitors and consumers will decide whether a show has relevance. If producers don't see relevance they won't enter and the show won't thrive. In other words the industry can't prescribe an overall structure for the Australian show system but exhibitors can express a preference by only entering those shows they consider relevant.

An accreditation system would help to control proliferation of shows and help maintain best practice. Such a system could define which types of show are eligible for accreditation and ensure best practice is followed.

The industry could establish an accreditation system. This is further discussed below. Refer to section 2.4.10.

2.4.1 Proliferation of shows

The number of wine shows in Australia has proliferated to about 70 in 2015. Some shows have seen reduced numbers of exhibits in recent years which may parallel the downturn of the Australian wine industry or indicate that producers are taking more care in choosing what wines to enter. However, this has been somewhat balanced by the increased number of smaller producers that now vie for awards and this can be observed in some instances as an increased number of exhibitors relative to exhibits.

The sheer number of shows and the debatable focus of some shows are of concern to the industry.

2.4.2 Pyramid structure

A pyramid structure with regional shows leading to state shows leading to the multi-regional capital city shows has often been proposed. In such a pyramid system, wines are eligible for the next level only if they win a medal in the lower tier.

If a pyramid system had been set up from the outset this could work. Now it is impractical; history is in the way.

Further, given the subjectivity and variability of judging (refer to sections 2.1 and 2.2) and how wines evolve in time, to be overlooked at one regional show and so not be eligible to enter the next level is not necessarily a fair judgement of a wine. A wine often needs to be exhibited at more than one show to demonstrate its worth.

Also, with a pyramid structure, all regional shows would need to precede their state show which would need to precede the national capital city show for current vintage wines. This would be difficult to schedule.

2.4.3 Regional shows

Regional shows are very important. Regionality is an important plank in the Australian wine story and these shows provide the tightest focus on region. Also, because they can permit very small volume and experimental wine entries which the larger shows often cannot, they offer the most complete view of their region.

A secondary benefit is that regional shows (and other small shows) are an entry point and training ground for new wine judges who may otherwise find it hard to enter the system.

2.4.4 State shows

State shows are a fact of life. Political boundaries don't make terroir sense but state governments, understandably, like focus on the industries in their states.

Also, awards from these shows may resonate with consumers who are interested in purchasing products from their state.

Even though these shows focus on the wines of their state they should seek to draw attention to the regional characters of their different regions (GIs). Developing awareness of the regional diversity of Australian wines is now seen as an important platform for enhancing the image of Australian wines domestically and in export markets.

2.4.5 Capital city shows

The seven capital city shows are all relatively long established national shows and are seen by the industry as the peak shows. There have been and still are concerns about direction and administration of certain of these shows but all are generally well accepted by the industry. They all have similar objectives and structure while retaining their own 'personalities'. The National show in Canberra has aspirations of being seen as the show of shows or the peak show of the Australian system. To differentiate itself, the National has set an entry criterion for most but not all classes whereby the entered wine must have been awarded a medal at shows it has approved in order to be eligible.

The other capital city shows do not see Canberra as the peak show but rather as one of the seven with a different entry requirement. Many exhibitors have the same view, also noting that trophies at other shows are more important. The National Show still has to develop its case with the industry and other shows if it is to be regarded as the peak show.

The current cooperation between the capital city shows and the industry, and the sharing of best practice between shows through the establishment of the CCWSC, is a positive development and bodes well for the future strength of the system.

The capital city shows are collaborating to raise the relevance, profile and recognition of the Australian Wine Show system and thus increase awareness of its robustness and the value of wine show awards. At the same time they are seeking to enhance the image of their shows in the eyes of consumers.

The industry hopes that the capital city shows, through the CCWSC and individually, will continue to take a leadership role and share their experience with regional, niche and state shows, particularly within their respective states.

The capital city wine shows should seek to draw attention to the regional characters of different regions (GIs). Developing awareness of the regional diversity of Australian wines is now seen as an important means for enhancing the image of Australian wines domestically and in export markets.

2.4.6 Niche shows

There has been a proliferation of these shows – the Australian Sparkling Wine Show, Australian Fortified Wine Show, various Cool Climate wine shows, Australian Alternative Varieties Wine show, private shows (Sydney International Wine Competition and Boutique Wine Awards), specialist international challenges (Canberra International Riesling Challenge) and others.

Because wines that are shown in these niche shows can also be shown in the regional, state and capital city shows, the question arises about whether there needs to be so many shows. Clearly there is support for many of them as they have become established in a relatively short time and quite a few do serve the purpose of promoting small, experimental or new wine categories that may be lost in the more general categories judged at state and capital city shows. An example is the Australian Alternative Varieties Wine show.

There is also a good argument for some shows that feature a single wine category e.g. Australian Fortified Wine Show and Australian Sparkling Wine Show, as there is for so-called single varietal challenges, e.g. the Canberra International Riesling Challenge and The James Halliday Chardonnay Challenge, especially when they are held in conjunction with a conference / workshop focussing on the same variety.

Such challenges may also have the potential to attract a worthwhile international entry that so-called international shows in Australia have so far not achieved.

A secondary benefit of niche shows is that, like regional shows, they are an entry point and training ground for new wine judges who may otherwise find it hard to enter the system.

2.4.7 Regional “national” shows

Does the industry need national shows other than the seven capital city shows? That is, should Cowra, Rutherglen and Riverina be national or should they focus on being regional and / or niche?

2.4.7.a Rutherglen Wine Show could become a regional (Rutherglen Wine Show and adjacent regions) as well as the Australian Fortified Wine Show. The Australian Fortified Wine Show is seen as a benchmark niche show that is particularly well located in the Rutherglen fortified wines region. In the case of Rutherglen Wine Show this transition has already begun.

2.4.7.b Cowra Wine Show still receives a strong though declining entry. It has support from a segment of the industry. At the time of writing, Cowra Wine Show has proposed to still continue as a national show and has introduced a second focus, the Australian National Single Vineyard Wine Show.

2.4.7.c Riverina Wine Show has also become a regional show as well as a niche show, the International Sweet Wine Challenge.

2.4.8 International entries

The industry does not support international entries in capital city, state and regional shows. These shows should focus on the development of Australian regional wine styles and awarding excellence in these styles.

Attempts by a number of shows to widen their entry criteria to include international wines have attracted only a narrow range of entries which cannot be claimed to give a representation of the true international competition. These wines detract from the focus on Australian regional wines.

However, the TAG sees an opportunity for more narrowly focused niche shows, those that focus on a single varietal or single wine category, to attract a more comprehensive international entry, in terms of both number of entries and range of countries.

An extension of this would be for a regional, state or capital city show to run, at the same time as their main show, a niche show (for instance, focused on a single variety) with international entries. If this is done, however, the judging of the niche segment should be as separate as possible from the main show.

2.4.9 Industry's preferred show system structure

The industry favours the following structure:

2.4.9.a Regional (GI) shows (local entry)

2.4.9.b State shows (state entry)

2.4.9.c Capital city shows (national entry)

2.4.9.d Niche shows. A limited number of niche shows with a unique focus that benefits the industry and or consumer. The industry believes that each niche show should provide a focus that regional, state, and capital city shows cannot or do not adequately address.

International entries may be appropriate at certain niche shows. Refer to section 2.4.8.

2.4.10 Accreditation of Shows

The majority of the TAG supported the establishment of an accreditation system for Australian shows, but this is not an agreed industry position.

It can be argued that an accreditation system would help to control proliferation of shows and encourage the adoption of best practice without narrowing the range of shows.

Further, if an accreditation system existed, it might assist trade negotiations seeking to permit the use of Australian wine show awards on bottles and other promotional materials in export markets.

An accreditation system should;

- Define which types of show are eligible for accreditation, and
- Set best practice criteria to achieve accreditation. These could draw from the 2015 ASVO Best Practice Recommendations, and
- Have an audit process.

The system would best be administered by an industry body such as WFA or ASVO.

The industry can't impose an accreditation system on the various organisations running shows and thus an accreditation system would be successful only if the majority of the industry entered only accredited shows. If such system were adopted, well-run shows would likely see the benefit in becoming accredited.

Does the industry want to fund the establishment and management of an accreditation system? This review committee leaves this as an open question.

The alternative to an accreditation system is for the industry to enter only those shows that are commercially relevant and which follow best practice recommendations such as the ASVO 2015 BPRs. Shows that do not follow best practice would lose viability if individual companies chose not to submit entries.

Recommendation. The wine industry and the wine shows give consideration to establishing an accreditation system for wine shows.

2.5 OTHER OBSERVATIONS

2.5.1 How many producers enter Australian wine shows?

At one of large capital city wine shows in 2015, the number of entries was around 3,500 and the number of exhibitors was 451 which is about 19% of the over 2,400 Australian wine producers. Most larger companies enter the capital city shows so the entries represent a higher proportion of overall production.

In regional shows over 50% of local producers enter. Why? Local shows generally compare like with like, and wines are less likely to be lost amongst other styles. Also producers can easily attend the exhibitor tastings, and entry fees are usually lower than in the capital city shows.

Exhibitor numbers suggest many producers see little benefit in entering shows, don't believe the judges appreciate their wine styles, or find the shows too expensive to enter. Some don't enter for the reasons listed in section 2.5.2.

From the point of view of the wine shows, the exhibitor numbers suggest that, if they can establish that their processes are rigorous and that judging does recognise a wide range of styles, there is opportunity to recruit considerably more exhibitors.

2.5.2 Many of Australia's domestically and internationally respected wines are not shown.

Why?

- The wines may be so sought after that the producers feel they have no need to use the shows to compare quality or they see little benefit from the potential publicity that an award can bring.
- Producers may feel they have more to lose if they don't win a top award than gain if they do.
- The producer may not respect the show system.

Does their absence matter?

- It would be good to have these wines entered because consumers tend to look for them as an internal reference. Their absence may lead consumers to think that the shows do not attract the best wines.
- The impact of their absence on judging is minor. There are many good wines entered and the judges are aware of the styles and quality of the respected non entries.

2.6 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.6.1.a Communication. It is recommended in section 4.6.2.a that to maximise the benefit to all interest groups of an effective show system, wine shows and the industry should work together to effectively communicate to trade and consumers in local and export markets about the excellence and rigor of the show system and the quality of wines that receive awards from these shows.
- 2.6.1.b There should be no international entries at capital city, state and regional shows. However international entries may be appropriate at certain niche shows. Refer to section 4.4.7.
- 2.6.1.c That the wine industry and the wine shows give consideration to establishing an accreditation system for wine shows.
- 2.6.1.d Wine shows should work towards attracting entries from a larger number of Australian producers.

3 IMPARTIALITY

The potential for exhibiting chairs of judges, panel chairs, or judges to bias their scores if they suspect a wine is from their company or region is real and the perception that this could happen in a show is a concern for the reputation of shows.

There are other judges, apart from those employed directly by the exhibitors, who could find themselves having a similar potential conflict of interest. Instances might include:

- Journalist judges who consult on communications to individual companies or regions being biased towards wines of these companies or regions.
- Judges who are financial investors in a company.
- Consultant winemakers or viticulturist judges who might have one or several clients exhibiting.
- A distributor judge whose agency brands may be exhibiting.

Furthermore, judges in a show that has given regional breaks (not the actual regions) within a class may be tempted to favour a group of wines they suspect is from a region in which they have a commercial or professional interest.

Eliminating all these potential conflicts, although ideal, would significantly limit the available pool of judges.

Given this situation it is suggested that the show system largely needs to rely on judges being impartial and the presentation of wines should reveal the minimum of information to judges.

The role of the chair of judges is most important in assuring the impartiality of the judging process and this is assisted if the chair of judges has no conflict of interest.

3.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1.1 Perceived Conflict of Interest

- 3.1.1.a Appointment of chair of judges. Preferably a chair is appointed who does not have any perceived conflict of interest.
- 3.1.1.a.i At regional or state shows, it is recommended that the wine show organisers should appoint a chair of judges from outside the region to ensure objectivity and transparency.
- 3.1.1.a.ii At capital city, state, and niche shows, the chair of judges should not be an exhibitor.
This avoids the external perception of bias should wines produced by the chair of judge's company receive awards or trophies.
- 3.1.1.b The chair of judges should declare any potential conflict of interest to the wine show organisers.
- 3.1.1.c Judges including panel chairs should be selected on their expertise to judge and ideally the panels should represent a wide range of industry interests. Refer to section 4.3.2 and Appendix A.
- 3.1.1.d Judges should declare any potential conflict of interest to the chair of judges and the wine show committee. Refer to section 4.2.5.a.
- 3.1.1.e Auditors should have no perceived conflict of interest. Refer to section 4.7.5.c.
- 3.1.1.e.i Auditors should not have wine entered in a show they are auditing.
- 3.1.1.e.ii If an auditor is a consultant, board member, shareholder, etc of an exhibiting winery, they should not audit those exhibitors.

3.1.2 Professional Conduct

- 3.1.2.a The chair of judges should formally remind judges of their role and obligation to remain objective. Refer to section 4.2.3.d and 4.5.6.a.

- 3.1.2.b The chair of judges should affirm that wines are to be judged recognising the diversity of styles expected within each class, a wine's quality and the show's guidelines (if any). Refer to section 4.5.6.a.
- 3.1.2.c Judges should conduct themselves in a professional manner at all times remembering to remain impartial and objective. This should be reiterated by the chair of judges and the panel chairs.
- 3.1.2.d The chair of judges and wine show organisers should ensure that no more than one (1) judge associated with a single company or organisation is on the same judging panel. Refer to section 4.3.1.b.
- 3.1.2.e All judges should assess wines impartially. There should be no discussion between judges of the attributes of wines during tasting. However, it is recognised that associate judges may seek guidance from the panel chair. Discussion of wines is only to occur after initial wine assessment when points are being discussed. Discussion to achieve consensus is also expected during any subsequent taste off. Refer to section 4.2.5.c and 4.5.6.e.
- 3.1.2.e.i An exception to this 'no discussion' recommendation is for specialist judges who are appointed to provide additional guidance on style. Refer to section 4.3.2.d and 4.5.6.e.i.
- 3.1.2.f If after collating and assessing points in a class there is a call back and taste off to determine awards, the wines should be randomised so as to minimise the tendency for judges to support a wine that they pointed highly in the initial tasting. Refer to section 4.5.6.g.
- 3.1.2.g All judges, stewards, committee members, and others associated with the show should maintain confidentiality about exhibits, judging and outcomes at all times. Information about the show and judging should only be issued by the show committee.

3.1.3 Social Media

- 3.1.3.a Each show should have a social media policy and this should be communicated in advance of judging to judges, stewards, committee members and others associated with the show.
- 3.1.3.b Any social media policy should specifically include a section that restricts the making of comments on known or potential results on social media before the announcement of awards. Refer to section 3.1.2.g.

3.1.4 Managing Judging Prejudice

- 3.1.4.a Non-varietal specific classes (e.g. other varieties and blends) should be sorted into groups by variety and then vintage to ensure that each wine is judged on its varietal character and merits, rather than suffering in mixed company, e.g. Chenin Blanc or Nebbiolo. Refer to section 4.4.4.a.
- 3.1.4.b For trophy judging as well as class judging, wines should be poured and stored out of the sight of judges and all bottles should be removed from their vicinity. A glimpse of a bottle finish or screw cap can compromise a judge's impartiality. Refer to section 4.2.1.d and 4.5.4.d.
- 3.1.4.c Wines eligible for class call backs or for a trophy taste-off should be randomised. Judges should be told only variety or blend and vintage. Judges should not be told the class number and or exhibit number. Refer to section 4.5.7.c.

3.1.5 Ethical Standards for Stewards

- 3.1.5.a Responsibilities of a chief steward and stewards.
 - 3.1.5.a.i Stewards are expected to maintain a high ethical and professional standard at all times. Refer to section 4.2.6.a.
 - 3.1.5.a.ii Stewards should declare any potential conflict of interest to the wine show organisers. Refer to section 4.2.6.b.

- 3.1.5.a.iii Stewards should at all times endeavour to keep their actions and reactions to an exhibit as neutral as possible so as to avoid influencing judges. Stewards should never discuss the exhibits with judges until the results are released. Refer to section 4.2.6.c.
- 3.1.5.a.iv Stewards should maintain confidentiality about exhibits, judging and outcomes at all times. Refer to section 3.1.2.g and 4.2.6.d.
- 3.1.5.b Only the stewards should be aware of which wines correspond to the exhibit numbers or judging numbers.

3.1.6 Exhibit Randomisation

- 3.1.6.a In order that exhibitor entries do not appear in the same order in different classes and so that multiple entries from a single exhibitor do not appear sequentially, shows should randomise entries for judging. An entry is allocated an exhibit number and these should be randomised post-delivery and prior to the week of judging to give a judging number that determines the order in which the wines appear on the table. This system could be assisted by using randomising software. Accurate recording and confidentiality is critical. Refer to section 4.5.4.b.
- 3.1.6.b Wine show organising committees should announce to judges at the beginning of the show that randomisation will occur.

