

AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY
OF VITICULTURE AND
OENOLOGY



The ASVO Wine Show Best Practice Recommendations

2020

© Copyright Australian Society of Viticulture and Oenology Inc. 2020

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

ISBN 978-0-9875346-3-7

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

Cover image by Jordan Wilken of Wilken, donated by the Royal Agricultural Society of New South Wales.

AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY
OF VITICULTURE AND
OENOLOGY



**The 2020 ASVO Wine Show
Best Practice Recommendations**

3 August 2020

Edited by
Louisa Rose, Dr Anthony Robinson and Jane Faulkner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 PAST AND CURRENT ASVO REVIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON WINE SHOW BEST PRACTICE	1
1.1 Reviews of the Australian show system.....	1
1.2 2020 ASVO Wine Show Best Practice Recommendations (BPR).....	1
1.2.1 Objective of 2020 review and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).....	1
1.3 Future ASVO Reviews of Wine Show BPR.....	1
2 PREAMBLE TO 2020 BPR.....	2
2.1 Variability in judging outcomes	2
2.2 Maintaining differences between wine shows	2
2.2.1 Accreditation of Shows	2
2.2.2 Changes from the 2015 recommendations	2
2.2.3 Recommendations from the 2020 Review	2
3 IMPARTIALITY	3
3.1 Recommendations	3
3.1.1 Conflict of Interest.....	3
3.1.2 Professional Conduct	3
3.1.3 Social Media and Privacy Policy.....	4
3.1.4 Managing Judging Prejudice	4
3.1.5 Exhibit Randomisation	4
3.1.6 Ethical Standards for Stewards	4
4 GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING A WINE SHOW	5
4.1 Introduction	5
4.2 Recommendations. Roles and responsibilities	5
4.2.1 Role and Responsibilities of Wine Show Organisers and Societies	5
4.2.2 Role and Responsibilities of an Exhibitor	6
4.2.3 Role and Responsibilities of Chair of Judges.....	6
4.2.4 Role and Responsibilities of a Panel Chair	6
4.2.5 Role and Responsibilities of a Judge including the Panel Chair and Associates	7
4.2.6 Role and Responsibilities of a Steward.....	7
4.3 Recommendations. Judge numbers, appointment, term and assessment	7
4.3.1 Number of Judges to be appointed and timing of appointment.....	7
4.3.2 Selection of Judges and Associates, International and Specialist judges.....	7
4.3.3 Register of Judges.....	7
4.3.4 Term of Appointment for Judges	8
4.3.5 Rotation between Panels.....	8
4.3.6 Performance Assessment of Judges.....	8
4.4 Recommendations. Development of show schedules.....	9
4.4.1 Show Class Structure	9
4.4.2 Entry Volumes	9
4.4.3 Blends	11
4.4.4 Mixed Varietal and Blended Classes.....	11
4.4.5 Museum/Aged Wines	11
4.4.6 Unfinished Wines.....	11
4.4.7 International Entries.....	12
4.4.8 Entry Criteria for Exhibits.....	12
4.5 Recommendations. Wine judging process.....	12
4.5.1 Judging environment	12
4.5.2 Hygiene requirements	12
4.5.3 Wine Temperature.....	14
4.5.4 Wine Glasses and pouring	14
4.5.5 Presentation and Randomisation of Exhibits.....	14
4.5.6 Classes Sizes, Split Class Judging and GI Split within Class	14
4.5.7 Class Judging	15
4.5.8 Trophy Judging	16
4.6 Recommendations. Communication and promotion	17
4.6.1 Communication of Results.....	17
4.6.2 Promotion of the Show System and Use of Show Awards	17

4.6.3	Enforcement of the Australian Grape and Wine's Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice (AGW CoP).....	18
4.6.4	Sourcing of Wines for Promotional Purposes.....	19
4.7	Auditing	19
4.7.1	Introduction	19
4.7.2	Objectives	20
4.7.3	Recommendations. General.....	20
4.7.4	Recommendations. Wine Show Regulations to Enable the Audit Process	20
4.7.5	Recommendations. Auditors, Auditor Remuneration and Audit Costs.....	21
4.7.6	Recommendations. Auditing.....	21
4.7.7	Recommendations. Consequences of Breach.	22
4.7.8	Recommendations. Penalties.....	22
4.7.9	Recommendations. Communication of Audit results.....	23
5	GLOSSARY.....	24
6	APPENDICES.....	28
	Appendix A. The 2020 ASVO Wine Show Best Practice recommendations Technical Advisory Committee and review process.....	28
	Appendix B. Supporting information for recommendations 4.3.2 Selection of Judges and Associates, International and Specialist judges.....	29
	Appendix C. Supporting information for recommendation 4.5.6.d in relation to GI Splits in Class Judging.	30
	Appendix D. Code of Conduct for Wine Show Judges.....	32
	Appendix E. Code of Conduct for Wine Show Stewards	33
	Appendix F. Judge Assessment.....	34

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

1.1 REVIEWS OF THE AUSTRALIAN SHOW SYSTEM

Discussion about best practice for conducting wine shows has been part of the industry agenda for many years. However, there was no one authoritative set of guidelines for organisers to use incorporating an overall wine industry view until now. This working document encompasses best practice for managing a show while reflecting the rapid changes within the industry, wine styles, fashions, judging criteria and more besides.

Since 1986, the Australian Society of Viticulture and Oenology (ASVO) has played a key role in this evolution, helping to define best practice in all aspects of the show system. Notable time points include:

- The 2001 ASVO seminar Who's Running this Show? – Future Directions for the Australian Wine Show System
- The 2004 ASVO Wine Show Recommendations
- The 2012 ASVO meeting held in conjunction with the 10th anniversary of the Len Evans Tutorial to discuss Wine Shows in the 21st Century and the formation of the Capital City Wine Shows Committee
- The 2015 ASVO Wine Show Best Practice Recommendations.

1.2 2020 ASVO WINE SHOW BEST PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS (BPR)

1.2.1 Objective of 2020 review and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Recognising how quickly the show system morphs and attitudes change, a TAC comprising 17 experts convened and conducted this review between August 2019 and June 2020. They were chosen to represent a spectrum of opinions coming from large and small companies, geographic origins, trade and media. Most have experience with shows from holding chairing or judging positions or key positions on wine show committees. Some had links to the 2004 and 2015 ASVO committees. The participants are listed in Appendix A.

It is difficult to collate a working document that perfectly fits every type of wine show or competition, but this aims to bridge the gap. It is a set of recommendations for best practice. Some aspects might be relevant to particular shows, others not. There will be consensus on some recommendations and disagreement on others. Common sense should prevail.

We want these recommendations to be used as a framework for the successful running and judging of Australian shows yet allowing flexibility for each show to express its own personality. The common goal is to achieve quality results through best practice while offering a level of confidence to all stakeholders from the exhibitor to the drinker.

1.3 FUTURE ASVO REVIEWS OF WINE SHOW BPR

Given the evolution of judging and proliferation of shows in recent years, the 2020 TAC agreed future reviews should occur every five years.

2 PREAMBLE TO 2020 BPR

2.1 VARIABILITY IN JUDGING OUTCOMES

Judging is a variable process. When judges assess the same wines or the same set of wines on different occasions or in another judging environment, results will change, although there should be reasonable consistency. Judges have their own sensory thresholds, experiences and views on wine style, it adds to a variability of results. This is not a weakness of the show system but its strength and should be encouraged.