4 GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING A WINE SHOW

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This guideline section is the core of this 2015 BPRs document. It sets out to be a comprehensive recommendation about conducting a show and in doing so significantly expands the topics covered in the 2004 'Standards' sections. It also expands and absorbs audit, trophy judging, and use of awards that were separate sections in the 2004 BPRs. For completeness it includes all the recommendations of Sections 2, 3, 4 of this document.

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4.2.1 Role and Responsibilities of Wine Show Organisers and Societies

The wine show societies or other groups who may be organising a show effectively 'own' the show. They are responsible for the approach of the show, establishing a schedule and set of regulations, publicity, accepting and organising entries, financial management, establishing an appropriate judging facility, organising the judging, preparing the catalogue of results and organising the exhibitor tasting and other events to announce awards. Thus the role of the society / organisers is diverse and many of the recommendations of the 2015 BPRs are recommendations on aspects of this role.

The following recommendations are roles and responsibilities that are related to the areas of judges, judging, awards, communication and use of awards, and audit. Show Societies should;

- 4.2.1.a Develop and implement a general code of conduct for all judges to agree to and sign.
- 4.2.1.b Recruit and train suitably qualified wine show judges and associates. The judging panel must be assembled in consultation with the chair of judges. Refer to section 4.2.3.a.
- 4.2.1.c Fully fund all travel, accommodation and out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the wine show judges for the duration of the judging period and if they attend, the exhibitors tasting. Depending on the financial position of the show, reimbursement of all or part of expenses incurred by associate judges and key stewards should be considered as should an honorarium for judges.
- 4.2.1.d Every effort should be made by the wine show organisers to ensure that judge impartiality is not compromised through the preparation and presentation of exhibits for judging. Wine bottles, either being stored or during pouring, should be out of sight of judges at all times. Refer to section 3.1.4.b and 4.5.4.d.
- 4.2.1.e Provide an environment for the judging of all wines best suited to showing exhibits in the best possible condition. Refer to section 4.5.1.
- 4.2.1.f Within budget resources, provide the best technology available to assist the judges to record their tasting notes and scores. With appropriate software, the use of networked tablet or laptop computers can provide each judge's screen with a tabulation and averaging of all judges' points as well as the tasting notes of all judges. This in turn speeds up the determination of awards – there is no calling of points - and, if required, allows the judges to choose the most appropriate tasting note on each wine to provide to the exhibitor. A number of shows are already exploring these options.
- 4.2.1.g Include brief judging comments on each class in the catalogue of results. Also, apart from direct discussion between exhibitors and judges at the exhibitors' tasting, develop systems to provide written feedback to exhibitors on their entries. Refer to section 4.6.1.d.

- 4.2.1.h All wine shows should adopt a consistent protocol for auditing exhibits. This will discourage any breach of regulations by an exhibitor, whether through carelessness or deceit, and assure other exhibitors, wine trade, press and consumers that high standards are being maintained. Wine shows should clearly outline the audit process in their regulations and the penalties applied where regulations are breached. Refer to section 4.7 on Audit.
- 4.2.1.i All wine shows should include in their regulations a code of responsibility for exhibitors in relation to correct medal use according to the Winemakers Federation of Australia's (WFA's) Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice (CoP) and to exercise penalties for breach of the code of practice. Refer to section 4.6.4.c and 4.6.4.g.

4.2.2 Role and Responsibilities of an Exhibitor

- 4.2.2.a An exhibitor should enter wines in a wine show strictly according to show regulations. Refer to section 4.4.8 and 4.7.4.e.
- 4.2.2.b Exhibitors must comply with the wine show audit regulations. Refer to section 4.7.4.f.
- 4.2.2.c An exhibitor should use wine show results, medals and trophies fairly and in the spirit in which they were intended. Awarded medals can be used only on the brand and blend that the entry represents at the time of judging. Refer to sections 4.4.2.b and 4.4.3.
- 4.2.2.d Exhibitors must comply with WFA's Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice. A wine show may refuse to accept entries from exhibitors demonstrated to have failed to comply with this code. Refer to section 4.6.4.c and 4.6.4.g.

4.2.3 Role and Responsibilities of a Chair(s) of Judges

- 4.2.3.a The chair of judges should work with wine show organisers to develop the wine show schedule and select a panel of judges which best meet the intentions of the wine show. Refer to section 4.2.1.b.
- 4.2.3.b The chair of judges should declare any perceived conflict of interest to the wine show organisers. Refer to section 3.1.1.b. Note from section 3.1.1.a that the chair of judges should not be an exhibitor.
- 4.2.3.c The allocation of judges to panels and classes to panels should be the responsibility of the chair of judges consulting with the wine show organisers.
- 4.2.3.d The chair of judges should take every opportunity to ensure that judges are aware of the importance of being impartial and free from bias and in addition, work where possible with the wine show organisers to avoid any possible bias. Refer to section 3.1.2.a and 4.5.6.a.
- 4.2.3.e The chair of judges should, at the commencement of the show, affirm that wines are to be judged recognising the diversity of styles expected within a class, quality and the show's guidelines (if any). Refer to section 3.1.2.b and 4.5.6.a.
- 4.2.3.f The chair of judges should arbitrate and resolve all disputes and issues arising in class and trophy judging.
- 4.2.3.g The chair of judges should attend the exhibitors' tasting and provide overview, feedback and comment to exhibitors on behalf of the panel of judges. Should a panel chair not be able to attend the exhibitors tasting his or her notes should be provided to the chair of judges for discussion with individual exhibitors if required.
- 4.2.3.h The chair of judges should take every opportunity to encourage, train and educate both judges and associate judges and be prepared to provide comment and feedback on performance, both to individual judges and the wine show organisers. Refer to section 4.3.5.a.

4.2.4 Role and Responsibilities of a Panel Chair

- 4.2.4.a Given the chair of judge's guidance about judging at the commencement of the show, the panel chair should provide further guidance if needed to the panel. Refer to section 3.1.2.b and 4.2.3.e.
- 4.2.4.b Once judging of a class is complete, the panel chair should lead panel discussion about the wines, be responsible for collating points, organise recalls and involve the chair of judges in the discussion, as directed by the chair. Once consensus has been reached on all wines including non-award wines, the panel chair should record final points and allocate awards, which are then submitted to the chair of judges as the master record. Refer to section 4.5.6.f.
- 4.2.4.c If the panel is using a computer system similar to that outlined in 4.2.1.f, the panel chair can select the tasting note of one judge and adapt it or draft a summary note that encapsulates the thoughts of the panel on each exhibit. Such summary notes could be used to provide feedback to exhibitors.
- 4.2.4.d The panel chair should encourage and train the associate judges allocated to them. Refer to section 4.3.4.

4.2.5 Role and Responsibilities of a Judge (including Panel Chair and Associate Judges)

- 4.2.5.a All judges should declare any potential conflict of interest to the chair of judges and the wine show committee. Refer to section 3.1.1.d.
- 4.2.5.b All judges should assess wines impartially and without bias.
- 4.2.5.c There should be no discussion of the attributes of wines during tasting. Discussion of wines should occur only after initial wine assessment when points are being discussed. Discussion to achieve consensus is also expected during any subsequent taste off. Refer to section 3.1.2.e and 4.5.6.e.
- 4.2.5.d All judges should endeavour to be available to provide feedback to exhibitors at the exhibitors tasting.
- 4.2.5.e Any judges not available to attend the exhibitors tasting should make their comments available to the panel chair to act as a proxy. Failing this, the panel chair should provide his or her notes to the chair of judges. This process would be facilitated if a computerised system (refer to section 4.2.1.f and 4.2.4.c) were being used to collate points and arrive at a summary comment on each wine.

4.2.6 Role and Responsibilities of a Steward

- 4.2.6.a Stewards are expected to maintain a high ethical and professional standard at all times. Refer to section 3.1.5.a.i.
- 4.2.6.b Stewards should declare any potential conflict of interest to the wine show organisers. Refer to section 3.1.5.a.ii.
- 4.2.6.c Stewards should at all times endeavour to keep their actions and reactions to an exhibit as neutral as possible so as to avoid influencing judges. Stewards should never discuss the exhibits with judges until the results are released. Refer to section 3.1.5.a.iii.
- 4.2.6.d Stewards should maintain confidentiality about exhibits, judging and outcomes at all times. Refer to section 3.1.2.g and 3.1.5.a.iv.

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS. JUDGE NUMBERS, APPOINTMENT, TERM AND ASSESSMENT

4.3.1 Number of Judges to be appointed and timing of appointment

- 4.3.1.a Most shows currently have one chair of judges. However, if the number of entries continues to increase it may be appropriate to appoint a second chair of judges or an associate (deputy) chair of judges.
- 4.3.1.b Judging panel structure. The current system of panel chair with two additional judges is the most preferred. However, no more than one (1) judge associated with a single company or organisation should be on the same judging panel. Refer to section 3.1.2.d.
- 4.3.1.c So that there are enough judges being developed through the associate system, it is desirable to have at least two (2) associate judges included on every judging panel.
- 4.3.1.d So that judges can organise their availability for judging, shows should endeavour to extend invitations to judges at least six (6) months prior to the week of judging.

4.3.2 Selection of Judges, Associate Judges, International and Specialist Judges

Ideally shows should have a complement of judges that reflects the makeup of the wider industry. The mix may include, but is not limited to, wine educators, winemakers, viticulturists, wine marketers, retailers, sommeliers, journalists and expert amateurs of wine. However, all judges no matter their background, must have a developed appreciation of Australian and international regional wine styles. The mix of judges should include some who have a sound technical background. Refer to Appendix A for further discussion.

4.3.2.a Judges should be appointed:

- 4.3.2.a.i Who are regarded by their peers as having good wine assessment ability and a developed appreciation of Australian and international regional wine styles.
 - 4.3.2.a.ii Based on their performance as judges at other shows as assessed by the chair of judges at that show. This may require sharing of performance assessments between shows.
 - 4.3.2.a.iii Based on favourable assessment by the panel chair and the chair of judges when they were associate judges.
 - 4.3.2.a.iv In the case of regional wine shows, the role of suitably experienced local judges who bring nuanced understanding of local terroir is acknowledged but judges should not be solely local.
 - 4.3.2.a.v It is acknowledged that in the case of specialised niche shows, e.g. Australian Fortified Wine Show, there may be a limited pool of experienced judges, which will restrict choice and make ideal rotation of judges difficult. Refer to section 4.3.3.f.
- 4.3.2.b Associate judges should be appointed;
- 4.3.2.b.i Who are regarded by their peers as having good wine assessment ability and a developed appreciation of Australian and international regional wine styles.
 - 4.3.2.b.ii Regional wine shows should consider the use of local judges for these positions.
- 4.3.2.c International judges should be appointed:
- 4.3.2.c.i Who are regarded by their peers as having a comprehensive knowledge of international wine styles and preferably have some experience of wine judging, and / or
 - 4.3.2.c.ii Bring to the show comprehensive knowledge of the wine styles of a particular region that the show wishes to feature (for instance a Bordeaux expert for Bordeaux blend classes).
 - 4.3.2.c.iii Who may act as an ambassador for Australian wines in international markets.

- 4.3.2.d Specialist judges should be appointed:
For classes where the chair of judges believes the judges may not have sufficient experience to judge the styles with confidence, the show could consider the appointment of specialist judges - judges with expertise in the relevant style - to head these panels and request that the appointee lead and guide the judging and at the same time educate the panel about the style. Refer to sections 3.1.2.e.i and 4.5.6.e.i.

4.3.3 Register of Judges

Shows have expressed an interest in having a register of judges that will give details of background and judging experience of potential judges.

Following the ASVO 2004 BPRs a register of judges was established by the ASVO.

This register still exists although it is currently not updated and rarely used. Refer to the following link; <http://www.asvo.com.au/australian-wine-show-advisory-group/wine-shows/wine-show-judge-register/>

The ASVO register captures judge and associate judge training and judging experience in regional, niche, capital city and international shows.

The database is self-managed by current and prospective wine show judges.

As this database is open, it is not appropriate to include individual wine show assessments of judge performance. Such information is confidential and should only be available on a case by case basis upon specific request from one show to another.

- 4.3.3.a The ASVO should refresh the "Wine show judge register" by contacting current judges to update their details. This judge register will then act as a database of current and prospective wine show judges detailing their training and judging experience, to which all shows can refer.
- 4.3.3.b The ASVO should contact current wine show committees to remind them of the "Wine show judge register".

4.3.4 Term of Appointment for Judges

- 4.3.4.a The industry recommends that each show has a clear policy on the rotation of all judges so that shows may refresh positions without the risk of embarrassment or angst. They should make this policy clear to the chair of judges and the judges at the time of their appointment. Specifically that:
- 4.3.4.a.i The chair of judges be appointed on a year-to-year basis for up to a maximum of four years with a minimum of four years before reappointment.
- 4.3.4.a.ii Show organisers canvass a wide range of possibilities including advice from the outgoing chair of judges when seeking a new chair of judges.
- 4.3.4.a.iii Show organisers should be ready to comment to other show organisers on the performance of the chair of judges and the judges if requested.
- 4.3.4.a.iv Judges, including the panel chairs, be appointed on a year-to-year basis for up to a maximum of four years with a minimum of two years before reappointment. If during this term a judge progresses to panel chair then the period of appointment of that judge can be extended by up to an additional four years.
- 4.3.4.a.v Associate judges be appointed on a year-to-year basis for up to a maximum of three years at a given show. Associate judges should be assessed (refer to section 4.3.5.b) and if their assessment indicates that they are ready to progress to full judge and they are offered a judging position, they can hold this position for up to the maximum term for a judge. Performance at other shows can be considered when promoting an associate judge.
- 4.3.4.a.vi International judges should be appointed for a maximum of one year with a minimum of four years before they can be reappointed.
- 4.3.4.b The rotation of a judge away from one show does not preclude them from participating at another show.

4.3.4.c It is acknowledged that in the case of specialised niche shows, e.g. Australian Fortified Wine Show, there may be a limited pool of experienced judges which will restrict choice and make ideal rotation of judges difficult. Refer to section 4.3.2.a.v.

4.3.5 Rotation between Panels

4.3.5.a To encourage exchange of skills and ideas between judges and to provide an assessment of a judge's performance by multiple panel chairs, it is recommended that judges be rotated between different panel chairs each day.

4.3.5.b Associate judges should stay on the same panel throughout the show. This facilitates assessment by the one panel chair of their overall judging performance and how their judging develops throughout the show. Further, they are exposed to the judging approach of multiple judges as they rotate each day (refer to section 4.3.4.a).

4.3.6 Performance Assessment of Judges

4.3.6.a The chair of judges should provide the show committee with a written assessment of each judge's performance after consultation with the panel chairs.

4.3.6.a.i These assessments should be held confidentially. Comments on the performance of an individual judge can be provided to other shows or the judge in question if requested by another show or the judge in question.

4.3.6.b Panel chairs should provide comment to the chair of judges on each associate judge's performance.

4.3.6.b.i The panel chair should report to the chair of judges on associate judge performance according to several categories. These could be, accuracy, spread of points, participation in discussion and overall performance.

4.3.6.b.ii Towards the end of judging the panel chair should give comment to each associate judge on his or her performance.

4.3.6.c The chair of judges should pass the assessment and recommendation on each associate judge to the wine show organisers. The recommendations could be, 'not suitable to continue as an associate judge', 'suitable to continue as an associate judge', 'ready to progress to full judge' or 'not suitable to be full judge'.

4.3.6.c.i These assessments should be held confidentially. Comments on the performance of an individual associate judge can be provided to other shows or the associate judge in question if requested by another show or the associate judge.

4.3.6.d If shows wish to trial statistical analysis of judges' scores to assess individual judge and panel performance then reliability assessment, and not reproducibility or discrimination, should be trialled. Refer to Appendix B.

4.3.6.e If shows collect judging scores in a database, they should be cautious about how this data is used for assessing judges and to whom the data is released. There are issues of confidentiality. Any assessment of judge's performance using statistical measures should be held confidentially between the show committee, the chair of judges and the judge. Refer to Appendix B.

4.3.6.f Adoption of statistical metrics as standard practice as part of judge assessment should be subject to future review by the shows and the industry. Refer to Appendix B.

4.4 RECOMMENDATIONS. DEVELOPMENT OF SHOW SCHEDULES

4.4.1 Show Class Structure

- 4.4.1.a Limit the use of subjective criteria, and use class descriptions which are defined essentially by variety or blend, and vintage e.g. 2015 Riesling or other objective criteria.
- 4.4.1.b Wines should be submitted as blends or varietals as they are labelled. Varietal wines must conform to the Australian Grape and Wine Authority Act 2013. Refer to sections 4.4.8.a and 4.4.8.b. For blends this means that if an exhibitor enters a wine that is > 85% of a single variety into a blend class because that is how the wine is commercially labelled, this should be permitted.
- 4.4.1.c Style definitions in wine show schedules as an instruction to judges are not necessary. These definitions should be left to the discretion of experienced judges, and particularly to the chair of judges and panel chairs. Refer to section 4.2.3.e and 4.2.4.a.
- 4.4.1.d Sparkling wine class structure is particularly complex due to the range of grape varieties used, different CO₂ pressures and production methods. This complexity requires that the class structure is segmented according to variety or blend, production method, yeast age, vintage or non-vintage; rosé, white or red. Depending on the number of entries for a particular grouping, some of these criteria can be combined resulting in fewer class divisions. For further explanation and class structure proposals for larger and smaller numbers of entries, refer to Appendix C.
- 4.4.1.e Fortified wine classes should be structured according to the Australian classification system with appropriate fortified wine styles broken into the subgroups 'Australian', 'Classic', 'Grand' and 'Rare'. If the number of entries is small for a given fortified style then these subgroups can be presented together and the judges told which subgroup each wine falls into. For further explanation and a class structure proposal, please refer to Appendix D.
- 4.4.1.f Should a wine show wish to include a focus (perhaps via specific trophies) on any one or several of Single (or Individual) Vineyard, Organic, Biodynamic, and Natural wines etc, it is recommended that these wines be judged with all other wines in their varietal or blend class and then awards particular to each type determined by sorting the results.
- 4.4.1.g An exception to section 4.4.1.f is if a show has a Wine of Provenance class where a series of vintages of the same wine are entered into a single class. Wines of Provenance should be reflective of the region, the variety or varieties and the influence of the winemaker. Recognising this, judges are assessing style, quality, and longevity. The wine must demonstrate consistency across a minimum of three vintages spanning at least ten years.
- 4.4.1.g.i It is noted that in 2015 Wine of Provenance classes are an emerging category; thus both the structure and approach to judging are still evolving.
- 4.4.1.h Should a wine show wish to differentiate wines by price point or volume - perhaps with a trophy for Best Red Under \$20 - the wines should be judged within their respective varietal classes. The awards should then be determined by sorting the results.

4.4.2 Entry Volumes

- 4.4.2.a For shows that do not accept unfinished wines (refer to section 4.4.6), exhibits must be commercially bottled at the time of submission of samples. This means that they do not necessarily need to be labelled at the time of submission. The exception to this are certain sparkling and fortified wines, refer to sections 4.4.2.f and 4.4.2.g.
- 4.4.2.b Current practice (2015) in shows is that wines are entered by brand name not exhibitor name. Because a brand may have several entries in the class, it is recommended that shows ensure;
 - 4.4.2.b.i That any one entry may not be entered by more than one brand.
 - 4.4.2.b.ii That any one entry may not be entered into more than one class. An exception to this is if a show has a Wine of Provenance class where a series of vintages may be entered, then these wines may be entered into one other appropriate class category. Refer to section 4.4.1.g.
 - 4.4.2.b.iii There is no limit on the number of entries per brand entered into any one class.
- 4.4.2.c The regulations should clearly state the number of bottles of any one exhibit required for judging. The recommended maximum number of bottles submitted for judging is:
 - 4.4.2.c.i Six 750 mL bottles, or equivalent volume, for table wine or sparkling wine classes. This could be reduced to four 750 mL bottles for regional and niche shows because they do not need as many bottles for trophy judging.
 - 4.4.2.c.ii Three 750 mL bottles, or equivalent volume, for fortified wine classes.
 - 4.4.2.c.iii Two 750 mL bottles, or equivalent volume, for brandy classes.
- 4.4.2.d As all exhibits must be commercially bottled at the time of submission, the minimum volume required for entry into a class should be quantified in dozens of 750 mL bottles (otherwise known as 9 litre equivalents).
- 4.4.2.e It is recommended that classes should not be split by production volume, price point, or any other categorisation. All wines should be judged to a single standard. The recommended minimum entry volume for table wine classes are:
 - 4.4.2.e.i 250 dozen at time of entry for capital city wine shows. Exceptions may be made for specific categories, for example single vineyard or small producer, where the minimum should be 100 dozen.
 - 4.4.2.e.ii 100 dozen at time of entry for regional, state and niche wine shows. Exceptions may be made for specific categories for example, single vineyard or small producer, where the minimum should be 50 dozen.
- 4.4.2.f Sparkling wine. In order to ensure the freshness of wines in the market place, sparkling wine producers may hold only small quantities of bottle-fermented sparkling wines as finished wine. The balance of the same blend should be held unfinished, en tirage. Thus smaller volumes of finished wine at the time of entry are appropriate for these styles provided the balance is being held unfinished. The recommended minimum entry volumes for sparkling wine classes are:
 - 4.4.2.f.i The equivalent bottled volumes as per table wines classes (refer to section 4.4.2.e) for carbonated and Charmat sparkling wine classes.
 - 4.4.2.f.ii 50 dozen at time of entry, with an additional 200 dozen (equivalent) of the same unfinished blend, for bottle-fermented sparkling wines at capital city wine shows.
 - 4.4.2.f.iii 10 dozen at time of entry, with an additional 90 dozen (equivalent) of the same unfinished blend, for bottle-fermented sparkling wines at regional, state and niche wine shows.

- 4.4.2.g Fortified wine. In order to ensure the freshness of wines in the market place fortified wine producers may hold only small quantities of Apera, the Australian, Classic, Grand and Rare styles of Tawny, Muscat, and Topaque categories as finished wine. The balance of the same blend should be held unfinished, in barrel or vat. Thus smaller volumes of finished wine at the time of entry are appropriate for these styles provided the balance is being held unfinished. Vintage fortified wines are also commonly produced in smaller volumes than standard table wines. The recommended minimum entry volumes for fortified classes are:
- 4.4.2.g.i 100 dozen at time of entry for Ruby and Vintage Fortified wines 5 years and younger.
 - 4.4.2.g.ii 50 dozen at time of entry for Vintage Fortified wines 6 years and older.
 - 4.4.2.g.iii 25 dozen at time of entry, with an additional 75 dozen (equivalent) of the same potential blend, for the Australian and Classic fortified Tawny, Muscat, and Topaque categories.
 - 4.4.2.g.iv 5 dozen at time of entry, with an additional 95 dozen (equivalent) of the same potential blend, for Apera, the Grand and Rare fortified Tawny, Muscat, and Topaque categories.
- 4.4.2.h Brandy exhibits should be broken down by the exhibitor to a strength between 37% and 44% alcohol by volume at 20 °C. Such strength is to be notified on the entry form and on the bottle label. Breaking down refers to samples only and due allowance must be made therefore for possible higher strength in the unfinished bulk quantities. The age of brandy shall be determined by the age of the youngest component of any blend. The recommended minimum entry volumes for brandy classes are:
- 4.4.2.h.i 100 dozen at time of entry, with an additional 400 litres of alcohol (LAL) of the same unfinished blend for brandy 2-3 years of age.
 - 4.4.2.h.ii 50 dozen at time of entry, with an additional 400 LAL of the same unfinished blend for brandy 4 years and older.
- 4.4.2.i Museum Classes exist to provide an understanding of how wines develop and particularly to recognise producers that produce wine of both excellence and longevity. Therefore, recommended entry volumes are small and may be of limited availability to the consumer. The recommended minimum entry volumes for museum classes are:
- 4.4.2.i.i 50 dozen at time of entry for capital city wine shows.
 - 4.4.2.i.ii Regional, state and niche wine shows may allow a smaller minimum entry volume than capital city shows.

4.4.3 Blends

- 4.4.3.a A blend is defined as a batch of wine made by blending component wines of variously different batches of the same variety, different varieties, different geographical indications, or different vintages. A wine submitted for judging should be identifiable as a unique blend, defined by having identical source materials blended in identical proportions and with sensory and chemical characteristics within reasonable tolerances.
- 4.4.3.b It is recognised that exhibitors may have two or more blends of a wine bottled under the same label. In this case the blend number (sometimes referred to as batch number) of the entry submitted for judging must be included on the entry form. Refer to section 4.7.4.d.

4.4.3.c It is recognised that the same blend may be broken down to multiple storage vessels and bottled across multiple bottling dates. Any award (medal and or trophy) bestowed on an exhibit may only be used in the marketing of subsequent bottlings of the same blend if the exhibitor can demonstrate that such other bottlings have identical source materials blended in identical proportions, and within reasonable tolerances, similar chemical and sensory characteristics.

4.4.4 Mixed Varietal and Blended Classes

4.4.4.a Non-varietally specific classes (e.g. other varieties and blends) should be sorted into groups by variety and then vintage. The variety, or blend, and year are to be given to the judges in hard or electronic copy. This is to help the judges to do justice to those varieties and styles that might otherwise be overlooked in mixed company. Refer to section 3.1.4.a.

4.4.5 Museum / Aged Wines

4.4.5.a It is recommended that museum entries should be five years or older at time of entry.

4.4.5.b Museum wines need no longer be commercially available. Refer to section 4.4.2.i.

4.4.5.c Museum wines should not be eligible for "general" trophies, but can be eligible for a specific museum class trophy. Refer to section 4.5.7.k.

4.4.6 Unfinished Wines

4.4.6.a Unfinished wines should not be entered into capital city wine shows.

4.4.6.b Unfinished wines may be entered into regional, state and niche wine shows with the following conditions;

4.4.6.b.i Finished and unfinished wines should be judged together in their appropriate class.

4.4.6.b.ii Unfinished wines should be given only points. Thus, medals should be awarded only to finished wines. The wider industry does not support the use of Commended etc. awards.

If a show decides to accept unfinished wines, a clause should be added to the regulations that the exhibitor agrees not to claim "judged to gold medal standard" or similar should their entry receive points that would lead to such an award had the wine been bottled. Unfinished wines should not be eligible for trophies.

4.4.7 International Entries

4.4.7.a The industry does not support entries of international wines into capital city, state, or regional wine shows as these exist to improve and promote Australian regional styles.

4.4.7.b Niche or specialist shows that can attract a significant number of international entries from a range of countries are supported.

If a niche show with international entries is held at the same time as another show (capital, state or regional), refer to section 2.4.8, the judging of the niche show should, as far as possible, be separate from the main show.

4.4.8 Entry Criteria for Exhibits

4.4.8.a Wines must strictly comply with all entry criteria. Refer to section 4.2.2.a, 4.4.1.b and 4.7.4.e.

4.4.8.b Shows should include a clause in their regulations that requires all Australian exhibits to conform to the respective Acts of the States and the Commonwealth of Australia that govern the production of Australian wine and Australian brandy, i.e. the Customs and Excise Act and Regulations, the Spirits Act and Regulations, the Health Act and Regulations, the Australian Grape and Wine Authority Act 2013, the Food Standards Australia New Zealand Act 1991, and the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code - Standard 4.5.1 - Wine Production Requirements.

- 4.4.8.c Wines should be entered under brand name as opposed to exhibitor name or parent company name. Refer to section 4.4.2.b.
- 4.4.8.d Preferably, wines that receive awards will use that award on the brand and blend under which the wine was entered. Currently wine portability (releasing the awarded wine under a brand other than that under which it was entered in the wine show) is permitted providing the wine show regulations so allow. Refer to sections 4.6.4 on WFA CoP and refer to sections 4.4.2.b and 4.4.3 on use of awards with respect to brand.
- 4.4.8.e The majority of the TAG questioned the continuing need for portability and recommends that the industry should continue to review the need for this.

The discussion related to this recommendation is as follows;

Given that in 2015 awards are given only to bottled wines, that in a single class multiple entries can be made under a brand and that the maximum volume requirements in any class is 250 x 9 litre equivalents, there seems to be less need for portability of awards as permitted in the WFA CoP.

Industry comments indicate portability may still be useful;

- If an exhibitor sells the ownership of a brand but retains the stock, it may want to use another brand name on medal winning wines retained.
- If a wine wins a medal, another wine company may wish to purchase cleanskin stock at a price that recognises the award, provided it can use the award under its own brand or label.
- If a wine wins a gold medal, an exhibitor may wish to release it under another brand in its portfolio which attracts a higher margin.

The counter argument relates to consumer perceptions.

- If the shows in future do become a reference point on wine quality for consumers then the consumer is not going to understand why a wine that was listed in the results catalogue as an award winner never becomes commercially available. The explanation that it is now under another brand may not be understood.

4.5 RECOMMENDATIONS. WINE JUDGING PROCESS

4.5.1 Judging environment

- 4.5.1.a Venues for judging should have as much natural light and ventilation as possible and also be in a quiet location free from distractions and odours.
- 4.5.1.b Wines should be judged in an environment with sufficient natural light defined as light with an emitted colour of 5500-6000 Kelvin and a luminous intensity of 500-1000 lux. If artificial light is required, then thought should be given to meeting this minimum standard.
- 4.5.1.c Room temperature for judging should ideally be between 18 °C and 21 °C.
- 4.5.1.d Judging tables should be a pure white colour with a matte finish. Judging numbers should be printed on the judging tables where an individual glass is placed for assessment.
- 4.5.1.e Judging tables should be set at a height of 900 – 1100 mm with stools provided to allow judges the option to sit or stand while judging wines.

4.5.2 Wine Temperature

- 4.5.2.a After being received from exhibitors, prior to judging, exhibits should be stored at an even temperature between 10 °C and 15 °C.
- 4.5.2.b The ideal serving temperature ranges for different wine styles have been listed below. It is recognised that serving wines at these ideal temperatures is currently impractical. Consequently most wines will be served at ambient temperature. However, Sparkling wines must be served chilled at 8-10 °C.
 - 4.5.2.b.i Sparkling wines: 8-10 °C,
 - 4.5.2.b.ii White and Rosé wines: 10-12 °C
 - 4.5.2.b.iii Red wines: 15-17 °C
 - 4.5.2.b.iv Apera and Sweet table wines: 10-12 °C
 - 4.5.2.b.v Brandies and fortified wines: 15-17 °C

4.5.3 Wine Glasses and Pouring

Over the past 10 years there has been a reassessment of the bowl size and shape of glasses best suited to judging wine. Because of logistics of handling thousands of glasses, universality (suitability for many wine styles) is important. There has been a shift away from the ISO XL5 glass towards larger bowls shaped for good aroma retention.

Currently (2015) the most common glass used in Australian shows is the Riedel Overture Magnum. It is one of several suitable glasses available commercially and the favourable pricing offered for the initial purchase by Riedel as well as the advocacy of some local champions of the glass, have encouraged its adoption.

There are many other brands of wine glasses that have styles that are suitable and they should be considered by shows.

- 4.5.3.a The following wine glasses are a few of the many suitable possibilities;
 - 4.5.3.a.i Sparkling wines: Riedel Vinum Chianti, XL5, Orrefors Difference Premium Red.
 - 4.5.3.a.ii White, Rosé, Red, Sweet table wines: Riedel Overture Magnum, Spiegelau Authentic Bordeaux, Riedel Vinum Chianti, Orrefors Difference Premium Red, Zalto White Wine
 - 4.5.3.a.iii Fortified wines: XL5
 - 4.5.3.a.iv Brandies: XL5
- 4.5.3.b A fresh, clean glass should be used for each wine exhibit. Glasses should be cleaned immediately after use, rinsing thoroughly with hot water, and then air-dried or dried with a smooth lint-free cloth.
- 4.5.3.c The pouring of wines should preferably be completed no earlier than 10 minutes prior to judging to ensure that wines are presented fresh. Pouring of sparkling wines should be conducted immediately prior to judging to ensure that the wines are as close as possible to 8-10 °C.

- 4.5.3.d All glasses should be filled to the appropriate fill height to allow judges the opportunity to revisit the wine. As a guide, 50 mL is sufficient in a smaller glass, (e.g. XL5) whereas 75 mL is a more appropriate volume for a larger glass (e.g. Riedel Overture Magnum).
- 4.5.3.e Brandy should have two glasses presented per sample, one at bottle strength 37 – 44 % v/v and one broken back using demineralised still water to 20 % v/v. It is normally regarded as a sufficiently close approximation to use equal volumes of brandy and demineralised still water.

4.5.4 Presentation and Randomisation of Exhibits

- 4.5.4.a Rigorous checking by wine show organisers should ensure that class identification is adhered to by exhibitors and that all wines presented for judging at class and trophy level are legitimate and are entered and awarded in accordance with class descriptor.
- 4.5.4.b Wine shows should adopt some form of randomisation technique to prevent entries from appearing in a predictable sequence or those from a large company appearing in blocks within a class. An entry is allocated an exhibit number and these should be randomised post-delivery and prior to the week of judging to give a judging number that determines the order in which the wines appear on the table. This system could be assisted by using randomising software. Accurate recording and confidentiality is critical. Refer to section 3.1.6.
- 4.5.4.c Wine show organising committees should announce to judges at the beginning of the show that randomisation has occurred on at least some (unspecified) classes. Refer to section 3.1.6.
- 4.5.4.d For class and trophy judging, wines should be poured either out of the sight of judges or from completely masked bottles at the judging tables while judges are away from the vicinity. All bottles should be removed from the vicinity of judges. A glimpse of a bottle finish or screw cap can compromise a judge's impartiality. Refer to section 3.1.4.b and 4.2.1.d.