Recognising the legitimacy of different style interpretations and preferences leads to closer examination by exhibitors and consumers of the types of wines receiving top awards. This, in turn, encourages evolution of style, an important objective of wine shows.

2.2 MAINTAINING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WINE SHOWS

While best practice can assist in organising and conducting a show, each competition should express its unique character. This is often achieved through the chair of judges, the mix of judges, the chair of judges guidance on style and judging, even the entries have an influence.

Shows attract a different entry mix due to the timing of the competition, different class structures or the special focus achieved through their award structure such as the Jimmy Watson Memorial trophy at the Royal Melbourne Wine Awards or the Stodart trophy at the Royal Queensland Wine Show. Regional and niche shows have their own focus and all these differences should be celebrated.

2.2.1 Accreditation of Shows

While there is some support for an accreditation system, it is not an agreed industry position.

2.2.2 Changes from the 2015 recommendations

While many of the protocols listed in the 2015 BPR's are still relevant, some changes are worth considering notably:

- 2.2.2.a Individuals to limit the number of shows they appear as a panel chair or judge at in any given year. Refer section 4.3.4.d.
- 2.2.2.b Minimum entry volume for table wine classes decreased to 100 dozen. Refer section 4.4.2.f.
- 2.2.2.c Judging by GI. Refer section 4.5.6.d and Appendix C.
- 2.2.2.d The 100 point scale should be adopted for all shows. Refer section 4.5.7.b.

2.2.3 Recommendations from the 2020 Review

- 2.2.3.a Diversity is paramount when selecting judges and designing panels. Each show should consider a diversity policy to help appoint judges.
- 2.2.3.b Hygiene requirements. It has become increasingly important to consider hygiene practices when conducting a wine show to minimise infection risk. This is considered in section 4.5.2.

3 IMPARTIALITY

The potential for exhibiting judges to bias scores if they suspect a wine is from their company or region is real. The perception this happens can affect a show's reputation and by extension, the show system.

There are others who might have a conflict of interest such as wine writers or marketing consultants who work on communications for companies or regions. Or judges who have a financial interest in a wine company or consultant winemakers and viticulturists who have exhibiting clients or a distributor whose agency brands are exhibited. Consciously or sub-consciously, the bias towards such companies or regions could be an issue.

Eliminating potential conflicts would be ideal but probably impossible as it would significantly limit the available pool of judges. Therefore, it is advised organisers reveal the least information to judges. The notion of impartiality must be made clear. The chair of judge's role in setting the panels and briefing judges is paramount in creating an impartial judging process. It is why the chair of judges must have no conflict of interest.

3.1 RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1.1 Conflict of Interest

- 3.1.1.a Recommendations for appointment of chair of judges:
 - 3.1.1.a.i A chair of judges should not have any conflict of interest.
 - 3.1.1.a.ii The chair of judges should not be an exhibitor.
 - 3.1.1.a.iii At regional or state shows the chair of judges should be from outside the region.
 - 3.1.1.a.iv The chair of judges should declare any potential conflict of interest to the wine show organisers.
- 3.1.1.b Judges should be selected on their judging expertise with the panels representing a wide range of industry interests. Refer to section 4.3.2 and Appendix B.
- 3.1.1.c Specialist judges should have no conflict of interest.
- 3.1.1.d Judges should declare any potential conflict of interest to the chair of judges and the wine show committee at the time of accepting an invitation to judge. Refer to section 4.2.5.a.
- 3.1.1.e Auditors should have no conflict of interest. Refer to section 4.7.5.c.
 - 3.1.1.e.i Auditors should not enter 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:
 - 3.1.2.a.i Officially remind judges of their role and obligation to remain objective. Refer to section 4.2.3.d and 4.5.7.a.
 - 3.1.2.a.ii Affirm 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 4.5.7.a.
 - 3.1.2.a.iii Reiterate to judges they should always conduct themselves in a professional manner and remain objective.
- 3.1.2.b The chair of judges and wine show organisers should ensure that no more than one judge or associate affiliated with a single company or organisation is on the same panel.
- 3.1.2.c Judges must assess wines impartially. There must 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 or chair of judges. When all judges' scores have been collated, discussion of wines can take place, discussion to achieve consensus is expected during any subsequent taste off. Refer to section 4.2.5.c and 4.5.7.d.

- 3.1.2.c.i An exception to the 'no discussion' recommendation is for specialist judges who are appointed to provide additional guidance on style. Refer to section 4.3.2.b and 4.5.7.d.i.
- 3.1.2.d Call back wines should be randomised. Refer to section 4.5.7.f.
- 3.1.2.e All judges, stewards, committee members, and others associated with the show must maintain confidentiality about exhibits, judging and outcomes at all times. Information about the show and judging should only be issued by the committee. Refer to section 3.1.6.a and 4.2.6.c

3.1.3 Social Media and Privacy Policy

- 3.1.3.a All shows should have a social media policy and inform judges, stewards, committee members and others associated with the show of the policy before judging starts.
- 3.1.3.b Any social media policy should specifically include a section restricting comments on known or potential results before awards are announced. Refer to section 3.1.2.e.
- 3.1.3.c Each show should have a privacy policy and terms and conditions regarding use of database information.

3.1.4 Managing Judging Prejudice

- 3.1.4.a Non-varietal specific classes such as other varieties and blends should be sorted into groups by variety and then vintage to ensure each wine is judged on its varietal character and merits, rather than suffering in mixed company. Refer to section 4.4.4.a.
- 3.1.4.b Wines to be judged must be poured and stored out of the judges' sight and all bottles removed from their vicinity. Refer to section 4.2.1.f and 4.5.5.c.
- 3.1.4.c Wines eligible for class call backs or for a trophy taste-off must be randomised. Judges should be told only variety or blend and vintage. Refer to section 4.5.8.d.

3.1.5 Exhibit Randomisation

- 3.1.5.a Exhibitor entries must be randomised to avoid sequential listings in any class.
 - 3.1.5.a.i If a class has been grouped by variety or blend (refer to section 3.1.4.a) the randomisation should occur within the group.
 - 3.1.5.a.ii Accurate recording and confidentiality are critical. Refer to section 4.5.5.b.

3.1.6 Ethical Standards for Stewards

- 3.1.6.a Responsibilities of a chief steward and stewards which includes all show organisers, support works and or volunteers.
 - 3.1.6.a.i Stewards are expected to maintain a high ethical and professional standard at all times. Refer to section 4.2.6.a.
 - 3.1.6.a.ii Stewards must declare any potential conflict of interest to the wine show organisers.
 - 3.1.6.a.iii Stewards should endeavour to keep their actions and reactions to an exhibit as neutral as possible to avoid influencing judges. Stewards must never discuss exhibits with judges until the results are released.
 - 3.1.6.a.iv Stewards must maintain confidentiality about exhibits, judging and outcomes at all times. Refer to section 3.1.2.e and 4.2.6.c.
- 3.1.6.b Only stewards should be aware of what wines correspond to exhibit numbers or judging numbers.

4 GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING A WINE SHOW

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section is the core of the 2020 BPR document. It sets out a comprehensive plan for conducting a show.

4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

4.2.1 Role and Responsibilities of Wine Show Organisers and Societies

Wine show societies or other groups organising a show are responsible for its approach, 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.