4.5.5 Classes Sizes, Split Class Judging, and GI Split within Class

- 4.5.5.a For larger classes, discretion should be applied in splitting classes so as not to overwhelm judges with excessively large flights. Brackets should ideally be limited to 30 wines. This recommendation should be applied without overcomplicating the daily allocation of classes, where some brackets may need to be more than 30 wines.
- 4.5.5.b Judges should be asked to assess a maximum of 130 wines per day, and ideally 120 wines or fewer.
- 4.5.5.c It is recommended that wine shows use the following methods for judging classes with a large number of entries:
 - 4.5.5.c.i Single panel split class method: The chair of judges decides that one panel will judge a class that needs to be split. That panel will therefore judge all brackets and reassess all potential gold and silver medals or alternatively all potential gold medals before deciding the final awards.
 - 4.5.5.c.ii Multiple panel split class method: Here a class is split and judged across two or more panels. The panel chairs and the chair of judges then reassess all potential gold medals, or alternatively the top golds from each split, before deciding the final awards.

4.5.5.d Class judging using GI splits. Also see Appendix E.
Some multi-regional shows, including two capital city shows, have chosen to group wines within a class by GI to assist in the recognition and promotion of regional style. Judges are provided with the separations between GIs, but not the GI identities. Industry feedback has been both in favour and against this, and the responses are discussed in Appendix E. In 2015, this approach requires further assessment. It is recommended that judging by GI should remain subject to ongoing review.

4.5.6 Class Judging

- 4.5.6.a For class and trophy judging, the chair of judges should formally remind judges of their role and obligation as judges to remain objective. Impartiality is vital and personal preference or bias should be discouraged with any perceived conflict of interest declared. The chair of judges should affirm that wines are to be judged on quality and that judging should recognise the range of styles possible. Refer to sections 3.1.2.b and 4.2.3.d.
- 4.5.6.b Wine show organisers can use either the 20 point scale or the 100 point scale for judging. However, exhibitors should be encouraged to use awards (trophy, gold, silver, and bronze) for promotional purposes, according to the WFA Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice rather than points. Refer to section 4.6.2.d and Appendix F for further discussion.
- 4.5.6.c If using the 100 point scale, the medal breaks are as follows:
- 4.5.6.c.i Gold medal award for exhibits gaining 95 points and over;
 - 4.5.6.c.ii Silver medal award for exhibits gaining 90 but fewer than 95 points;
 - 4.5.6.c.iii Bronze medal award for exhibits gaining 85 but fewer than 90 points.
- 4.5.6.d If using the 20 point scale, the medal breaks are as follows:
- 4.5.6.d.i Gold medal award for exhibits gaining 18.5 points and over;
 - 4.5.6.d.ii Silver medal award for exhibits gaining 17.0 but fewer than 18.5 points;
 - 4.5.6.d.iii Bronze medal award for exhibits gaining 15.5 but fewer than 17.0 points.
- 4.5.6.e All judges should assess wines impartially.
There should be no discussion of the attributes of wines during tasting. However, it is recognised that associate judges may seek guidance from the panel chair. Discussion of wines is to occur only after initial wine assessment, when points are being discussed. Discussion to achieve consensus is also expected during any subsequent taste off. Refer to section 3.1.2.e and 4.2.5.c.
- 4.5.6.e.i An exception to this recommendation is for specialist judges who, to provide additional guidance on style, may need to talk to the other judges during tasting. Refer to section 4.3.2.d and 3.1.2.e.i.
- 4.5.6.f Once judging of a class is complete, the panel chair should lead panel discussion about the wines, be responsible for collating points, organise recalls and involve the chair of judges in the discussion, as directed by the chair. Once consensus has been reached on all wines including non-award wines, the panel chair should record final points and allocate awards, which are then submitted to the chair of judges as the master record. Refer to section 4.2.4.b.
- 4.5.6.g If after assessing points in a class there is call back and taste off to determine awards, the call back wines should be randomised, in order to minimise the tendency for judges to support a wine that they gave a high award to in the initial tasting. Refer to section 3.1.2.f.
- 4.5.6.h All eligible gold medals, being the highest pointed gold medal wines in eligible classes, should advance to the trophy judging. Refer to section 4.5.7.a.

4.5.6.i For wines that are affected by the cork or other closure or other faults such as oxidation, calling for a second bottle should not be permitted. A policy of recall is biased towards the wines that have an obvious taint or other faults, and disadvantages those that are almost imperceptibly affected and hence may not be recalled.

4.5.7 Trophy Judging

4.5.7.a Trophies should be awarded only to gold medal winners. If the highest award in eligible classes is a silver medal then this wine should not advance to a trophy taste off. Thus, only eligible gold medals, being the highest pointed gold medal wines in eligible classes, should advance to the trophy judging. Refer to section 4.5.6.h.

4.5.7.b To avoid issues of bias, there should be no pre-trophy culling of eligible gold medals.

4.5.7.c Wines eligible for a trophy taste off should be randomised. Judges should be told only the variety or blend and vintage. Judges should not be told the class number and or exhibit number. Refer to section 3.1.4.c.

4.5.7.d The chair of judges should remind judges that they must judge impartially and that they must approach the trophy judging with an open mind, carrying no preconceived ideas from the class judging, or about preferred varieties, blends or styles.

4.5.7.e Prior to trophy judging there should be no discussion, so as to avoid the potential for one judge to influence another. During the trophy tasting and submission of points there should be silence.

4.5.7.f The judging of trophies should continue to use the Borda count method. That is, each judge (excluding associate judges) should allocate points to the wines in decreasing order of preference. For example, with six wines:

- first preference 5
- second preference 4
- third preference 3
- fourth preference 2
- fifth preference 1
- sixth preference 0

4.5.7.g And similarly for any number of wines.

The total points for each wine should be tallied, with the winner being the wine with the highest number of points.

4.5.7.h Using the Borda count it is important that all wines selected for inclusion in the judging are rated and all scores are included.

4.5.7.i For the Borda count method to be effective, judges must not engage in tactical manipulation of voting. The chair of judges must remind all judges that they must judge trophy wines impartially and must rate the wines strictly from the most preferred to the least preferred. Judges must not give a wine a lower preference vote than they believe it deserves to tactically favour a wine they prefer more.

4.5.7.j Using the Borda count, or any other method, a situation can arise where there is polarisation between high and low points for two wines with an even split in the panel. In this case a third wine may receive the highest count even though it may have few or no first votes. In such cases, where the counts are very close, the chair of judges, having the ultimate discretion, may decide to reconsider which of the closely pointed wines should receive the trophy. To arrive at a decision the chair of judges may:

4.5.7.j.i View the total points in a Borda count in conjunction with a count of first preference votes,

4.5.7.j.ii View the total points in a Borda count of the panel chairs and chair of judges separately to other judges.

- 4.5.7.j.iii Use his or her casting vote to resolve the deadlock.
- 4.5.7.k Museum wines should not be awarded "general" trophies, but may be awarded a specific trophy for museum classes. Refer to section 4.4.5.c.
- 4.5.7.l Best Exhibitor trophies should be discontinued.
- 4.5.7.m Trophies should be organised in a logical hierarchy to limit the total number of trophies won by a single wine to preferably no more than three. The logical hierarchy is;
- Best of varietal or blend
 - Best of wine type (sparkling, white, red or fortified)
 - Best of show
- 4.5.7.n If a wine show has a "Prize" awarded by the international judge and this is a free choice of the international judge(s) based on the wines tasted, it is possible the wine may not have received a gold or any medal in the class in which it was judged. Thus, because of the different eligibility criterion, this award should be recognised as a "Prize" instead of a Trophy.

4.6 RECOMMENDATIONS. COMMUNICATION AND PROMOTION

4.6.1 Communication of Results

- 4.6.1.a The results catalogue should include details for each exhibit namely, vintage, variety / varieties and brand name.
- 4.6.1.b The results catalogue should record the results of award winning wines as trophy, gold, silver, and bronze with their points. The non-award winning wines are recorded in the catalogue without points and these points are communicated to the exhibitor directly. Refer to section 4.6.1.d.
- 4.6.1.b.i The highest pointed gold medal wine in any class should be listed in the results catalogue as top gold and the points should differentiate it from the other gold medal wines.
- 4.6.1.c The results catalogue should list the judges for each class as a reference for exhibitors seeking more detailed feedback.
- 4.6.1.d It is suggested, post judging, that exhibitors are provided with a complete listing of their entries with awards and points for each. Where possible, judge' comments should also be communicated. Refer to section 4.2.1.g.

4.6.2 Promotion of the Show System and Use of Show Awards

It can be said that the Australian wine show system and the wine industry have not been effective in engaging with consumers in any meaningful way. This may be because the shows were originally established to serve the producers and the producers were simply interested in seeing how their products competed against those of their peers.

There is a significant opportunity to increase the awareness of consumers worldwide of the rigour of the Australian wine show system and the quality of wines that receive awards. The show system and the industry should work together to achieve this.

To succeed, the whole show system, not merely a small group of shows, needs to be seen as rigorous and of a consistently high standard. If there is a suggestion of better and lesser shows, the consumer will not understand and will look to simpler propositions for guidance on wine quality.

- 4.6.2.a To maximise the benefit to all interest groups of an effective show system, wine shows and the industry should work together to effectively communicate to trade and consumers in local and export markets about the excellence and rigor of the show system and the quality of wines that receive awards from these shows.
- 4.6.2.b To facilitate communication with trade and consumers, the establishment of a central results database for all shows should be considered.
- 4.6.2.c Wine shows are encouraged to hold public tastings which feature award winning wines.
- 4.6.2.d Exhibitors should be encouraged to use awards (trophy, gold, silver, and bronze) for promotional purposes, according to the WFA Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice, rather than points. The use of medals by the show system conveys the recognised structure, process, rigour, transparency and auditability that underpin the results and the medal hierarchy. Medals are a symbol of excellence and can be used by the winning exhibitors on packaging, point of sale and other marketing collateral. Refer to Appendix F for further discussion.

4.6.2.e Design of awards stickers.

There are three parties to consider. The consumer, the exhibitor and the shows. So that consumers, Australia and worldwide, can readily recognize a trophy, gold, silver or bronze award from an Australian show, there should preferably be a single design for trophies and medals that is universal to all shows.

The message to consumers about awards will not be as clear if different shows have different stickers. At a glance, consumers should see a familiar award format for all Australian wine shows and not a myriad of different formats that they then have to interpret.

Further, it is easier for exhibitors who win multiple awards at multiple shows to print and display awards on bottles if there is a single format.

If shows wish to have their proprietary awards sticker format as part of their branding they should consider a dual approach of having a standard industry format as well as their own format and leaving it to exhibitors to choose which they use.

4.6.2.e.i Medals should take the form of round discs in either gold, silver, or bronze colour to reflect the appropriate award conferred on an exhibit. Text should be in either black or white with a minimum font size of 7 point. Colour references are as follows;

Gold - PMS 871 or CMYK (0%, 22%, 100%, 22%) or RGB (199, 155, 0)

Silver - PMS 877 or CMYK (0%, 0%, 0%, 40%) or RGB (153, 153, 153)

Bronze - PMS 875 or CMYK (0%, 45%, 73%, 24%) or RGB (194, 107, 52)

Black - PMS Black or CMYK (0%, 0%, 0%, 100%) or RGB (0, 0, 0)

White - PMS White or CMYK (0%, 0%, 0%, 0%) or RGB (255, 255, 255)

4.6.2.e.ii As a minimum requirement, medals should communicate the name of the show, the year of award and either one or both of the class number and class description. Communicating the class description is beneficial but not necessary as there may not be sufficient text space on the medal.

4.6.2.e.iii Disc shaped medals should be reproduced with a minimum size of 20 mm in diameter to ensure legibility.

4.6.2.e.iv Medal design, ordering and printing can be arranged by either the wine show or the exhibitor as long as the medal design conforms to the WFA *Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice*.

4.6.3 Sourcing of Wines for Promotional Purposes

Many wine shows request additional bottles of gold medal winning wines for the exhibitors tasting and / or awards presentation events. Exhibitors should assist wine shows in showcasing and promoting the best wines of the show. However, this should not be unreasonably burdensome or expensive for the exhibitor. It is therefore recommended that:

4.6.3.a Wine shows should clearly state in their regulations any expectation that an exhibitor should supply additional wine in the event of being awarded a gold or trophy award and the terms of compensation associated with compulsory purchases.

4.6.3.b Wine shows should not require an exhibitor, as a condition of entry, to supply bottles of wine as a compulsory purchase in addition to the volumes recommended in 4.6.3.c, 4.6.3.d, or 4.6.3.e. Further purchases may be made through direct negotiation with the exhibitor after judging.

4.6.3.c Wine shows may request additional bottles of a gold award exhibit at the exhibitors' expense for the exhibitor's tasting. However, it is recommended that wine shows request no more than six additional 750mL bottles for table wine and sparkling wine exhibits and no more than three additional 750mL bottles for fortified wine and brandy exhibits.

- 4.6.3.d Wine shows should purchase additional bottles of a gold award wine from an exhibitor at the lesser of 100% of wholesale price or \$240 per dozen bottles, exclusive of WET and GST as appropriate. Wine shows should request no more than three dozen additional bottles of a gold award exhibit from an exhibitor for promotional purposes by the show i.e. Awards dinners, public tastings, etc. Further purchases may be made through direct negotiation with the exhibitor post judging, refer to section 4.6.3.b.
- 4.6.3.e Wine shows may request additional bottles of a trophy award exhibit at the exhibitors' expense for the show's promotional purposes, for instance awards dinners, public tastings etc. However, it is recommended that wine shows request no more than two dozen additional 750mL bottles for table wine and sparkling wine exhibits and no more than one dozen additional 750mL bottles for fortified wine and brandy exhibits. Further purchases may be made through direct negotiation with the exhibitor after judging. Refer to section 4.6.3.b.

4.6.4 Enforcement of the Winemakers Federation of Australian *Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice (WFA CoP)*

- 4.6.4.a The WFA's Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice can be found at the following link;
<http://www.wfa.org.au/assets/technical-and-packaging/Display-Awards-Code.pdf>
- 4.6.4.b The WFA CoP applies to all Australian wine producers for wine produced in Australia and sold in Australia or in export markets.
- 4.6.4.c All wine shows should include in their regulations a code of responsibility for exhibitors so that compliance by a producer (including by subsidiaries or by associated companies) with the WFA CoP is a prerequisite for entry to Australian wine shows. Refer to section 4.2.1.i.
- 4.6.4.d If an apparent breach of the WFA CoP occurs it should be brought to the attention of the WFA (tony@wfa.org.au).
- 4.6.4.d.i WFA will ask the owner of the brand in question to show good cause why the breach has occurred.
- 4.6.4.d.ii If good cause is not presented then the breach of the WFA CoP will be communicated to the relevant wine show(s) by the WFA. WFA should contact the ASVO directly (asvo@asvo.com.au) to request a current list of Australian wine show contacts.
- 4.6.4.d.iii Penalties, as set out in 4.6.4.g, should then be applied by the relevant wine show.
- 4.6.4.e Minimum penalties, as set out in 4.6.4.g, can be applied only by wine show organisers.
- 4.6.4.f Minimum penalties, as set out in 4.6.4.g, should be uniform across all wine shows and should be included in the regulations for each wine show. For instance, if a brand owner is ineligible to enter a wine show for a specified period, this should apply to all shows.
- 4.6.4.g The following minimum penalties are recommended and should be included in each show's regulations and communicated to all exhibitors by appropriate wording on the application for entry:
 - 4.6.4.g.i A breach of the WFA CoP where the brand owner can show good cause should result in a warning but should not attract a penalty.
 - 4.6.4.g.ii A first breach of the WFA CoP (and without good cause being shown) should result in a warning, removal of any award conferred on the relevant wine and a decision that for the period of two years commencing from the date of the breach, the brand owner is ineligible to enter any exhibit at any wine show in Australia.

- 4.6.4.g.iii A second breach of the WFA CoP (and without good cause being shown) should result in a warning, removal of any award conferred on the relevant wine and a decision that for the period of five years commencing from the date of the breach, the brand owner is ineligible to enter any exhibit at any wine show in Australia.
- 4.6.4.h The wine show organisers should not publicise incidents where the exhibitor showed good cause. Refer to section 4.6.4.g.i.
- 4.6.4.i Once a show has applied penalties to an exhibitor, the show should notify all other shows and the WFA of all breaches of the conditions of entry and the penalties applied. Refer to sections 4.6.4.g.ii and 4.6.4.g.iii. These penalties should then be applied at all wine shows. Wine show organisers should contact the ASVO directly (asvo@asvo.com.au) to request a current list of Australian wine show contacts.

4.7 AUDITING

4.7.1 Introduction

All capital city and many regional wine shows should have formal audit procedures in their regulations to guarantee the integrity of exhibits and results.

Auditing is seen as very important by the wider industry.

The aim of auditing is to discourage any breach of regulations by an exhibitor, whether through carelessness or deceit, and assure other exhibitors, wine trade, press and consumers that high standards are being maintained.

Auditing by shows currently varies from minimal to thorough.

To minimise management and costs, some shows are conducting a number of so called 'desk' audits. These are audits where an exhibitor is contacted by phone or email by the show or the show's nominated auditor and asked to provide the LIP documentation for a particular entry to confirm that the wine complies with the class requirements including volume in warehouse at the time of entry.

Given that these 2015 BPRs suggest quite small volume requirements – refer to section 4.4.2 - the maximum being 250 x 9 litre equivalents, desk audits are less likely to reveal a breach than in the past. Thus emphasis should be on pre- and post- judging audits, both of which require sourcing samples to taste against the exhibits submitted.

Some shows that have the announcement of awards on the final day of judging, or a day or two later, have expressed concern that they can't carry out post show audits before the announcement of awards; also that it would be embarrassing to withdraw an award if auditing after the announcement reveals a breach.

The industry believes that the audit process must be rigorous and so, if auditing occurs after the announcement of awards, then any difficulties with potential withdrawal of awards has to be accepted.

The 2004 BPRs sought to bring uniformity to the auditing approach across all shows and whilst the recommendations were well received in principle, the recommended appointment and management of auditors through ASVO proved to be expensive and complex, and some shows thought it removed some of their independence.

This review reinforces the system that most shows have adopted, namely that auditors are appointed and remunerated by the shows themselves. It is proposed that the ASVO keeps a register of auditors to assist the shows in finding auditors local to regions that are remote from where the show is conducted.

The objectives of the 2004 review are still relevant and to them is added the fourth objective concerning affordability and simplicity.

4.7.2 Objectives

- To establish a common audit protocol which all national and regional wine shows may adopt.
- To make audits thorough and consistent across all national, regional, state and niche wine shows.
- To establish clear and specific penalties for breaches of regulations identified during audit.
- To encourage adoption by developing a system that has rigour and simplicity, and is affordable for wine show organisers.

4.7.3 Recommendations. General

4.7.3.a All wine shows should carry out an audit of exhibits every year and use an audit protocol that is consistent across all shows. This is to discourage any breach of regulations by an exhibitor, whether through carelessness or deceit, and to assure other exhibitors, wine trade, press and consumers that high standards are being maintained.

- 4.7.3.b The exhibits, classes and regions to be audited should be determined by the wine show organisers in conjunction with the chair of judges.
- 4.7.3.c All wine shows should undertake audits on a regular basis and audit no less than 1% of total entries.
- 4.7.3.d Given that volume requirements are small (max 250 x 9 litre equivalents) for all classes, an audit that checks label integrity and volume is less likely to identify a breach than in the past. Thus it is recommended that;
 - 4.7.3.d.i Pre-judging audits should involve tasting by the chair of judges and the panel chair of submitted exhibits against samples drawn by an auditor from the exhibitor's warehouse or purchased from a retailer.
 - 4.7.3.d.ii Post-judging audits should involve tasting by the chair of judges, or a suitable proxy, plus one other judge, of submitted exhibits against samples drawn by an auditor from the exhibitor's warehouse.
- 4.7.3.e Post-judging audits should target trophy winners and classes of major significance and, as far as it is practical, audit different classes each year.
- 4.7.3.f It is recognised that audit of international entries may be impractical for those niche shows that have international exhibits, apart from those from New Zealand.

4.7.4 Recommendations. Wine show regulations to enable the audit process

- 4.7.4.a Wine shows should clearly outline the audit process in their regulations and also the penalties applied where regulations are breached.
- 4.7.4.b All entries should include the address where the wine entered can be audited and the stock inspected.
- 4.7.4.c The regulations should require that all exhibitors agree to retain stock records at the time of entry that will demonstrate to an auditor, if required, that they meet the volume requirements of the classes which they have entered.
- 4.7.4.d If the entry submitted for judging is from a single blend then no blend number need be stated on the entry form. However, if there are two or more blends of a wine bottled under the same label, the blend number (sometimes referred to as batch number) of the entry submitted for judging must be included on the entry form. Refer to section 4.4.3.b.
- 4.7.4.e All exhibitors should be required to declare that their entries meet the entry criteria for exhibits as set out in the regulations. Refer to section 4.2.2.a and 4.4.8.
- 4.7.4.f All exhibitors should agree, as a condition of entry, to cooperate with and abide by the consequences of the wine show auditing process.
- 4.7.4.g The regulations should include provisions to the effect that by entering the wine show, the exhibitor agrees to the publication, as contemplated by these recommendations, of audit results, including details of any penalties imposed; and the exhibitor agrees to make no claim of any kind or description arising out of or in connection with that publication, and indemnifies the wine show organisers in respect of any claim by any third party in respect of loss or damage arising out of or in connection with that publication.
- 4.7.4.h The regulations should also include provisions enabling the wine show organisers, and the bodies with which they are associated, to recognise and act in conformity with any penalties imposed by any other wine show organiser and/or associated body, and for the exhibitor in question to have no claim of any kind or description against a "recognising" wine show organiser (including the bodies with which they are associated) in respect of any such recognition or action.
- 4.7.4.i The provisions of 4.7.4.g and 4.7.4.h are not to be read as legal advice. Wine show organisers should consult their own legal advisers to ensure that any regulations of the kind referred to in those paragraphs are properly and effectively drafted.

4.7.5 Recommendations. Auditors, Auditor remuneration, audit costs

- 4.7.5.a Wine shows should appoint external or internal auditors who meet the following criteria.
 - 4.7.5.a.i Knowledge of generic wine recording systems
 - 4.7.5.a.ii A basic understanding of oenology and viticulture but not necessarily tasting skills
 - 4.7.5.a.iii Knowledge of relevant Acts (refer to section 4.7.7.b).
 - 4.7.5.a.iv Good communication skills, both written and oral
 - 4.7.5.a.v Ability to maintain a co-operative, productive, positive attitude
 - 4.7.5.a.vi Ability to operate largely unsupervised and exercise a high level of discretion
 - 4.7.5.a.vii Ability to take a firm approach to auditing
 - 4.7.5.a.viii Accept and understand that they will be perceived to be ambassadors for the wine show in question, and thus accept that they must at all times be courteous and understanding.
- 4.7.5.b The ASVO will maintain a register of suitable auditors that meet the criteria listed in section 4.7.5.a, to which the wine shows can refer if required. Wine show organisers should contact the ASVO directly (asvo@asvo.com.au) to request the auditor register.
- 4.7.5.c Auditors should have no perceived conflict of interest. Refer to section 3.1.1.e.
 - 4.7.5.c.i An auditor should not have wine entered in the show being audited.
 - 4.7.5.c.ii If an auditor is a consultant, board member, shareholder of, or has some other particular connection or relationship with, an exhibiting winery, he / she should not audit that exhibitor.
- 4.7.5.d The Australian Grape and Wine Authority (AGWA), which trades as Wine Australia, has provided a protocol for auditing. Wine show organisers should contact the ASVO directly (asvo@asvo.com.au) to request a copy of this protocol.
- 4.7.5.e An appropriate fee should be paid to auditors that recognises the professional nature of their work. Fees should be negotiated with the auditors prior to the audit being undertaken. Some auditors, typically internal appointments, may be prepared to carry out audits for a small fee or act on a voluntary basis.
- 4.7.5.f It is acknowledged that travel costs may be greater when auditing or obtaining check samples from exhibitors in regions distant from the show. To reduce costs shows can consider appointing auditors local to those areas. The shows can use the ASVO register of auditors to source suitable candidates. Refer to section 4.7.5.b.
- 4.7.5.g Travel costs can be minimised at capital city, state and niche shows by auditing one or two regions (GIs) when selecting pre-judging check samples or later auditing of trophy and medal winners. This recommendation does not apply to regional shows.

4.7.6 Recommendations. Auditing

- 4.7.6.a Both pre-judging auditing using check samples and post judging auditing of trophy and medal winners are recommended.
- 4.7.6.b Pre-judging auditing
 - 4.7.6.b.i Check samples - wines that are sourced after the committee receives the entry forms but before judging - are sourced by an auditor or the wine show organisers.
 - 4.7.6.b.ii The wine show organisers choose the exhibits to be audited at random. However, to reduce costs in a given year it is recognised that a show may target just one or two regions. Refer to section 4.7.5.g.
 - 4.7.6.b.iii If a wine selected for pre-judging audit has more than one blend as indicated on the entry form, then the check sample for the wine should be drawn from the exhibitors' warehouse because if the check sample were to be purchased from retail, the wine may be a different blend from the wine entered. Refer to section 4.4.3.b and 4.7.4.d.

- 4.7.6.b.iv Sourcing check samples from exhibitor's winery or warehouse:
The auditor visits the winery or warehouse nominated by the exhibitor in the entry form and obtains, as specified in the regulations, three bottles (without charge) of the indicated stock that corresponds to the entry. The auditor also inspects computer records and physical stock levels to confirm entry requirements have been met. If the computer records and/or physical stocks are not on site, the auditor should require the exhibitor to provide such information, or access to other sites, as may be required to satisfy the auditor on the issue.
- 4.7.6.b.v Sourcing check samples from a retailer:
The auditor or delegate of the wine show organiser buys sample wines from a retailer or the exhibiting company's cellar door. This method can be used only when the wines are currently commercially available.
- 4.7.6.b.vi Assessment of check samples:
The audit check samples are tasted by the panel chair alongside the entered exhibit while the relevant class is being judged. If the panel chair finds a difference between the samples this is brought to the attention of the chair of judges. If the chair of judges confirms the difference, the chief steward and the wine show committee are notified, the wine is automatically deemed in breach of the regulations and the exhibit is removed from the class. The chair of judge's decision is final in this matter and after the exhibitor has been informed, no further correspondence should be entered into.
In the case of a breach, the procedures detailed in section 4.7.7 should be followed.
- 4.7.6.c Post-judging auditing
- 4.7.6.c.i A selection of exhibits with major awards such as golds and trophies should be audited. This selection preferably occurs before the announcement of the results. Refer to section 4.7.1.
- 4.7.6.c.ii The auditor visits the winery or warehouse nominated by the exhibitor in the entry form and obtains, as specified in the regulations, three bottles (without charge) of the indicated stock that corresponds to the entry. The auditor also inspects computer records and physical stock levels to confirm entry requirements have been met. If the computer records and/or physical stocks are not on site, the auditor should require the exhibitor to provide such information, or access to other sites, as may be required to satisfy the auditor on the issue.
- 4.7.6.c.iii The audit sample is tasted by the chair of judges or a suitable proxy plus one other judge, alongside a newly opened bottle of the entered exhibit. If the chair of judges (or proxy) plus one other judge finds there is a difference, the wine show committee are notified and the wine is automatically deemed in breach of the regulations. The chair of judge's decision is final in this matter and after the exhibitor has been informed, no further correspondence should be entered into.
In the case of a breach the procedures detailed in section 4.7.7 should be followed.

4.7.7 Recommendations. Consequences of Breach.

- 4.7.7.a If there is a deemed breach of the regulations as described above (refer to sections 4.7.6.b.vi and 4.7.6.c.iii) the exhibitor should be asked if they can explain the breach (within a defined time frame) and why disqualification and penalties should not apply. If they cannot give a sufficiently credible explanation then the show should;
- 4.7.7.a.i Disqualify the exhibit.
- 4.7.7.a.ii Impose any other appropriate penalties allowed within the regulations. Refer to section 4.7.8.c.
- 4.7.7.a.iii Notify all other shows and the WFA of all breaches of the conditions of entry and the penalties applied. Wine show organisers should contact the ASVO directly (asvo@asvo.com.au) to request a current list of Australian wine show contacts.

- 4.7.7.b If an auditor discovers a breach of the regulations (refer to section 4.7.4.e) by an exhibitor and notes that this breach may also contravene one or more of the following Acts and Regulations the Australian Grape and Wine Authority Act 2013, Food Standards Australia New Zealand Act 1991, Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code - Standard 4.5.1 - Wine Production Requirements or other applicable Acts of the States and the Commonwealth of Australia, the wine show organisers must refer the matter to the AGWA for further investigation.

4.7.8 Recommendations. Penalties

- 4.7.8.a Penalties, as set out in 4.7.8.c, can be applied only by wine show organisers.
- 4.7.8.b Minimum penalties, as set out in 4.7.8.c, should be uniform across all wine shows and should be included in the regulations for each wine show. For instance, if an exhibitor is ineligible to enter a wine show for a specified period, this should apply to all wine shows. This requires appropriate provisions in the regulations: refer to sections 4.7.4.g and 4.7.4.h.
- 4.7.8.c The following minimum penalties are recommended and should be included in each show's regulations and communicated to all exhibitors by appropriate wording on the application for entry:
- 4.7.8.c.i A breach of the regulations where the exhibitor gives a sufficiently credible explanation for its occurrence should result in a warning and removal of any award conferred on the relevant exhibit.
- 4.7.8.c.ii A first breach of the regulations (and without a sufficiently credible explanation for its occurrence) should result in a warning, removal of any award conferred on the relevant exhibit and a decision that for the period of two years commencing from the date of the breach, the exhibitor is ineligible to enter any exhibit at any wine show in Australia.
- 4.7.8.c.iii A second breach of the regulations (and without a sufficiently credible explanation for its occurrence) should result in a warning, removal of any award conferred on the relevant exhibit and a decision that for the period of five years commencing from the date of the breach, the exhibitor is ineligible to enter any exhibit at any wine show in Australia.

4.7.9 Recommendations. Communication of Audit results

- 4.7.9.a A summary of the extent of audit and audit results should be included in the catalogue of results. These should describe:
- 4.7.9.a.i The number of entries audited
- 4.7.9.a.ii The regions audited and the number of exhibitors
- 4.7.9.a.iii The broad results (without mentioning actual exhibitors) - for example, "Twenty entries were audited, 18 entries found true to regulations, 2 entries were found to be in breach of the regulations. Further information can be obtained by contacting the wine show organisers".
- 4.7.9.a.iv If auditing cannot be completed before the announcement of awards - refer to the discussion in section 4.7.1- then the audit results for the show of the previous year should be announced.
- 4.7.9.b The wine show organisers should not publicise incidents where the exhibitor showed good cause. Refer to section 4.7.8.c.i.
- 4.7.9.c Once a show has applied penalties to an exhibitor, the show should notify all other shows and the WFA of all breaches of the conditions of entry and the penalties applied. Refer to sections 4.7.8.c.ii and 4.7.8.c.iii. These penalties should then be applied at all wine shows. Wine show organisers should contact the ASVO directly (asvo@asvo.com.au) to request a current list of Australian wine show contacts.
- 4.7.9.d Wine show organisers should communicate to the AGWA any breaches that also contravene the Acts related to wine production. Refer to section 4.7.7.b.