The following recommendations on roles and responsibilities relate to judges, judging, awards, communication, use of awards and auditing.

Show Societies or show organisers should;

- 4.2.1.a Develop and implement a general code of conduct for judges and stewards to agree to and sign. Refer to Appendix D and Appendix E.
- 4.2.1.b Recruit qualified wine show judges and train associate judges. The judging panel must be determined in consultation with the chair of judges. Refer to section 4.2.3.a.
- 4.2.1.c Have a policy to ensure the diversity of judges. Refer to section 4.3.2 and Appendix B.
- 4.2.1.d Fund all travel, accommodation and out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the 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 the expenses incurred by associates and key stewards should be strongly considered. Judges should be paid an honorarium.
- 4.2.1.e Ensure judges do not drive to and from the judging venue or to and from their accommodation. Transport must be provided or reimburse any cost of transport such as taxis.
- 4.2.1.f Ensure judge impartiality is not compromised through the preparation and presentation of exhibits for judging. Refer to section 3.1.4.b and 4.5.5.c.
- 4.2.1.g Provide a judging environment suited to showing exhibits in the best possible condition. Refer to section 4.5.1.
- 4.2.1.h Provide a safe and healthy environment for judges and stewards. Refer to section 4.5.2.
- 4.2.1.i Within budget resources, provide the best technology available to assist judges to record their tasting notes and scores. With appropriate software, the use of networked devices can provide each judge's screen with a tabulation and averaging of all judges' points as well as all their tasting notes. This speeds-up the determination of awards and, if required, allows judges to choose the most appropriate note on each wine for the exhibitor. Many shows are using these options successfully.
- 4.2.1.j Include brief judging comments on each class in the catalogue of results.
- 4.2.1.k Develop systems to provide written feedback to exhibitors on their entries. Refer to section 4.6.1.d.
- 4.2.1.l Adopt a suitable protocol for auditing exhibits. 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 Auditing.
- 4.2.1.m Include in the regulations a code of responsibility for exhibitors in relation to correct medal use according to the Australian Grape and Wine's (AGW's) Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice (CoP) and to exercise penalties for breach of the code of practice. Refer to section 4.6.3.b and 4.6.3.g.

4.2.2 Role and Responsibilities of an Exhibitor

- 4.2.2.a Exhibitors should enter wines in a show strictly according to the show regulations. Refer to section 4.4.8 and 4.7.4.e.
- 4.2.2.b Exhibitors must comply with the show audit regulations. Refer to section 4.7.4.f.
- 4.2.2.c Exhibitors 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 AGW's Wine Industry Display of Awards CoP. A wine show may refuse to accept entries from exhibitors demonstrated to have failed to comply with this code. Refer to section 4.6.3.b and 4.6.3.g.

4.2.3 Role and Responsibilities of Chair of Judges

- 4.2.3.a The chair of judges should work with organisers to develop the schedule and select a panel of judges with appropriate diversity that best meets the intentions of the show. Refer to section 4.2.1.b.
- 4.2.3.b The chair of judges should declare any conflict of interest to organisers. Refer to section 3.1.1.a.iv.
- 4.2.3.c The allocation of judges to panels and classes to panels should be the responsibility of the chair of judges in consultation with the organisers.
- 4.2.3.d The chair of judges should take every opportunity to ensure judges are aware of the importance of impartiality and work with the organisers to avoid any possible bias. Refer to section 3.1.2.a and 4.5.7.a.
- 4.2.3.e At the start of the show, the chair of judges should affirm 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.a.i and 4.5.7.a.
- 4.2.3.f In consultation with the panel chair, the chair of judges should confirm the top awards for each class and 'sign off' the results of each class for the master record.
- 4.2.3.g The chair of judges should adjudicate any disputes and issues arising in class and trophy judging.
- 4.2.3.h The chair of judges should attend the exhibitors' tasting and provide overview, feedback and comment to exhibitors on behalf of the judges. If a panel chair cannot attend, tasting notes should be provided to the chair of judges allowing discussion with individual exhibitors if required.
- 4.2.3.i The chair of judges should take every opportunity to encourage, train and educate judges and associates. The chair of judges should provide comment and feedback on performance to individual judges and the organisers. Refer to section 4.3.6.a.
- 4.2.3.i.i The chair of judges should let judges and associates know feedback on their performance will be given to the show society and to other shows on request. Refer to section 4.3.6.a.i.

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 start of a show, the panel chair should provide further guidance to the panel. Refer to section 3.1.2.a.i and 4.2.3.e.
- 4.2.4.b Once judging a class has finished, the panel chair should lead discussion, be responsible for collating points, organise recalls and involve the chair of judges in the discussion, as directed by the chair of judges. Once consensus has been reached on all wines including non-award wines, the panel chair should confirm the top awards with the chair of judges, record final points and allocate awards, which are then submitted to the chair of judges for 'sign off' as the master record. Refer to section 4.5.7.e. The panel chair should also write a brief class comment for inclusion in the results catalogue. Refer to section 4.6.1.
- 4.2.4.c If the panel is using a computer system, 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 A panel chair is a mentoring role: to encourage and train judges and associates, and provide constructive feedback to them and to the chair of judges on each of the judges and associates. Refer to section 4.3.6.b.

4.2.5 Role and Responsibilities of a Judge including the Panel Chair and Associates

- 4.2.5.a All judges should declare any conflict of interest to the chair of judges and the 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 about any wine during the tasting with the exception perhaps of associates asking for guidance from the panel chair or chair of judges. Any discussion should occur only when points have been collated. Discussion to achieve consensus is expected during any subsequent taste off. Refer to section 3.1.2.c and 4.5.7.d.
- 4.2.5.d All judges should endeavour to attend the exhibitors' tasting to provide feedback to exhibitors.
- 4.2.5.e Any judges not available to attend the exhibitors' tasting should make their comments available to the panel chair. Failing this, the panel chair should provide notes to the chair of judges.

4.2.6 Role and Responsibilities of a Steward

- 4.2.6.a Stewards are defined as organisers of the show, support workers and/or volunteers.
- 4.2.6.b Stewards are expected to maintain a high ethical and professional standard. Refer to section 3.1.6.
- 4.2.6.c Stewards must maintain confidentiality about exhibits, judging and outcomes. Refer to section 3.1.2.e.

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 have one chair of judges. However, if the number of panels continues to increase it may be appropriate to appoint a second chair of judges or an associate or 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.
- 4.3.1.c It is highly recommended to have at least two associates on every panel.
- 4.3.1.d So judges can organise their availability for judging, shows should extend invitations at least six months before the week of judging. Refer section 4.3.4.d.

4.3.2 Selection of Judges and Associates, International and Specialist judges

Ideally shows should have a complement of judges. The mix may include, but not limited to, educators, winemakers, viticulturists, marketers, retailers, sommeliers, writers and expert amateurs. However, no matter their background, judges must have a developed appreciation of Australian and international wine styles.

- 4.3.2.a Regional shows can consider local judges for associate positions.
- 4.3.2.b Specialist judges may be appointed for classes where the chair of judges believes their expertise is warranted. In such cases, they play a role in leading and educating the panel. Refer to sections 3.1.2.c.i and 4.5.7.d.i.

4.3.3 Register of Judges

After the 2004 review, the ASVO established a register of judges. The register lists judges and associates' experience in regional, niche, capital city and international shows.