5 GLOSSARY

Term	Definition
Award:	Judges recognise that a wine has achieved a specific level of quality by bestowing an award of gold, silver, or bronze medal.
Blend:	A blend is defined as a batch of wine made by blending component wines of variously different batches of the same variety, different varieties, different geographical indications, or different vintages. A wine submitted for judging should be identifiable as a unique blend, defined by having identical source materials blended in identical proportions and with sensory and chemical characteristics within reasonable tolerances.
Brandy:	<p>Brandy means the spirit obtained by the distillation of wine in such a manner as to ensure that the spirit possesses the taste aroma and other characteristics generally attributed to brandy, in accordance with the requirements set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must be matured in wooden containers for no less than 2 years. • Must contain no less than 250 mL/L of the spirit distilled at a strength of no more than 830 mL/L at 20 °C of ethanol. • May contain water, caramel, sugars, grape juice, grape juice concentrates and wine. • Must not contain methanol in a proportion exceeding 3 g/L of the ethanol content thereof at 20 °C.
Fortified Wine:	Fortified wine means the product consisting of wine to which has been added Australian grape spirit, brandy or both and the term may be further qualified by the addition of the name of a grape variety including <i>inter alia</i> Muscat, Muscadelle, Pedro, Frontignac, Verdelho, Shiraz, etc. Fortified wine must, after the addition of grape spirit, brandy or both, contain no less than 150 mL/L and no more than 220 mL/L of ethanol at 20 °C. It may, however, attain a higher level of ethanol by natural increases created by maturation in wooden vessels.
Fortified Wine Style - Apera:	<p>Apera describes a style of fortified wine which ranges from a dry to a very sweet style. The wine is usually produced using a solera system and ageing takes place in a variety of vessels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pale Dry (\leq 15 g/l Residual Sugar) • Medium Dry (\leq 1.5 Baumé) • Medium Sweet (1.5 to 4.0 Baumé) • Sweet ($>$ 4.0 Baumé) • Cream ($>$ 5.0 Baumé)
Fortified Wine Style - Cream:	Cream describes an Apera style of Australian fortified sweet wine of not less than 5 Baumé. The wine will be pale yellow to light amber in colour, rich and sweet to taste and typically with a vinous to fruity aroma. The wine can be blended from more than one vintage and typically does not exhibit age-derived characters. Ageing takes place in wooden vessels not greater than 9,000 L.
Fortified Wine Style - Muscat (Australian, Classic, Grand and Rare):	<p>Muscat may be a fortified wine. Muscat juice is fermented until it reaches the desired Baumé level, when grape spirit is added. The wines may be matured in oak vessels of various sizes. Wines may be blended using either a modified solera system where the wine is drawn down through a series of barrels into which selected parcels of new vintage Muscat or a range of matured wines are added from time to time or by selecting individual parcels of quality Muscat. The finished wine must have a sweetness greater than or equal to 9 °Baumé. Ageing takes place in wooden vessels not greater than 9,000 L.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australian (Any age) • Classic (Has an average age of $>$ 5 years) • Grand (Has an average age of $>$ 10 years) • Rare (Has an average age of $>$ 15 years)

Fortified Wine Style - Ruby:	Ruby describes a style of Australian fortified red wine that receives only a few years of ageing prior to bottling. At bottling the wine retains a deep ruby colour and tends to be robust in character, full bodied and fruity. The wine can be blended from more than one vintage, with a view to sustaining the primary characteristics of colour and aroma.
Fortified Wine Style - Tawny (Australian, Classic, Grand and Rare):	Tawny describes a style of Australian fortified wine that receives varying years of ageing prior to bottling. At bottling the wine has a red-gold or "tawny" hue. The wines should reflect the characteristics of careful aging showing complex, developed rather than fresh fruit characters. However, many show the fresh well developed fruit characteristics of younger wine. The wine is usually blended from more than one vintage, may be matured in oak containers and reaches an optimal age before sale. Ageing takes place in wooden vessels not greater than 9,000 L. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australian (Any age) • Classic (Has an average age of >5 years) • Grand (Has an average age of >10 years) • Rare (Has an average age of >15 years)
Fortified Wine Style - Topaque (Australian, Classic, Grand and Rare):	Topaque is an Australian term that may be used to describe a fortified wine produced from Muscadelle. This is a high quality wine from a single vintage or a blend of vintages and is unique to Australia. Fortification must be from Australian grape spirit. The wines are usually aged in oak containers for different lengths of time according to the classification system below. The wines are quite sweet and are generally served as a dessert style wine. These wines must be made from 85% Muscadelle grapes, may be presented with an Australian Geographic indication. The finished wine must have a sweetness greater than or equal to 9 °Baumé. Ageing takes place in wooden vessels not greater than 9,000 L. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australian (Any age) • Classic (Has an average age of >5 years) • Grand (Has an average age of >10 years) • Rare (Has an average age of >15 years)
Fortified Wine Style - Vintage:	Vintage describes a style of Australian fortified wine that is produced from a single vintage year. These high quality wines are characterised by relatively long periods of bottle maturation. They are generally deep in colour and full bodied. They are entitled to bear the designation 'vintage' and the corresponding year. These wines are characterised by the ability to improve with age in bottle and benefit from prolonged cellaring. Such wines are aged for a minimum of twenty months prior to release but can be exhibited for judging earlier than this.
Geographical Indication (GI):	Geographical Indication means a defined geographic region or locality in which the grapes were grown and harvested. Only GIs listed under the Australian Grape and Wine Authority (AGWA) Register of Protected GIs and Other Terms are permitted to be entered for judging.
Label:	Label means any brand, mark, pictorial or other descriptive matter written, printed, stencilled, marked, embossed or impressed on, or firmly affixed to, the primary container of wine. Labels must adhere to the Australian Grape and Wine Authority Act 2013 and Regulations, the Food Standards Code, the National Measurement Act and the Competition and Consumer Act 2010.
Manufacturer:	The Manufacturer of wine goods means a person who operates an establishment at which: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Wine is manufactured; or b) Grape extract is manufactured, being grape extract that is used or intended to be used in manufacturing wine; or c) Wine goods are otherwise processed, modified or packaged.
Moscato:	Moscato is a Semi-sparkling wine produced from at least 85% of Muscat varieties.

Organic Wine:	The wine must be certified by a registered authority in Australia against Australian Standards 6000-2009 – Organic and biodynamic products. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organic wine is wine made from grapes grown in accordance with principles of organic farming, which typically excludes the use of artificial chemical fertilizers, pesticides, fungicides and herbicides.
Biodynamic Wine:	The wine must be certified by a registered authority in Australia against Australian Standards 6000-2009 – Organic and biodynamic products. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodynamic wine is made from grapes grown and using winemaking practices in accord with the International Demeter Biodynamic protocols.
Regulations:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collectively refers to wine show regulations, general regulations, entry regulations and all other applicable regulations employed in controlling, directing, or managing a wine show.
Single Vineyard Wine: NB: Currently there is no definition of a Single Vineyard wine in the Australian Grape and Wine Authority Act 2013.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wine may be a blend of multiple varieties from the one vineyard. The wine has to be made from a minimum of 95% of grapes from the nominated vineyard. The vineyard does not need to have a limit to its size. The vineyard should have a single, continuous boundary and be easily identifiable.
Sparkling Wine:	Sparkling wine ≥ 5.0 g/L CO ₂ or ≥ 2.5 bar pressure. These wines can be produced by carbonation, by the Charmat method or by the bottle fermented method to high pressure.
Semi-sparkling wine:	Sparkling wine with 2.0 - 5.0 g/L CO ₂ or 0.0 - 2.5 bar pressure. Semi-sparkling wines are mainly produced by retaining fermentation CO ₂ or by the Charmat method to low pressure.
Still Wine:	Wines with less than 2.0 g/L dissolved CO ₂ are classified as Still Wine as opposed to Sparkling Wine.
Sparkling Wine production method - Bottle Fermentation:	Sparkling wine that undergoes second fermentation in individual bottles. This includes both transfer and méthode traditionnelle as methods of removing yeast from the bottle.
Sparkling and Semi Sparkling wine production method – Charmat or tank fermentation:	Sparkling wine that undergoes second fermentation in pressure tanks. After completion of second fermentation the wine is bottled under pressure to retain the dissolved CO ₂ .
Carbonated Wine:	Wine where CO ₂ gas is injected into the wine using a carbonator. These wines are not supercharged with CO ₂ by fermentation so even though they cover a pressure range that overlaps Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wines they cannot be called Sparkling or Semi-sparkling wine. They are a category of their own.
Trophy:	Judges recognise that a wine is considered the best in a specifically defined category when judged against its peers by bestowing a specific prize referred to as a Trophy.
Variety:	Variety means the cultivar of the grapes from which the wine was obtained. Only varieties listed by the following organisations are permitted to be entered for judging : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> International Organisation of Vine and Wine (OIV). International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI)

<i>Vintage:</i>	Vintage means the year (within the ordinary meaning of the term) in which the grapes from which the wine was manufactured or obtained were harvested. In the case of fruit harvested in December the following calendar year is the effective vintage year.
<i>Wine:</i>	Wine is defined as the product of the complete or partial fermentation of fresh grapes, or a mixture of that product and products derived solely from grapes. Wine produced in Australia must adhere to the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code - Standard 4.5.1 - Wine Production Requirements.
<i>Wine of Provenance:</i>	A wine that reflects the region, the variety or varieties and the influence of the winemaker. The wine must demonstrate consistency across a minimum of three vintages spanning at least ten years.
<i>Wine show organisers:</i>	A group of people appointed to administer and coordinate the running of a wine show. This group is responsible for the style of the show, establishing a schedule and set of regulations, publicity, accepting and organising entries, financial management, establishing an appropriate judging facility, appointing the chair of judges, appointing the judges in consultation with the chair of judges, organising the judging, preparing the catalogue of results and organising the exhibitor tasting and other events to announce awards.

6 APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 4.3.2 SELECTION OF JUDGES, ASSOCIATE JUDGES, INTERNATIONAL AND SPECIALIST JUDGES.

Introduction

A judge is required to be able to accurately assess a wine's style, structure and character and to be able to accurately score the wine. Their appreciation of style has to be in the broadest context of international wines.

This requires formal tasting training in the basics and then considerable experience tasting wines from all regions of the world with expert peers. Further, they need to be experienced in judging in the show system to understand the consensus process.

Where do these judges come from? From diverse occupations, diverse backgrounds and diverse training

- Who?
Sommeliers, journalists, winemakers, viticulturists, wine marketers, restaurateurs, retailers, wine educators, and don't forget the expert amateurs of wine, etc.
- Formal Training.
Sommelier courses, oenology and viticulture courses, Master of Wine (MW) courses, Wine & Spirit Education Trust (WSET) courses, etc., and wine appreciation courses of many types.
- Further training and development:
 - Working for extended periods and tasting in different parts of the world
 - Attending regular tastings where there is wide range of international wines available (e.g. trade tastings, especially in places like NY, London, LA, HK, etc.)
 - Attending as many specialist tastings and courses as possible e.g. MW tastings in London and elsewhere, AWRI Advanced Wine Assessment course(s), Len Evans Tutorial – and many, many more globally.

It is not appropriate to make successful completion of these or other courses a requirement to be selected as a judge because of the diverse backgrounds of the judges and because some of the courses have limited availability to prospective attendees. Additionally, some are expensive to attend so without employer support may be beyond the means of individuals.

 - Using international wine trade fairs as a means to taste widely
 - Travelling to and tasting in wine regions (with good contacts)
 - Being active in tasting groups, especially those that are well financed
 - Employment in a company that believes in continuous training and has a budget for competitor and wider style wine tastings
 - Judging in international shows in the UK (Decanter awards, Wine and Spirit Competition, Wine Challenge, etc.) and various shows in the USA, South Africa, NZ, etc.
 - Simply tasting a good bottle with somebody who knows what they are talking about.

There is no best way to develop tasting skills. The background, training and ongoing development of judges is very diverse, so giving simple recipes based on attending particular courses, specialist tastings or training to assist show committees in selecting judges is not practical.

Mix of Judges

Ideally shows should have a complement of judges that reflects the makeup of the wider industry. The mix may include wine educators, winemakers, viticulturists, wine marketers, retailers, sommeliers, journalists and expert amateurs of wine. However, all judges, no matter from which background, must have a developed appreciation of Australian and international regional wine styles.

It is often said that there are style judges and technical judges, but this is an oversimplified view as all judges must have an appreciation of wine style. It is desirable to have a mix of judges as indicated above and that mix should include some judges who have a sound technical background.

Recommendation:

Refer to Section 4.3.2 Selection of Judges, Associate Judges, International and Specialist Judges

APPENDIX B. SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 4.3.5 PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF JUDGES

Recommendations:

Refer to Section 4.3.5.a.

The chair of judges should provide the show committee with a written assessment of each judge's performance after consultation with the panel chairs.

Refer to Section 4.3.5.a.i.

These assessments should be held confidentially. Comments on the performance of an individual judge can be provided to other shows or the judge in question if requested by another show or the judge in question.

Use of statistical analysis of scores to assess judge performance

The use of metrics based on statistical analysis of judges scores to assess judge performance is a possibility.

With the recording of judges' points and comments likely to be increasingly computerised (refer to section 4.2.1.f and 4.2.4.c) the opportunity will exist to readily carry out statistical analysis on each judge's score relative to the panel's final consensus score. Further, by introducing repeat samples into class judging, the *reliability* (also referred to as repeatability) of a judge's repeated assessment of the same wine can be determined.

There are pros and cons to adopting these statistical metrics.

What are the statistical metrics available?

Three different performance measures may be considered; *reliability*, *discrimination* and *reproducibility*, which are defined below.

Reliability

Reliability is the ability to provide the same score to the same wine. It is also referred to as repeatability.

This can be determined by introducing repeated pours randomly in the same class from a single bottle of wine. The simplest calculation of reliability, but not the only statistical approach, is to calculate the average of the absolute difference (AAD) between scores allocated to the same wine. For example if a judge rated the same wine 16.5 and then 16.0 (when using the 20 point system) then the absolute difference is 0.5 (there are no negative AD values). If this value is determined for at least twenty wines across multiple classes then an average of the absolute differences can be calculated. The closer the *reliability* score is to 0 the better, with a score of ≤ 1.5 (when using the 20 point system) being desirable.

It is suggested that if the shows have the management resource to set up and analyse *reliability* then it could be trialled for use to compliment the chair's assessment of each judge's performance after consultation with the panel chairs. Full adoption should be subject to further review.

Discrimination

Discrimination refers to the ability of a panel or judge to differentiate between the wines within a class.

This can be determined by the range of scores that the judge uses when scoring wines. For example, a judge may use a narrow range of points indicating that the wines are comparatively similar in quality or that the judge cannot discriminate between the wines within a class. The simplest calculation of *discrimination* is to calculate the range of the average scores for the repeated pours of at least twenty wines (conducted to assess a judges' *reliability*). It is essential that shows determine a *discrimination* score from repeated pours to ensure that only repeatable scores influence the *discrimination* result. The larger the *discrimination* score the better with a score of ≥ 3.0 (when using the 20 point system) being desirable, provided the repeated wines chosen vary in quality.

The use of *discrimination* scores is not recommended for assessing judges during show judging as the results may be indicative of the wines selected for the *reliability* calculation having a narrow quality range and not the performance of the judge. For example, if the wines selected for repeat pours are all of medium commercial quality then the range of the average scores will be closer to 0. *Discrimination* metrics are best determined in a controlled tasting laboratory as part of formalised training programs.

Reproducibility

Reproducibility indicates how an individual agrees, on average, with the panel as a whole, i.e. with the panel's final consensus score. It is also referred to as consensus.

The simplest calculation of *reproducibility* is to calculate the absolute difference of an individual's scores from the panel's final consensus score and then calculate the average of these absolute differences for the class or for all wines judged by that panel.

For example, if the consensus score for a wine is 16.0 (when using the 20 point system) and a judge scored it as a 14.5 then the absolute difference for that individual wine would be 1.5. At first sight it may be assumed that it is desirable to have a homogeneous panel, that is, the ideal average reproducibility score for each panellist would be zero (0). This assumption is debatable.

The knowledge that the show is assessing individual judges' *reproducibility* may lead judges to assign high points mainly to those wines that they perceive as conforming to the accepted styles of the day (*status quo* judging). The judges may do this because they believe this will lead to their *reproducibility* rating being close to zero.

This would be a disservice to the show's objective to foster style evolution.

Differing opinions on wine style amongst judges result in a desirable variability in scores, which in turn leads to encouragement of style evolution - an objective of all shows (see full discussion in sections 2.1 and 2.2).

For instance, a judge may have a view of style that is currently radical but turns out to be a major style direction of the future. A judge who in 1995 was advocating styles of Chardonnay that were more restrained and less oaked would have been out of line with the awards of the time (a reproducibility well above zero) but with hindsight would have been ahead of a trend.

Another example. If an international judge has a somewhat different interpretation of style in a particular class to that of the local judges (one of the reasons they are appointed) then the *reproducibility* of the whole panel and its individual members may be quite different from zero.

Thus it is not recommended that shows use *reproducibility* metrics as a method for assessing judges.

Confidentiality Issues

If shows collect judges' raw scores on a database it will be necessary to keep these data and any analysis of the data confidential. Dissemination of this information could impact on an individual's career and the show's reputation, and might lead to legal action.

It is suggested that shows trial statistical analysis of judge's scores as a method of assessing judges but before adoption as standard practice there should be further review by shows and the industry.

Recommendations:

Refer to Section 4.3.5.d

If shows wish to trial statistical analysis of judges' scores to assess individual judge and panel performance then *reliability* assessment, and not *reproducibility* or *discrimination*, should be trialled. Refer to Appendix B.

Refer to Section 4.3.5.e

If shows collect judging scores in a database, they should be cautious about how this data is used for assessing judges and to whom the data is released. There are issues of confidentiality. Any assessment of judge's performance using statistical measures should be held confidentially between the show committee, the chair of judges and the judge. Refer to Appendix B.

Refer to Section 4.3.5.f

Adoption of statistical metrics as standard practice as part of judge assessment should be subject to future review by the shows and the industry. Refer to Appendix B.

APPENDIX C. SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR RECOMMENDATION

4.4.1.D IN RELATION TO SPARKLING WINE AND CARBONATED WINE CLASS

STRUCTURE.

Introduction

Since the 2004 ASVO Wine Show review there have been changes in the sparkling wine category with the expansion of the largest segment, bottle fermented sparkling made from the traditional varieties - Chardonnay, Pinot Noir and Pinot Meunier. There are also more producers and more regions; the strong growth of sparklings made from Muscat varieties; the growing popularity of Prosecco (aka Glera); some increase in sparklings made from other varieties - Chenin Blanc, Pinot Gris, Sauvignon Blanc, etc. It is likely that domestic and imported Muscat based sparklings, particularly Moscato, and Prosecco will continue to grow.

Still Wine, Semi-sparkling Wine, Sparkling Wine and Carbonated Wine

Wines with less than 2.0 g/L dissolved CO₂ are classified as Still Wine. At 2.0 g/L the effect of CO₂ on the palate is just lightly spritzig (fizzy) on the tongue, like a carbonated soft drink. Sparkling wines are defined in the Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code - Standard 4.5.1 - Wine Production Requirements as "the product of wine that by complete or partial fermentation of contained sugars has become supercharged with carbon dioxide". This refers to wines that undergo a second fermentation but also includes spritzig wines that have been made sparkling because of the retention of first fermentation carbon dioxide.

Sparkling wines (aka mousseux and spumante) in the Australian classification are defined as those that have a pressure above 2.5 bar or dissolved CO₂ greater than 5.0 g/l. Wines with between 5.0 g/L dissolved CO₂ (2.5 bar pressure at 20 °C) and 2.0 g/L dissolved CO₂ are defined as Semi-sparkling (aka spritzig, frizzante, petillant). These wines are mainly produced by retaining fermentation CO₂, or by tank fermentation (Charmat) to low pressure. The increasingly popular, in 2015, Moscato wines are mainly low pressure Semi-sparkling wines.

To distinguish between these categories, we suggest the terms Semi-sparkling (2.0 - 5.0 g/L CO₂ i.e. 0.0 - 2.5 bar pressure) and Sparkling (≥ 5.0 g/L CO₂ i.e. ≥ 2.5 bar) as defined above be adopted by the Australian wine show system.

Carbonated wines are not supercharged with CO₂ by fermentation so even though they cover a pressure range that overlaps Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wines they cannot be called Sparkling or Semi-sparkling wine. They fall into a product category of their own.

Semi-sparkling wines fall between Still and Sparkling wine.

They can be categorised as a separate group of wines but as the number entered in shows in 2015 is still relatively small they can be **judged either with the still wines or with the Sparkling wines of the same varietal or blend description.**

In the discussion and proposed class structure below, Semi-sparkling and Sparkling wine are grouped together as they are supercharged with carbon dioxide, i.e. have bubbles and are at least spritzig on the tongue.

Carbonated wines are placed in a separate class of their own.

Objective criteria that can be used for class definition of Semi-sparkling, Sparkling and carbonated wines.

A. Grape varieties and blends.

The grape varieties used to make White and Rosé Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wines include the so called traditional or classic Champagne varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier), Prosecco (Glera), Chenin Blanc, Semillon, Pinot Gris, Sauvignon Blanc, Riesling, the many Muscat varieties etc. Furthermore, Sparkling red wines are made from a range of red varieties and their blends.

Thus currently, in 2015, given the growth of styles (Sparkling and Semi-sparkling) made from Muscat varieties, classes may be divided according to the following varietal and blend types;

- A.i. Sparkling wines made from the classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir and Pinot Meunier)
- A.ii. Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wines made from Muscat varieties, 85% minimum. This includes Moscato wines and Asti styles
- A.iii. Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wines made from blends of less than 85% Muscat varieties with non-Muscat varieties
- A.iv. Sparkling and Semi-sparkling from non-Muscat and non-classic varieties and blends, combined with blends of these with classic varieties
- A.v. Sparkling Red Wine made from any variety or blend
- A.vi. Carbonated wine made from any variety or blend

B. Winemaking methods.

The winemaking methods used to make Sparkling, Semi-sparkling and carbonated wines are;

- B.i. Bottle fermentation usually with aging on yeast (tirage age) followed by transfer to a pressure tank and rebottling (transfer method) or followed by riddling and disgorging (méthode traditionnelle)
- B.ii. Charmat (second fermentation in a pressure tank)
- B.iii. Semi Sparkling
- B.iv. CO₂ retention from primary fermentation.
- B.v. Charmat (second fermentation in a pressure tank)
- B.vi. Carbonation

C. Yeast age.

The bottle fermented classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, and Pinot Meunier) or their blends segment is the premier segment of Australian sparkling wine and currently (2015) forms a group of classes that are usually segmented according to yeast age. Segmentation according to yeast age recognises the different styles produced by shorter and longer yeast age.

- C.i. Less than 30 months
These styles rely less on yeast autolysis and more on primary fruit characters as well as secondary characters from base wine winemaking and blending
- C.ii. Greater than 30 months
These wines can be expected to show significant tertiary character, complexity and structure derived from yeast autolysis and subsequent changes in the wines

D. Vintage or Non-Vintage (NV)

The bottle fermented classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, and Pinot Meunier) or their blends can be segmented according to whether they are Vintage or Non-vintage varietals or blends.

- D.i. Vintage wines contain at least 85% of the vintage specified on the label

D.ii. Non-Vintage are blends across two or more vintages

These wines may derive complexity from the aged wines used in the blends and are usually, although not necessarily, aged for a shorter time on yeast than vintage wines

If a class is not segmented as Vintage and Non-Vintage, the judges should be told which wines are Vintage and Non-Vintage, the year of vintage and blend compositions.

E. Single varietal or blends.

The bottle fermented classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, and Pinot Meunier) can be segmented between those made from;

E.i. Chardonnay (Blanc de Blancs)

E.ii. Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier or a blend of the two (Blanc de Noirs)

E.iii. Blends of Chardonnay and one or both of the red varieties

If a class is not segmented in this way, judges should be told which are Blanc de Blancs, Blanc de Noirs or blends and given blend composition.

F. Colour.

The bottle fermented classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, and Pinot Meunier) or their blends, other Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wines and carbonated wines can be segmented according to colour. The colours distinguished are;

F.i. White (pale yellow, yellow/ green, deeper yellow and may show a little bronze or pink hue)

F.ii. Rosé (from very pale to deep pink/ bronze)

F.iii. Red (deep red colour akin to a red wine)

White and Rosé Sparkling wines made from the classic varieties are often separated into different classes although they can be judged together if there are few Rosé entries. If judged together, the judges should be told which wines have been entered as Rosés. Sometimes there are Whites with Rosé colour, which is a fault.

G. Sugar level (sweetness).

The current European community categorisation of sugar levels in Semi-sparkling and Sparkling is:

G.i. Brut Nature (no added sugar and 0.0 - 3.0 g/L)

G.ii. Extra Brut (0.0 - 6.0 g/L)

G.iii. Brut (0.0 - 12.0 g/L)

G.iv. Extra Dry (12.0 - 17.0 g/L)

G.v. Dry Sec (17.0 - 32.0 g/L)

G.vi. Demi Sec (32.0 - 50.0 g/L)

G.vii. Doux (>50.0 g/L)

Apart from the observation that the naming is confusing for consumers - i.e. extra dry wines are in fact slightly sweet - the categorisation is not particularly relevant for Australian wines given that sweetness perceptions differ with different acid structures.

Thus it is suggested that if classes are categorised according to sugar level then the categorisation should simply be between Brut styles that are perceived as dry on the palate and Sweeter styles that are at least perceptibly sweet.

- Brut, including zero dosage (0.0 - 18.0 g/L)
- Sweeter styles, including Demi Sec and Doux (>18.0 g/L)

Judges should be provided with the sugar levels for the Sweeter styles.

Current (2015) segmentation of classes.

1. For the varietal and blend classes A.i defined above as;
 - A.i. Sparkling wines made from the classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir and Pinot Meunier)

These are usually segmented according to production method (bottle fermented, Charmat and carbonated in separate classes); yeast age; colour (White or Rosé).
If there is a large number of entries or if a show wishes to feature certain styles, the bottle fermented wines may be further segmented according to Vintage or Non-vintage; single varietal or blends; sweetness.
2. For the varietal and blend classes A.ii, A.iii, and A.iv defined above as;
 - A.ii. Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wines made from Muscat varieties, 85% minimum. This includes Moscato wines and Asti styles
 - A.iii. Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wines made from blends of less than 85% Muscat varieties with non-Muscat varieties
 - A.iv. Sparkling and Semi-sparkling from non-Muscat and non-classic varieties and blends, combined with blends of these with classic varieties

These classes are not segmented according to winemaking method, yeast age (which often does not apply), vintage or non-vintage (usually does not apply), single variety or blend, colour nor sweetness.
Currently there are few entries in A.iv and even in A.iii so often these varietal groups can be amalgamated with the A.ii group. If grouped the judges should be given varietal or blend composition of each wine.
3. For the varietal and blend classes A.v as defined above as;
 - A.v. Sparkling Red Wine made from any variety or blendSparkling Reds in 2015 are a declining category. Thus all varieties and blends, all production methods and all sugar levels are grouped together. Judges should be told varieties or blend composition and vintage if appropriate.
4. For varietal and blend classes A.vi defined above as;
 - A.vi. Carbonated wine made from any variety or blendAll varieties and blends, all colours, all sugar levels are grouped together. Judges should be told varieties or blend composition.

Examples of possible class structures (2015) for Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wines for larger and smaller (< 180) total number of Sparkling, Semi-sparkling and Carbonated wine entries

With the many different grape varieties and blends and the different winemaking methods used to produce Semi-sparkling and Sparkling wines, as well as the style differences discussed above, a simple class structure is hard to define and this is evidenced by the diversity of class structures in current (2015) Australian wine show schedules.

The following example attempts to be as concise as possible for a larger and smaller number (< 180) of entries and use objective criteria discussed above for defining classes. In several classes, secondary criteria can be used to further divide the class, should there be many entries or if the show wishes to feature some aspect of variety, blend or style.

A CLASS STRUCTURE FOR A SHOW WITH A LARGE NUMBER OF ENTRIES.

1. White Sparkling wine

Classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier)

Bottle fermented - Transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle

Vintage and Non-Vintage

Less than 30 months tirage age

Drier styles, 18 g/l or less sugar

Notes:

- i. Bottle fermented and time on yeast are factors in determining style, not the method of removing yeast from the bottle, hence transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle.
- ii. Time on yeast in the bottle (tirage age) is regarded as an important determinant of style, hence the division of the class according to tirage age.
- iii. Vintage and non-vintage together. The styles of vintage and non-vintage wines overlap, so they can be judged together. However, if there are many entries the class can be split between vintage and non-vintage.
- iv. As the class includes Blanc de Blancs, Blanc de Noirs and blends, judges should be given blend composition and vintage.

2. White Sparkling wine

Classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier)

Bottle fermented - Transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle

Vintage and Non-Vintage

30 months or more tirage age

Drier styles, 18 g/l or less sugar

Notes:

- i. 30 months is chosen as significant autolysis has normally occurred by this time. Also see notes for 1 above.

3. Rosé Sparkling wine

Classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier)

Bottle fermented - Transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle

Vintage and Non-Vintage

Less than 30 months tirage age

Drier styles, 18 g/l or less sugar

Notes:

- i. Rosé's style is as dependent on yeast age as white sparkling, hence the same 30 month tirage age divide.
- ii. The same comments as 1 (i) to (iv) apply.
- iii. If entry numbers are small, Rosés can be judged with the whites.
If this occurs the Rosés should be grouped together to facilitate judging.

4. Rosé Sparkling wine

Classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier)

Bottle fermented - Transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle

Vintage and Non-Vintage

30 months or more tirage age

Drier styles, 18 g/l or less sugar

- 5. White and Rosé Sparkling wine.**
Classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier)
Charmat (tank fermented)
Vintage and Non-Vintage
Drier styles, 18 g/l or less sugar

Notes:

- i. This is not normally a large class, so Rosé and White can be grouped together.
- ii. If there are many entries the class can be split between Rosé and White.
- iii. As the class includes Blanc de Blancs, Blanc de Noirs and blends, judges should be given blend composition.

- 6. White and Rosé, Sparkling, Semi-sparkling wine**
Classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier)
Bottle fermented - Transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle
Charmat (tank fermented)
Vintage and Non-Vintage
Sweeter styles, more than 18 g/l sugar

Notes:

- i. Includes the Demi sec and Doux sweetness levels.
- ii. Because the entry numbers are usually small all winemaking methods are grouped together.
- iii. If entry numbers are very small these wines can be included with the appropriate drier (18 g/l or less) sugar class and the judges told the sweetness level.

- 7. White and Rosé, Sparkling, Semi-sparkling wine**
Muscat varieties, 85% minimum (includes Moscato and full pressure wines)
Blends of less than 85% Muscat varieties with non-Muscat varieties
Bottle fermented, Charmat, and Retained CO₂
Vintage and non-Vintage
Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. This class includes Moscato styles and higher pressure Muscat blends.
- ii. Unless the entry numbers are large the < 85% Muscat blends are included in this class.
- iii. As there are few that are bottle fermented all production methods are included.
- iv. Rosé and Whites can be judged together.

- 8. White and Rosé, Sparkling, Semi-sparkling wine**
Non Muscat and non-classic varieties and blends
Blends of Non Muscat and non-classic varieties with classic varieties
Bottle fermented, Charmat, and Retained CO₂
Vintage and non-Vintage
Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. Prosecco, Sparkling Chenin Blanc, Sparkling Sauvignon Blanc, etc.
- ii. This class excludes blends with Muscat.
- iii. Includes blends with the classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, and Pinot Meunier) but excludes pure classic variety blends.
- iv. Judges to be given variety or blend and vintage.
- v. If a particular varietal or blend attracts a large number of entries then it can be made a separate class.

9. Red Sparkling wine

Any variety or blend

**Bottle fermented - Transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle, Charmat, Carbonated
Vintage and non-Vintage**

Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. There are declining numbers of entries in this class, reflecting the declining market. Thus all varieties/ blends, vintage and non-vintage and all production methods are judged together.
- ii. Judges to be given variety or blend composition and vintage.
- iii. Some shows may wish to create a niche class of bottle fermented traditional variety (Shiraz) to reflect the history of the style.

10. White, Rosé and Red Carbonated wine

All varieties and blends

Carbonated

Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. Judges to be given blend compositions.

A CLASS STRUCTURE FOR A SHOW WITH A SMALL (< 180) TOTAL NUMBER OF ENTRIES

1. White and Rosé Sparkling wine

Classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier)

Bottle fermented - Transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle

Vintage and Non-Vintage

Less than 30 months tirage age

Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. Small entry hence White and Rosé together. Judges to be told which wines are entered as Rosé.
- ii. Bottle fermented and time on yeast are factors in determining style, not the method of removing yeast from the bottle, hence transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle together.
- iii. Time on yeast in the bottle (tirage age) is regarded as an important determinant of style, hence the division of the class according to tirage age.
- iv. Vintage and non-vintage together. The styles of vintage and non-vintage wines overlap, so they can be judged together
- v. As the class includes Blanc de Blancs, Blanc de Noirs and blends, judges should be given blend composition and vintage.
- vi. As this class could include Demi sec and Doux styles. Judges should be told the sugar levels of wines with > 18 g/l sugar.

2. White and Rosé Sparkling wine

Classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier)

Bottle fermented - Transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle

Vintage and Non-Vintage

30 months or more tirage age

Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. 30 months is chosen as significant autolysis has normally occurred by this time.
- ii. Also see notes for 1 above.

3. White and Rosé Sparkling wine
Classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, Pinot Meunier)
Charmat (tank fermented)
Vintage and Non-Vintage
Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. This is not normally a large class, so Rosé and White can be grouped together.
- ii. If there are many entries the class can be split between Rosé and White.
- iii. As the class includes Blanc de Blancs, Blanc de Noirs and blends, judges should be given blend composition.
- iv. As this class could include Demi sec and Doux styles, judges should be told the sugar levels of wines with >18 g/l sugar.

4. White and Rosé Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wine
Muscat varieties, 85% minimum (including Moscato and full pressure wines)
Blends of less than 85% Muscat varieties with non-Muscat varieties
Bottle fermented, Charmat, and Retained CO₂
Vintage and non-Vintage
Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. This class includes Moscato styles and higher pressure Muscat blends.
- ii. Unless the entry numbers are large the < 85% Muscat blends are included in this class.
- iii. As there are few that are bottle fermented all production methods are included.
- iv. Rosé and whites can be judged together.

5. White and Rosé Sparkling and Semi-sparkling wine
Non Muscat and non-classic varieties and blends
Blends of Non Muscat and non-classic varieties with classic varieties
Bottle fermented, Charmat, and Retained CO₂
Vintage and non-Vintage
Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. Prosecco, Sparkling Chenin Blanc, Sparkling Sauvignon Blanc, etc.
- ii. This class excludes blends with Muscat.
- iii. Includes blends with the classic varieties (Chardonnay, Pinot Noir, and Pinot Meunier) but excludes pure classic variety blends.
- iv. Judges to be given variety or blend and vintage.
- v. If a particular varietal or blend attracts a large number of entries then it can be made a separate class.

6. Red Sparkling wine
Any variety or blend
Bottle fermented - Transfer and Méthode Traditionnelle, Charmat, Carbonated
Vintage and non-Vintage
Any sweetness level

Notes:

- i. There are declining numbers of entries in this class, reflecting the declining market. Thus all varieties/ blends, vintage and non-vintage and all production methods are judged together.
- ii. Judges to be given variety or blend composition and vintage.

- iii. Some shows may wish to create a niche class of bottle fermented traditional variety (Shiraz) to reflect the history of the style.

7. White, Rosé and Red Carbonated wine

All varieties and blends

Carbonated

Any sweetness level

Notes:

- ii. Judges to be given blend compositions.

Recommendation:

Refer to Section 4.4.1.d.

Sparkling wine class structure is particularly complex due to the range of grape varieties used, different CO₂ pressures and production methods. This complexity requires that the class structure is segmented according to variety or blend, production method, yeast age, vintage or non-vintage; rosé, white or red. Depending on the number of entries for a particular grouping, some of these criteria can be combined resulting in fewer class divisions. For further explanation and class structure proposals for larger and smaller numbers of entries, refer to Appendix C.