Refer to the following link <https://www.asvo.com.au/wine-judges-directory>

As this database is open to the public, it is not appropriate to include individual wine show assessments of a judge's 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 ensure the register is current by contacting judges. This register is a database to which all shows can refer.
- 4.3.3.b The ASVO should remind show committees of the wine show judge register.

4.3.4 Term of Appointment for Judges

- 4.3.4.a Each show should have a policy on the rotation of judges. This rotation should be planned to have a similar number of judges and associates renewed each year. Shows should make this policy clear to the chair of judges and judges at the time of their appointment. Specifically:
 - 4.3.4.a.i The chair of judges be appointed on a year-to-year basis for up to a maximum of three years. It is suggested that no person should chair a particular show more than once, especially capital city wine shows.
 - 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 and actively consider diversity of the judging panel by referring to their diversity policy.
 - 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 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 three 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 three years.
 - 4.3.4.a.v Associate judges be appointed on a year-to-year basis for up to a maximum of three years. Associates should be assessed, refer to section 4.3.6.b, and if 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.
 - 4.3.4.a.vi International judges should be appointed for a maximum of three years with a minimum of three 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 in the case of specialised niche shows, 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.b.
- 4.3.4.d It is suggested that in any year, no individual should panel chair or judge more than two capital city shows and two regional shows. More so, it is advisable any individual only chair one capital city show in any one year. It is up to the individual to self-regulate.

4.3.5 Rotation between Panels

- 4.3.5.a To encourage the exchange of skills and ideas between judges and provide an assessment of their performance by the panel chairs, it is recommended judges rotate between different panels each day.
- 4.3.5.b Associates should stay on the same panel throughout the show. This facilitates assessment by the one panel chair, who can provide mentoring and feedback to associates on their overall judging performance and how their judging develops throughout the show. Yet, they are exposed to many judges, and their approach, as per section 4.3.5.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 the performance of each panel chair, judge and associate, after consultation with the panel chairs. This could be done on a common assessment form. Refer to Appendix F.
 - 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.
- 4.3.6.b Panel chairs should provide comment to the chair of judges on the performance of each judge and associate.
 - 4.3.6.b.i The panel chair should report to the chair of judges on judge and associate performance with consideration to alignment with the consensus score, spread of points and participation in discussion and overall judging ability. This could be done on a common assessment form, as referenced in 4.3.6.a.

- 4.3.6.b.ii The panel chair should offer feedback about the performance of each judge and associate.
- 4.3.6.c The chair of judges should pass on the assessment and recommendation of each judge and associate to the organisers.
- 4.3.6.c.i These assessments must be held confidentially. Comments on the performance of an individual judge or associate can be provided to other shows or, the judge or associate in question if requested.

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 objective class descriptions which are defined essentially by variety or blend and vintage such as 2020 Riesling.
- 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 schedules are not necessary for judges. It is up 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 the class structure to be 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 the criteria can be combined resulting in fewer class divisions.
- 4.4.1.e Fortified wine classes should be structured according to the Australian classification system with appropriate styles broken into the subgroups Australian, Classic, Grand and Rare. If the number of entries is small for a given style, then these subgroups can be presented together, and the judges told which subgroup each wine falls into.
- 4.4.1.f If a show includes a focus on, perhaps via specific trophies, for example, a single or individual vineyard, organic, biodynamic and natural wines, it is recommended these wines be judged with the other wines in their varietal or blend class and awards 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.h Should a show wish to differentiate wines by price point or volume – for example a trophy for Best Red Under \$20 - the wines should be judged within their respective varietal or blend classes. The award then 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. Unless there are specific requirements for commercial availability, they do not necessarily need to be labelled at the time of submission. The exception to this could be certain sparkling and fortified wines, refer to sections 4.4.2.g and 4.4.2.h.
- 4.4.2.b Current practice (2020), wines are entered by brand name not exhibitor name. Because a brand may have several entries in the class, it is recommended shows ensure:
 - 4.4.2.b.i Any one entry is not entered by more than one brand.

- 4.4.2.b.ii Any one entry is not 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 unless the show has specific reason to limit the overall number of entries.
- 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 smaller shows if they do not need as many bottles for trophy judging.
 - 4.4.2.c.ii Three 750 mL bottles, or equivalent volume, for fortified classes.
 - 4.4.2.c.iii Two 750 mL bottles, or equivalent volume, for brandy classes.
 - 4.4.2.c.iv With the increased focus on hygiene and the importance of not sharing glasses, the number of bottles must be sufficient to ensure enough wine for judging, call backs and trophies with all judges and associates having their own glasses. This may mean another bottle needs to be opened in some situations.
- 4.4.2.d As all exhibits must be commercially bottled at the time of entry, the minimum volume required for entry into a class should be quantified in dozens of 750 mL bottles.
- 4.4.2.e Classes should not be split by production volume, price point, or any other categorisation. All wines should be judged to a single standard.
- 4.4.2.f The recommended minimum entry volume for table wine classes are:
 - 4.4.2.f.i 100 dozen at time of entry for capital city wine shows.
 - 4.4.2.f.ii 100 dozen at time of entry for regional, state and niche wine shows.
- 4.4.2.g Sparkling wine. In order to ensure the freshness of wines in the marketplace, sparkling wine exhibitors may hold only small quantities of bottle-fermented sparkling wines as finished wine. The balance of the same blend can be held unfinished, *en tirage*. The recommended minimum entry volumes for sparkling wine classes are:
 - 4.4.2.g.i The equivalent bottled volumes as per table wines classes, refer to section 4.4.2.f, for carbonated and Charmat sparkling wine classes.
 - 4.4.2.g.ii 50 dozen at time of entry, with an additional 50 dozen equivalent of the same unfinished blend, for bottle-fermented sparkling wines at capital city wine shows.
 - 4.4.2.g.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.h Fortified wine. In order to ensure the freshness of wines in the marketplace fortified wine exhibitors 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. 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.h.i 100 dozen at time of entry for Ruby and Vintage Fortified wines 5 years and younger.
 - 4.4.2.h.ii 50 dozen at time of entry for Vintage Fortified wines 6 years and older.
 - 4.4.2.h.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.h.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.i 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.i.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.i.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.j Museum classes exist to provide an understanding of how wines develop and particularly to recognise exhibitors that produce wine of 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.j.i 50 dozen at time of entry for capital city wine shows.
 - 4.4.2.j.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 in the Glossary. 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 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 a 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 the same blend may be broken down and bottled across multiple bottling dates. Any 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 such other bottlings are of the same blend.

4.4.4 Mixed Varietal and Blended Classes

- 4.4.4.a Non-varietal specific classes such as blends or other varieties, should be sorted into groups by variety and then vintage. The variety or blend, or at least the major blend variety, and year should be given to the judges in hard or electronic copy before judging the class. This helps judges do justice to those varieties and styles that might otherwise be overlooked in mixed company. Refer to section 3.1.4.a.
- 4.4.4.a.i It is recognised there are differing views around this practice, particularly for exhibits that may be a rare variety or blend which could identify the producer. However, given all larger classes of wines are judged knowing the variety or blend, not knowing in the 'other' classes puts these wines at a disadvantage.
- 4.4.4.a.ii If judges are not given this information, the decision should be made by the chair of judges, not the panel chair, and be consistent for all the 'other' classes in the show.

4.4.5 Museum/Aged Wines

- 4.4.5.a It is recommended museum entries should be five years or older.
- 4.4.5.b Museum wines do not need to be commercially available. Refer to section 4.4.2.j
- 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 4.5.8.i.

4.4.6 Unfinished Wines

- 4.4.6.a Unfinished wines must not be entered into capital city wine shows.
- 4.4.6.b Unfinished wines may be entered into regional, state and niche 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 only given points, not medals. Medals are awarded only to finished wines. The industry does not support the use of highly commended, commended etc awards. If a show accepts unfinished wines, a clause should be added to the regulations stating 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 are not 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 shows. Such shows exist to improve and promote Australian regional styles.
- 4.4.7.b Niche or specialist shows that can attract significant international entries from a range of countries are supported. If a niche show with international entries is held at the same time as a capital, state or regional show, the judging of the niche competition should be separate from the main show, as far as possible.

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 requiring 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, such as 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 Awards can only be used on the brand and blend under which the wine was entered. It is recommended shows do not allow wine portability since awards are a reference point on wine quality for consumers, who will not understand why a wine 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. Refer to sections 4.6.3 on AGW CoP and refer to sections 4.4.2.b and 4.4.3 on use of awards with respect to brand.

4.5 RECOMMENDATIONS. WINE JUDGING PROCESS

4.5.1 Judging environment

- 4.5.1.a Judging venues should have as much natural light and ventilation as possible, free from odours and distractions and in a quiet location.
- 4.5.1.b Wines should be judged in an environment with sufficient natural light defined as light with an emitted colour of 5,500-6,000 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 pure white with a matte finish. Numbers should be printed on the tables for individual glasses to be placed for assessment.
- 4.5.1.e Judging tables should be set at a height of 900–1100 mm with stools provided.

4.5.2 Hygiene requirements

It has become increasingly important to consider hygiene practices to minimise infection risks. Shows should have a safety plan that includes hygiene and any specific conditions or compliance required by local jurisdictions, venue owners and managers, and where relevant, agricultural societies.

- 4.5.2.a Display signage in the tasting area to encourage people to practise hand hygiene, cough etiquette and respiratory hygiene.
- 4.5.2.b Any stewards or judges who exhibit cold or flu-like symptoms should not attend judging.
- 4.5.2.c Body temperature of stewards and judges should be taken at the start of the day. A tympanic (ear) thermometer is recommended as they have superior accuracy. Normal temperature range using a tympanic thermometer is between 35.5 °C and 37.7 °C. Always use disposable caps and clean the thermometer with an ethanol-based hygiene wipe between testing.
- 4.5.2.d Ensure stewards and judges have the facilities and are encouraged to regularly wash their hands for a minimum of 20 seconds, using either or both:
 - 4.5.2.d.i Unscented soap and water: Wet hands with running warm or cold water, turn off the tap and apply soap. Lather hands with soap by rubbing them together. Lather the backs of hands, between fingers and under nails. Clean for at least 20 seconds then rinse under running water. Dry hands using a clean disposable paper towel.
 - 4.5.2.d.ii Unscented hand sanitiser containing minimum 70% alcohol: Apply to the palm of one hand, then rub hands together covering all the surfaces including fingers until hands are dry. This should also take 20 seconds.
- 4.5.2.e Judges and stewards should respect social distancing in working areas, social spaces, during judging and score collation areas. Organisers should ensure there is enough space provided so this can be achieved.
- 4.5.2.f Judges and stewards should wear lab coats or aprons. Lab coats or aprons must be removed before going to the restroom and be laundered each day.
- 4.5.2.g A fresh, clean glass should be used for each exhibit. Glasses should be cleaned immediately after use using a glass washer at 50-55 °C, rinsing thoroughly with fresh hot water at 60-70 °C, and then air-dried. Glasses should not be cleaned or dried using a cloth as this may cross contaminate the glasses or introduce off odours. If water leaves marks, it is advised to invest in a mobile RO unit to reduce the electrical conductivity of the rinse water. For example, commercial units are available under the Winterhalter brand.
- 4.5.2.h Glasses should not be shared by judges including call back wines and trophy judging.
- 4.5.2.i Buffets and self-service foods should be avoided as they increase food safety risks. Utensils should be cleaned thoroughly and wrapped or environmentally friendly disposable utensils supplied.
- 4.5.2.j Stewards involved in cleaning, removal of glasses or emptying of spittoons should wear appropriate personal protective equipment (PPE) including face masks and rubber gloves.
- 4.5.2.k Routine cleaning of frequently touched surfaces using appropriate detergent/disinfectant solutions or wipes is effective. Particular attention should be given to tables, chairs and frequently touched surfaces such as handrails, door handles, computer keyboards/mouse and tablets. Cleaning and disinfecting are two different processes:
 - 4.5.2.k.i Cleaning means physically removing germs, dirt and organic matter from surfaces.
 - 4.5.2.k.ii Disinfecting means using chemicals to kill germs on surfaces. It's important to clean before disinfecting because organic matter and dirt can reduce the ability of disinfectants to kill germs.
 - 4.5.2.k.iii Cleaning products should be chosen that are approved for the surface to be cleaned. In general, combined detergent/disinfectant solutions or wipes are acceptable for hard surfaces. Avoid using bleach and ensure cleaning solutions do not introduce additional background smells to the tasting areas.
- 4.5.2.l Carpets should be regularly vacuumed, ideally with a vacuum cleaner fitted with a HEPA filter.
- 4.5.2.m Exhibitor tastings should consider the above points in addition to the following;
 - 4.5.2.m.i Crowd density should be considered with density of 1 person per 4 m² or less.
 - 4.5.2.m.ii Spittoons should only be on floors and at least 2 metres from the tasting tables to prevent splashing on people, tables, bottles or glasses.

4.5.3 Wine Temperature

- 4.5.3.a Before judging, exhibits should be stored at an even temperature between 10 °C and 15 °C.
- 4.5.3.b The ideal serving temperature range for different wine styles is listed below. As it can be impractical to serve wines at ideal temperatures, most will be served at ambient temperature. However, sparkling wines must be chilled to 8-10 °C.
 - 4.5.3.b.i Sparkling wines: 8-10 °C
 - 4.5.3.b.ii White and Rosé wines: 10-12 °C
 - 4.5.3.b.iii Red wines: 15-17 °C
 - 4.5.3.b.iv Apera and sweet table wines: 10-12 °C
 - 4.5.3.b.v Brandies and fortified wines: 15-17 °C

4.5.4 Wine Glasses and pouring

The most common glass used in Australian shows is the Riedel Overture Magnum. It is one of several suitable glassware available. There are many other brands with styles that could be considered.

- 4.5.4.a The following glasses are some of the many possibilities:
 - 4.5.4.a.i Sparkling wines: Riedel Vinum Chianti, Orrefors Difference Premium Red. Flutes should not be used.
 - 4.5.4.a.ii White, rosé, red, sweet table wines: Riedel Overture Magnum, Spiegelau Authentic Bordeaux, Riedel Vinum Chianti, Orrefors Difference Premium Red, Zalto White Wine
 - 4.5.4.a.iii Fortified wines: XL5
 - 4.5.4.a.iv Brandies: XL5
- 4.5.4.b The pouring of wines should be completed no earlier than 10 minutes before judging to ensure wines are fresh. Sparkling wines should be poured immediately before judging to ensure wines are as close as possible to 8-10 °C.
- 4.5.4.c 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 such as the XL5 whereas 75 mL is an appropriate volume for a larger glass such as the Riedel Overture Magnum.
- 4.5.4.d Brandy should have two glasses 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.