APPENDIX D. SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 4.4.1.E IN RELATION TO FORTIFIED WINE CLASS STRUCTURE.

Introduction

The Agreement between Australia and the European Community on Trade in Wine, and Protocol (Wine Agreement) entered into force on 1 March 1994. Article 8 of the agreement required Australian producers to cease using certain geographic indications (GIs) in any market to describe or present wine. These GIs included "Port" and "Sherry". In addition, the European Union sought exclusive use of the terms ruby, tawny, vintage, cream, crusted / crusting and solera for fortified wines

In order to maintain use of these terms in the Australian market and to permit their use on the European market, the Australian industry was required to regulate the use of these terms through a Fortified Wine Code of Practice. This new naming and classification system for Australian Fortified wines is described below. It provides a framework for producers to benchmark their styles against the defined descriptors and use of classification terminology to describe their wines.

Objective criteria that can be used for class definition of Fortified wines

A. Aperitif Fortified Wine Styles.

To distinguish between different fortified wine styles the introduction of the Aperitif fortified Apera and its sub categories has been established.

A.i. Apera

Apera describes a style of fortified wine which ranges from a dry to very sweet and pale to very dark in colour. The wine is produced and matured using a variety of wood vessel types and systems such as solera systems.

Fortification must be from Australian grape spirit, brandy or both. Typically, the commercial Apera styles are described using sweetness. Other descriptors such as fine, intense or rich may be used to provide additional information for these classifications for the premium styles or to sub-divide existing classifications.

- Pale Dry (≤ 15 g/l Residual Sugar)
- Medium Dry (≤ 1.5 Baumé)
- Medium Sweet (1.5 to 4.0 Baumé)
- Sweet (> 4.0 Baumé)
- Cream (> 5.0 Baumé)

In addition the term Cream has additional requirements for maturation in the context of an export market.

A.ii. Cream

'Cream' describes an Apera style of Australian fortified sweet wine of not less than 5 Baumé. The wine will be pale yellow to light amber in colour, rich and sweet to taste and typically with a vinous to fruity aroma. The wine can be blended from more than one vintage and typically does not exhibit age-derived characters.

Ageing takes place in a variety of vessels. Fortification must be from Australian grape spirit, brandy or both. In addition, for the export market, the wine will be produced using the solera system, including being aged in oak barrels for at least 3 years.

B. Dessert Fortified Wine.

To distinguish between different fortified covered under Dessert Wine there have been several specific category definitions which in the case of wood aged categories also include a secondary classification that relates to age.

B.i. Ruby

Ruby describes a style of Australian fortified red wine that receives only a few years of ageing prior to bottling. At bottling the wine retains a deep ruby colour and tends to be robust in character, full bodied and fruity. The wine can be blended from more than one vintage, with a view to sustaining the primary characteristics of colour and aroma.

Ageing takes place in a variety of wooden vessels. Fortification must be from Australian grape spirit, brandy or both. In addition, for the export market, the ageing of the wine will include, as a minimum, ageing in oak barrels for 4 months.

B.ii. Vintage

Vintage describes a style of Australian fortified wine that is produced from a single vintage year. These wines are characterised by the ability to sustain relatively long periods of bottle maturation. They are generally deep in colour, full bodied and smooth. They are entitled to bear the designation 'vintage' and the corresponding year.

Such wines are aged for a minimum of twenty months prior to release.

Ageing takes place in a variety of vessels. Fortification must be from Australian grape spirit, brandy or both.

In addition, for the export market, the ageing of the wine will include, as a minimum, ageing in oak containers for 4 months.

B.iii. Tawny

Tawny describes a style of Australian fortified wine that receives varying years of ageing in wood prior to bottling. At bottling the wine has a red-gold or 'tawny' hue. The wines should reflect the characteristics of careful ageing showing complex, developed rather than fresh fruit characters. However, many show the fresh well developed fruit characteristics of younger wine.

The wine is usually blended from more than one vintage.

Ageing takes place in a variety of vessels but must be in wooden vessels not greater than 9,000 L. Fortification must be from Australian grape spirit, brandy or both.

B.iv. Muscat

Muscat fortified wine is produced using a minimum 85% of a Muscat variety and is fortified with Australian grape spirit when the desired Baumé level is achieved. These styles are sweet styles and with the exception of the Australian classification have a minimum finished Baumé of 9.0. Ageing takes place in a variety of vessels and utilises a variety of methods including solera systems. The age potential must be in wooden vessels not greater than 9,000 L.

B.v. Topaque

'Tokay' is a synonym for Muscadelle and for the purposes of this code is a term used to describe an Australian fortified wine. From June 2020, the word Tokay may not be used to describe or present an Australian wine. Topaque is an Australian term that may be used to describe a fortified wine produced from Muscadelle. This is a wine from a single vintage or a blend of vintages and is unique to Australia. The wines are sweet and are generally served as a dessert style wine.

Ageing takes place in a variety of vessels but age potential must be in wooden vessels not greater than 9,000 L. Fortification must be from Australian grape spirit, brandy or both.

To use the classification Topaque, the wine must:

- Be made from 85% Muscadelle grapes
- Be presented with an Australian Geographic indication
- Contain no less than 150 mL/L and no more than 220 mL/L of ethanol at 20 °C. It may, however, attain a higher level of ethanol by natural increases created by maturation in wooden vessels.

- For classifications older than Australian must have a minimum finished Baumé of 9.0.

B.vi. Flavoured Fortified Wines

Flavoured wine such as Vermouth and Marsala can be designated 'Australian Flavoured Fortified Wine'.

Marsala will require a name change and will no longer be able to be used in the description or presentation of Australian wine. "Marsala" with egg can be labelled as "all'uovo".

C. Dessert Fortified Wine Classification.

To assist consumers in distinguishing between young and older styles of wood aged fortified wine the introduction of a fortified wine sub-classification applies.

Dessert category sub-classification applies to Tawny, Topaque, and Muscat.

C.i. Australian

Base classification which can have any average age. A younger style showing fresh fruit characters, integration of spirit and some wood maturation, though not essential.

C.ii. Classic

Has a minimum average blended age of greater than 5 years. A maturing style showing some complexity of age and some fruit characters.

C.iii. Grand

Has a minimum blended average age of greater than 10 years. A mature style exhibiting aged fruit flavour, and rich cask aged character. The palate shows balanced lushness, rich mid-palate from cask ageing, and concentrated flavours from ageing.

C.iv. Rare

Has a minimum average blended age greater than 15 years. The epitome of the style showing all the flavours of prolonged cask ageing, with extreme cask aged character and great length.

Note: Age refers to the time in wood of a size less than 9,000 litres and does not include time held in non-wood containers.

Additional notes:

- 1) There appears to be an anomaly in the code of practice classification system between Tawny and Topaque and Muscat in that Tawny has a more definitive definition of age.
- 2) Given these classification descriptors apply to all wood aged Dessert styles consideration must be given to ensure Australian, Classic, Grand and Rare are uniformly applied to ensure consistent communication and gain consumer confidence around the system.
- 3) Wine shows should easily be able to adopt this simple system. It allows for the judging of like styles and classifications to be coordinated.
- 4) While no age parameters are set for the Vintage category it should be considered when judging that the class be split into two sections ≤ 5 years and > 5 years.

Recommendation:

Refer to Section 4.4.1.e.

Fortified wine classes should be structured according to the Australian classification system with appropriate fortified wine styles broken into the subgroups 'Australian', 'Classic', 'Grand' and 'Rare'. If the number of entries is small for a given fortified style then these subgroups can be presented together and the judges told which subgroup each wine falls into. For further explanation and a class structure proposal, please refer to Appendix D.

APPENDIX E. SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 4.5.5.D IN RELATION TO GI SPLITS IN CLASS JUDGING.

1. Grouping of wines by region for class judging.
2. Achieving greater focus / emphasis on regionality in judging.

Introduction

It is now recognised that a focus on the diversity of regional (GI) styles is an important platform in the re-imagining of Australian wines in world markets.

The world in 2015 still tends to view Australia as a not having the regional diversity of European wine producing countries but is effectively like one region with a single style offer for each varietal or blend.

To build a diverse fine wine reputation, Australia must change this image to one that recognises excellence and diversity within regional (GI) styles.

The possibility that all wine shows, not just the regional wine shows, could have a role in recognising and promoting the diversity of regional (GI) styles is worth considering.

Achieving regional focus in the judging process

Regional shows necessarily achieve a regional focus (it is noted that at least one regional show, McLaren Vale, is using sub regional splits).

In 2015, two capital city wine shows (Melbourne and Sydney) have grouped wines within a class by GI (individual region, zone, or state). Multi-regional blended wines are grouped in their zone or state.

The niche show, the James Halliday Chardonnay Challenge, judged in conjunction with the Yarra Valley wine show, uses regional (GI) splits.

At these shows, to help maintain impartiality, judges are given the regional breaks but *not the name of or any other information about each region*. Judging therefore remains blind. Regions with fewer than three entries are grouped together and judged as *others*. These others do not benefit from the possible advantages discussed below as they fall into a mixed regional grouping.

It is important for the panel chair and the chair of judges to emphasise that, just because there are relatively few entries from a region, it is nevertheless possible there may be high quality wines within the class.

A brief description of the current approach to judging with GI splits is as follows.

When entries from any individual region, zone, or state GI as specified on the entry form by the exhibitor total three or more (the actual number determined by the show), the class can be split into brackets according to the GI classifications. When wines from a GI are fewer than the specified number of entries, they can be grouped together as *others*. Multi regional blends will be entered into their appropriate zone or state classification. The breaks between brackets should be indicated to the judges but not the names of the GI associated with the brackets. Where appropriate, wines within a GI grouping should be arranged in vintage order and the vintages should be provided to the judges (refer to section 4.4.4.a). Wines should appear, as far as possible, in random order with respect to brand within each GI and vintage grouping. The order in which GI groupings are presented should vary from class to class.

A variant of this method aimed at reducing the shadow effect rather than achieving focus on regionality is used by Brisbane and The NSW Wine Awards. They group by region but do not give the regional breaks. The bigger wines then appear largely together so there is less chance of a 'shadow' effect.

Some perceived advantages and comments on judging of classes grouped by region with regional breaks declared but no regions named

- Regional splits, even though the regions are unknown, give judges the opportunity to judge like with like. When moving from one regional split to another, a judge is expecting a possible change in character and is therefore more open minded and alerted to character differences.
- By judging wines grouped by region, judges know they are working in a narrower character range. It is therefore easier for them to focus on subtle differences and distinguish the top wines from each regional split.
- Judges will more readily identify the top wines within each split, some of which may have been overlooked or been the subject of the shadow effect (contrast effect) if the class had been randomised across all regions.
- This method of judging may lead to more wines from a region being recognised for potentially high awards. More awards encourage style evolution in regions.
- Judges can subsequently look back on their tasting notes once awards are announced and gain greater insight into the style characteristics of wines from individual regions.

Some perceived disadvantages and comments on judging of classes grouped by region with regional breaks declared but no regions named

- Some companies, judges and shows have expressed concern that a move to regionally focussed judging at the capital city wine shows may lead to potential bias against specific regions and/or multi-regional wines.
- Regional splits, even though the regions are not revealed to the judges, may lead to potential bias as some judges will try to guess the regions, i.e. they will be distracted by 'where is it from?' rather than simply 'is it good?'
- Judges may potentially be biased against smaller splits as they may be assumed to be representing less relevant regions in spite of the chair's instructions that all splits must be judged as equals.
- Because regional wine shows are necessarily focussed on the wines of a single region that is sufficient attention to regionality in the show system.
- Judging classes with regional splits may be of no advantage if the terroir/varietal synergy of a region is real and strong as this will show in the results of multi-regional judging anyway.
- With the smaller groups of wines (30) now being judged in many shows, the shadow effect may no longer be a major issue.
- The *others* grouping that occurs when there are regional splits does not enjoy the focus claimed for individual regions and this is unfair on the wines that fall into *other*.

Summary

Judging using regional splits, with no regional names specified, is a relatively new approach in 2015, having been introduced in the last four years. Most but not all judges who have judged using this approach have spoken positively about it.

The TAG generally supported judging with GI splits. However there is currently (2015) concern in the wider industry that this method introduces potential bias into the judging. Thus, as this report seeks to express a majority industry point of view, the recommendation at this time is listed in Section 4.5.5.d.

Recommendation:

Refer to Section 4.5.5.d.

Class judging using GI splits. Also see Appendix E.

Some multi-regional shows, including two capital city shows, have chosen to group wines within a class by GI to assist in the recognition and promotion of regional style. Judges are provided with the separations between GIs, but not the GI identities. Industry feedback has been both in favour and against this, and the responses are discussed in Appendix E. In 2015, this approach requires further assessment. It is recommended that judging by GI should remain subject to ongoing review.

APPENDIX F. SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR RECOMMENDATIONS 4.5.6.B AND 4.6.2.D IN RELATION TO USE OF MEDALS / TROPHIES VERSUS POINTS

Introduction

These 2015 BPRs have recommended that:

“Exhibitors should be encouraged to use awards (trophy, gold, silver, and bronze) for promotional purposes, according to the WFA *Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice* (CoP), rather than points. The use of medals by the show system conveys the recognised structure, process, rigour, transparency and auditability that underpin the results and the medal hierarchy. Medals are a symbol of excellence and can be used by the winning exhibitors on packaging, point of sale and other marketing collateral.”

TAG discussion on this recommendation included:

In spite of some weaknesses, the current Australian wine show system does have a recognised structure, a process (a consensus, three judge panel system guided by a chair of judges), rigour, transparency and an audit trail all of which underpin the results and the medal hierarchy (trophies and gold, silver and bronze awards) it uses. The commercial use of these awards is then regulated by the WFA CoP, which is in turn enforced by the show societies.

These factors, the medal hierarchy and the WFA CoP, differentiate shows from the points frequently used by wine journalists, other commentators and the retail trade. Unfortunately, the sometimes dubious use of these points systems by retailers using in-house judges devalues the format.

The TAG felt that it makes sense that a wine show system trying to focus attention on the excellence and rigour of its judging approach, and hence the value of its awards to consumers and the industry, should use an awards format that is easily understood but is differentiated from that used in other parts of the wine industry. The use of medals and trophies does this.

Journalists and trade could, of course, also adopt the shows’ use of medals and trophies; they are not the intellectual property of shows. However, given the very widespread use of points globally it is unlikely they will adopt the medal awards system.

Some say that in 2015, consumers better understand points than medals so medal use by shows puts them at a disadvantage. Given that the hierarchy of medals is well understood globally and the industry clearly sees value in using medals on packaging and in publicity material, this is not a strong proposition. Arguably this is only an issue of ongoing consumer education.

Thus, medals and trophies give the show awards a relative uniqueness / exclusiveness that in turn can facilitate (it is easier to communicate a point of difference than a similarity) achievement of the communication recommendation 4.6.2.a “*to effectively communicate to trade and consumers in local and export markets about the excellence and rigor of the show system and the quality of wines that receive awards from these shows*”.

Role of points in the shows and use of points for publicity.

Panel judging necessitates the use of points to arrive at consensus. The final point score awarded to a wine as well as medal and trophy awards (if any) need to be 'published' in the Show Awards catalogue so that exhibitors can determine which exhibits gained very similar points (e.g. 16.5 v. 17.0; 18.0 v. 18.5 v. 19.0 or their equivalents in the 100 point scale) to their exhibits so they can do tasting comparisons. Comparisons between exhibitors wines to indicate style and quality direction is an important objective of the shows. Thus, given that the points from judging are known, it is not practical to restrict their subsequent use. That is, if an exhibitor wants to quote their point score in publicity, they can.

However, the 2015 TAG recommendation 4.5.6.b still applies. Shows should encourage exhibitors to "use awards (trophy, gold, silver, and bronze) for promotional purposes, according to the WFA *Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice* rather than points", as this gives them a relative uniqueness / exclusiveness which in turn can facilitate publicity as mentioned above.

Given the points discussed above the 2015 ASVO BPR TAG made the following recommendation:

Recommendation:

Refer to Section 4.5.6.b.

Wine show organisers can use either the 20 point scale or the 100 point scale for judging. However, exhibitors should be encouraged to use awards (trophy, gold, silver, and bronze) for promotional purposes, according to the WFA *Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice* rather than points. Refer to section 4.6.2.d and Appendix F for further discussion.

Refer to Section 4.6.2.d.

Exhibitors should be encouraged to use awards (trophy, gold, silver, and bronze) for promotional purposes, according to the WFA *Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice*, rather than points. The use of medals by the show system conveys the recognised structure, process, rigour, transparency and auditability that underpin the results and the medal hierarchy. Medals are a symbol of excellence and can be used by the winning exhibitors on packaging, point of sale and other marketing collateral. Refer to Appendix F for further discussion.

AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY
OF VITICULTURE AND
OENOLOGY