4.5.5 Presentation and Randomisation of Exhibits

- 4.5.5.a Rigorous checking by show organisers should ensure class identification is adhered to by exhibitors and all wines presented for judging at class and trophy level are legitimate, entered and awarded in accordance with the class descriptor.
- 4.5.5.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 before the week of judging to set a judging number determining the pouring order and where the wine appears on the table. This system could be assisted by using randomising software. Accurate recording and confidentiality are critical. Refer to section 3.1.5.
- 4.5.5.c For class and trophy judging, wines should be poured either out of the judges' sight or from completely masked bottles away from the judges. 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.f.

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

- 4.5.6.a For larger classes, discretion should be applied in splitting classes so as not to overwhelm judges with excessively large flights.
 - 4.5.6.a.i Brackets should ideally be limited to 30 wines. This recommendation should be applied without overcomplicating the daily allocation of classes. Some brackets may need to be more than 30 wines.

- 4.5.6.a.ii This should be at the direction of the chair of judges when allocating classes and pouring schedules, ideally in consultation with the panel chairs prior to the show time.
- 4.5.6.b Judges should be asked to assess a maximum of 120 wines per day, and ideally 110 wines or fewer.
- 4.5.6.c It is recommended that wine shows use the following methods for judging classes with a large number of entries:
 - 4.5.6.c.i Single panel split class method: One panel 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.
 - 4.5.6.c.ii Multiple panel split class method: A class is split and judged across two or more panels. The respective panel chairs of each panel and the chair of judges then reassess all potential gold medals, or alternatively the top golds from each split, before deciding the final awards.
- 4.5.6.d Class judging using GI splits. Also see Appendix C.
It is recommended judging by GI remain subject to ongoing review. If shows continue using the practice, it is up to the discretion of the show but splits between GIs must not be identified.

4.5.7 Class Judging

- 4.5.7.a For class and trophy judging, the chair of judges should formally remind judges of their role and obligation to remain objective. The chair of judges should affirm wines are to be judged on quality and judging should recognise a range of styles. Refer to sections 3.1.2.a.i and 4.2.3.d.
- 4.5.7.b The 100 point scale should be used in preference to the 20 point scale. Regardless, exhibitors should be encouraged to use awards such as trophy, gold, silver, and bronze for promotional purposes rather than points according to the AGW Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice. Refer to section 4.6.2.d.
- 4.5.7.c When using the 100 point scale, medal breaks are:
 - 4.5.7.c.i A gold medal is 95 points and above. A gold medal will be awarded to wines considered exceptional quality.
 - 4.5.7.c.ii A silver medal is 90 to 94 points. A silver medal will be awarded to wines considered very good quality.
 - 4.5.7.c.iii A bronze medal is 85 to 89 points. A bronze medal will be awarded to wines considered of good quality.
 - 4.5.7.c.iv No medal for exhibits awarded 80 to 84 points. These wines are still considered commercially sound.
 - 4.5.7.c.v No medal for exhibits receiving less than 80 points. These wines are considered technically faulty.
- 4.5.7.d 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 or chair of judges. Discussion of wines is to occur only after initial wine assessment, when points have been collated. Discussion to achieve consensus is also expected during any subsequent taste off. Refer to section 3.1.2.c and 4.2.5.c.
- 4.5.7.d.i An exception to this 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.b and 3.1.2.c.i.
- 4.5.7.e Once judging of a class is complete, the panel chair should lead discussion about the wines, collate the points, guide a consensus final score, organise recalls and involve the chair of judges in the discussion, as directed by the chair of judges. Once consensus has been reached on all wines, the panel chair should record final points and allocate awards, which are then submitted to the chair of judges for the master record. Refer to section 4.2.4.b.
- 4.5.7.e.i The final consensus score should be out of 100. The consensus score does not need to equate to the average of the judges' scores.

- 4.5.7.f If after assessing points in a class there are call back and taste off wines needed to determine awards, those wines must be randomised. This minimises the tendency for judges to support a wine they gave a high award to in the initial tasting. Refer to section 3.1.2.d.
- 4.5.7.g All eligible gold medals, being the highest pointed gold medal wines in eligible classes, should advance to the trophy judging. Refer to section 4.5.8.a.
- 4.5.7.h For wines affected by a defective closure or other fault 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.h.i If a wine has TCA or other cork-related fault and the score is less than 80, there should be a mechanism for this to be noted and feedback given to the exhibitor. Refer to 4.2.1.k.

4.5.8 Trophy Judging

- 4.5.8.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. Only eligible gold medals, being the highest pointed gold medal wines in eligible classes, should advance to the trophy judging. Refer to section 4.5.7.g.
- 4.5.8.b To avoid bias, there should be no pre-trophy culling of eligible gold medals from different classes. However, if there are multiple gold medals from a single class eligible for a trophy, refer to section 4.4.1.f, then there should be a judge off to ascertain the top wine to go forward.
- 4.5.8.c If entries bear commercial labels, then stewards should confirm, as far as they are able, label details comply with the class criteria before trophy judging.
- 4.5.8.d Wines eligible for a trophy taste off must be randomised. Judges should be told only the variety or blend and vintage. Judges should not be told the class number or exhibit number. Refer to section 3.1.4.c.
- 4.5.8.e The chair of judges should remind judges they must be impartial and approach trophy judging with an open mind, carrying no preconceived ideas from the class judging or about preferred varieties, blends or styles.
- 4.5.8.f Before trophy judging, there should be no discussion to avoid the potential for one judge to influence another. During the trophy tasting and submission of points there should be silence apart from the instructions issued by the chair of judges.
- 4.5.8.g Trophy judging should use the Borda count method. That is, each judge including the chair of judges but excluding associates, should allocate points to 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
- 4.5.8.h The total points for each wine are tallied with the winning wine accruing the highest number of points.
- 4.5.8.i With the Borda count, it is important all wines are rated and all scores included.
- 4.5.8.j For the Borda count method to be effective, judges must not engage in tactical manipulation of voting. The chair of judges must remind judges they 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.
- 4.5.8.k 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 closely pointed wine should receive the trophy. To arrive at a decision the chair of judges may:
 - 4.5.8.k.i View the total points in a Borda count with a count of first preference votes.

- 4.5.8.k.ii View the total points in a Borda count of the panel chairs separately to other judges.
- 4.5.8.k.iii Use a casting vote to resolve the deadlock.
- 4.5.8.l 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.
- 4.5.8.m Best Exhibitor trophies should be discontinued.
- 4.5.8.n Trophies should be organised in a logical hierarchy to limit the total number of trophies won by a single wine to no more than three. The logical hierarchy is 1 Best of varietal or blend, 2 Best of wine type such as sparkling, white, red or fortified and 3 Best of show.
- 4.5.8.n.i It is acknowledged other trophies might come from subsets of classes for example best organic, single vineyard and so forth and may increase the number of trophies above three.
- 4.5.8.o If a wine show has an award conferred by an international or specialist judge, and if this is a free choice, it is possible the wine may not have received a gold or any medal in the class in which it was judged. 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 including vintage, variety/varieties and brand name.
- 4.6.1.b The catalogue should record the results of award winning wines as trophy, gold, silver and bronze with their points. Non-award winning wines are recorded in the catalogue without points in either alphabetic or exhibit order depending on the layout. Non-award points should be 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 catalogue as top gold and the points should differentiate it from other gold medal wines.
- 4.6.1.c The catalogue should list the judges for each class as a reference for exhibitors seeking more detailed feedback.
- 4.6.1.d Exhibitors should be provided with a complete list of their entries with awards and points for each. Where possible, judges’ comments should be given. Refer to section 4.2.1.k.

4.6.2 Promotion of the Show System and Use of Show Awards

There is an opportunity to promote the Australian wine show system, the rigour associated with it and the wines awarded trophies or gold medals. But how best to achieve that? While it requires the input of all wine shows to have meaning, some considerations include:

- 4.6.2.a Promoting the benefits of the show system as part of a show’s communications.
- 4.6.2.b Shows and the wine industry should work together to develop a mechanism that can effectively communicate the excellence and rigour of the show system resulting in the awards for quality of wines.
- 4.6.2.c Shows are encouraged to host public tastings featuring the award winners and consider education opportunities.
- 4.6.2.d Exhibitors should use awards for promotional purposes rather than points, according to the AGW Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice. 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 section 4.5.7.b.
- 4.6.2.e In respect to the design of awards stickers, there are three parties to consider – the consumer, exhibitor and the shows. To ensure consumers easily recognise a trophy, gold, silver or bronze award from an Australian show, there should be a single design for trophies and medals and universal to all shows. 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 award. 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 relay the show's name, the year of award and either the class number or the class description if there is room.
- 4.6.2.e.iii Disc-shaped medals should be reproduced with a minimum 20 mm diameter to ensure readability.
- 4.6.2.e.iv Medal design, ordering and printing can be arranged by either the wine show or the exhibitor providing the design conforms to the AGW Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice.

4.6.3 Enforcement of the Australian Grape and Wine's Wine Industry Display of Awards Code of Practice (AGW CoP)

- 4.6.3.a The AGW's CoP can be found at the following link;
<https://www.agw.org.au/assets/codes-and-guidelines/pdfs/Wine-Industry-Display-of-Awards-Code-of-Practice-2015.pdf>
- 4.6.3.b All shows should include in their regulations a code of responsibility for exhibitors so that compliance with the AGW CoP is a prerequisite for entry to Australian shows. Refer to section 4.2.1.m.
- 4.6.3.c If a breach of the AGW CoP occurs, it should be brought to the attention of the AGW agw@agw.org.au.
- 4.6.3.c.i AGW will ask the owner of the brand to show good cause why the breach has occurred.
- 4.6.3.c.ii If good cause is not presented, then the breach of the AGW CoP will be communicated to the relevant wine show(s) by the AGW. The AGW should contact the ASVO directly asvo@asvo.com.au to request a list of Australian wine show contacts.
- 4.6.3.c.iii Penalties, as set out in 4.6.3.e, should then be applied by the relevant wine show.
- 4.6.3.d Minimum penalties, as set out in 4.6.3.e, can be applied only by wine show organisers.
- 4.6.3.e The following minimum penalties 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.
- 4.6.3.e.i A breach of the AGW CoP where the brand owner can show good cause should result in a warning but should not attract a penalty.
- 4.6.3.e.ii A first breach of the AGW CoP, 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 Australian wine show.
- 4.6.3.e.iii A second breach of the AGW CoP, 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 Australian wine show.
- 4.6.3.f The wine show organisers should not publicise incidents where the exhibitor showed good cause. Refer to section 4.6.3.e.i.
- 4.6.3.g Once a show has applied penalties to an exhibitor, the show should notify all other shows and the AGW of all breaches of the conditions of entry and the penalties applied. Refer to sections 4.6.3.e.ii and 4.6.3.e.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 list of Australian wine show contacts.

4.6.4 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 shows in showcasing and promoting the best wines of the show. However, it must not be unreasonably burdensome or expensive for the exhibitor. It is therefore recommended that:

- 4.6.4.a Shows clearly state in their regulations any expectation an exhibitor should supply additional wine in the event of being awarded a gold or trophy award with the maximum number of bottles and the terms of compensation associated with compulsory purchases.
- 4.6.4.b Shows should not require an exhibitor as a condition of entry to supply wine as a compulsory purchase in addition to the volumes recommended in 4.6.4.c, 4.6.4.d, or 4.6.4.e. Further purchases may be made through direct negotiation with the exhibitor after judging.
- 4.6.4.c Shows may request additional bottles of a gold award wine, at the exhibitor's expense, for the exhibitors' tasting. However, it is recommended no more than six additional 750mL bottles of table wine and sparkling exhibits and no more than three additional 750mL bottles of fortified wine and brandy are requested.
- 4.6.4.d In addition to 4.6.4.c, for promotional purposes such as awards dinners or public tastings, shows should request no more than two dozen additional 750mL bottles of table wine and sparkling and no more than one dozen additional 750mL bottles of fortified wine and brandy of a trophy award exhibit, which is at the exhibitor's expense.
- 4.6.4.e In addition to 4.6.4.c and, if a trophy wine, 4.6.4.d, for promotional purposes such as awards dinners or public tastings, shows should purchase no more than three dozen additional bottles of a gold award wine from an exhibitor at the lesser of 100% of wholesale price or \$300 per dozen bottles, exclusive of WET and GST. Further purchases may be made through direct negotiation with the exhibitor post judging. Refer to section 4.6.4.b.

4.7 AUDITING

4.7.1 Introduction

All Australian wine shows must have audit procedures in their regulations to guarantee the integrity of exhibits and results. Auditing is important to discourage any breach of regulations by an exhibitor and assure other exhibitors, wine trade, media and consumers high standards are being met.

The level and type of auditing varies from show to show. There are different types of audits, and shows may choose to use one or a combination suiting their requirements.

Pre-judging physical auditing is where a show representative or nominated auditor visits an exhibitor to check records, physical stock, and may source samples to be tasted against entries by judges during the show.

Desk audits, where an exhibitor is contacted by phone or email and asked to provide the documentation for a particular entry to confirm the wine complies with class requirements. This is more commonly done after a class has been judged but can be initiated before all classes have been judged. Desk audits should be conducted before announcements of awards. If a show wishes to conduct desk audits on award winning wines, this could be done in conjunction with a call for extra stock of award winning wines.

Post-judging physical auditing is a process similar to the pre-judging audit but done after judging has finished. If this is implemented, it should occur before awards are announced.

If auditing occurs after the announcement of awards, then any difficulties with potential withdrawal of awards must be accepted.

Auditors should be appointed and remunerated by the show in question. The ASVO keeps a register of auditors to assist shows.

4.7.2 Objectives

- To establish a range of auditing methods available for shows to adopt rather than a common protocol.
- To establish clear and specific penalties for breaches of regulations identified during an audit.
- To encourage adoption by developing a system that has rigour, simplicity and affordable for show organisers.

4.7.3 Recommendations. General

- 4.7.3.a All shows should implement a random audit of exhibits every year and use an audit protocol appropriate to their needs and resources.
- 4.7.3.b The exhibits, classes and regions to be audited should be determined by the show organisers.
- 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 Samples sourced from wineries during pre-judging audits should be tasted by the chair of judges and panel chair of the class against the submitted exhibit. It is not advisable to source retail samples for the comparison due to the variability of storage conditions. However, if this is the only option, then they should be tasted in the same manner as winery sourced samples.
- 4.7.3.e Post-judging physical audits should involve tasting of submitted exhibits against samples drawn by an auditor from the exhibitor's warehouse by the chair of judges, or a suitable proxy, and another judge.
- 4.7.3.f Post-judging audits, either desk or physical, should target award and trophy winning wines.
- 4.7.3.g It is recognised auditing international entries may be impractical for those niche shows with 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 for breaches.
- 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 exhibitors agree to retain stock records at the time of entry demonstrating to an auditor, if required, they meet the volume requirements of the classes 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 declare 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 show auditing process.
- 4.7.4.g The regulations should stipulate that by entering the show, the exhibitor agrees to the publication, as contemplated by these recommendations, of audit results including details of any penalties imposed. Also, the exhibitor agrees to make no claim of any kind or description arising out of or in connection with that publication, and indemnifies the 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 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 and Audit Costs

- 4.7.5.a Wine shows should appoint independent auditors who meet the following criteria:
- 4.7.5.a.i Knowledge of wine recording systems and the relevant show schedule.
 - 4.7.5.a.ii A basic understanding of oenology and viticulture.
 - 4.7.5.a.iii Knowledge of relevant Acts. Refer to section 4.7.7.b.
 - 4.7.5.a.iv Other attributes specific to the show or as listed in the ASVO Auditors procedure, which is a set of guidelines for wine shows and auditors. These guidelines are available on request from the ASVO asvo@asvo.com.au.
- 4.7.5.b The ASVO will maintain a register of suitable auditors who meet the criteria listed in section 4.7.5.a, for wine shows to utilise. Show organisers should contact the ASVO directly asvo@asvo.com.au to request the auditor register.
- 4.7.5.c Auditors should have no conflict of interest. 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. Refer to section 3.1.1.e.
- 4.7.5.d An appropriate fee should be paid to auditors recognising the professional nature of their work. Fees should be negotiated before the audit.
- 4.7.5.e 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 Within the region or regions being audited, show organisers choose the exhibitors to be audited at random.
 - 4.7.6.b.ii If a wine selected for pre-judging audit has more than one blend as indicated on the entry form, then any check sample should be drawn from the exhibitor's warehouse rather than retail. Refer to section 4.4.3.b and 4.7.4.d.
 - 4.7.6.b.iii Check samples, which are sourced after the committee receives the entry forms but before judging, are sourced by an auditor or show organisers.
 - 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 as specified in the regulations, obtains three bottles without charge of the indicated stock corresponding 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.
 - 4.7.6.b.v Assessment of check samples:
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. The chair of judges and the panel chair should then conduct a simple triangle test to confirm a difference exists. If the chair of judges confirms the difference, the chief steward and the show committee must be notified. If the exhibit is determined to be different to the check sample, procedures in section 4.7.7 should be followed.
- 4.7.6.c Post-judging auditing.
A selection of exhibits with major awards such as golds and trophies should be audited. Post-judging auditing should occur before the announcement of the results. Refer to section 4.7.1.

- 4.7.6.c.i Post-judging - Desktop Auditing.
A show committee member or auditor contacts the exhibitor and requests electronic records be provided. These records should state the physical stock levels at the time of entry meet the class volume requirements, and blend composition confirming vintage, variety, and GI meet the class entry criteria.
- 4.7.6.c.ii Post-judging - Physical Auditing.
The auditor visits the winery or warehouse nominated by the exhibitor in the entry form and as specified in the regulations, obtains three bottles without charge of the indicated stock corresponding 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.
- 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. The same process should then be followed as described in 4.7.6.b.v.

4.7.7 Recommendations. Consequences of Breach.

- 4.7.7.a If there is a breach of the regulations as described above, refer to sections 4.7.6.b.v and 4.7.6.c.iii, the exhibitor should be asked to explain the breach within a defined time frame, and why disqualification and penalties should not apply. If they cannot give a credible explanation, then the show should:
 - 4.7.7.a.i Disqualify the exhibit.
 - 4.7.7.a.ii Using appropriate discretion, impose appropriate penalties allowed within the regulations. Refer to section 4.7.8.c.
 - 4.7.7.a.iii If the show organisers deem the breach significant, it should notify all other shows and the AGW of the breach of the conditions of entry and the penalties applied. Organisers should contact the ASVO asvo@asvo.com.au to request a list of other 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 the 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, show organisers must refer the matter to Wine Australia 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 shows and 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 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 without a credible explanation for its occurrence should result in a warning, removal of any award conferred on the relevant exhibit and a decision for the period of two years commencing from the date of the breach, the exhibitor is ineligible to enter any exhibit at any Australian show.
 - 4.7.8.c.iii A second breach of the regulations without a credible explanation for its occurrence should result in a warning, removal of any award conferred on the relevant exhibit and a decision for the period of five years commencing from the date of the breach, the exhibitor is ineligible to enter any exhibit at any Australian show.

4.7.9 Recommendations. Communication of Audit results

- 4.7.9.a A summary of the audit and audit outcomes 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: “There were 20 entries audited, 18 entries true to regulations and 2 entries 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 section 4.7.1, then the audit results for the show of the previous year should be included.
- 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 AGW 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 list of Australian wine show contacts.
- 4.7.9.d Wine show organisers should inform Wine Australia of any breaches contravening the Acts related to wine production. Refer to section 4.7.7.b.

5 GLOSSARY

Term	Definition
Award	An award is a gold, silver or bronze medal.
Blend	A wine made by blending components of different batches of either 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	A spirit made by distilling wine. Requirements for brandy include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • matured in wooden containers for no less than 2 years. • contains 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	A wine to which has been added Australian grape spirit, brandy or both. The term may be further qualified by the addition of the grape's variety including <i>inter alia</i> Muscat, Muscadelle, Pedro, Frontignac, Verdelho, Shiraz, etc. After adding the fortified spirit, the wine must contain no less than 150 mL/L and no more than 220 mL/L of ethanol at 20 °C. However, it can reach a higher level of ethanol naturally through maturation in wooden vessels.
Fortified Wine: Apera	Apera is a style ranging from dry to very sweet. The fortified wine is usually produced using a solera system and ageing takes place in a variety of vessels. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)
Fortified Wine: Cream:	Cream is an apera style, sweet wine no less than 5 °Baumé. Cream 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 litres.
Fortified Wine: Muscat and its four classifications comprising Australian, Classic, Grand and Rare	In this classification, Muscat is a fortified wine. Muscat juice is fermented to the desired Baumé level and then grape spirit added. The wines are 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 litres. The four classifications of style are: <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: Ruby	Ruby is a style of Australian fortified red wine with only a few years of ageing before bottling. The wine can be blended from more than one vintage in order to preserve primary characteristics of colour and aroma.
Fortified Wine: Tawny and its four classifications comprising Australian, Classic, Grand and Rare	<p>Tawny describes a style of Australian fortified wine that receives varying years of ageing before bottling. The wine is usually blended from more than one vintage, matured in oak until reaching an optimal age before sale. Ageing takes place in wooden vessels not greater than 9,000 litres.</p> <p>The four classifications of style are:</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: Topaque and its four classifications comprising Australian, Classic, Grand and Rare	<p>Topaque is an Australian term that may be used to describe a fortified wine made from Muscadelle and this sweet style is unique to Australia. It can be made from a single vintage or a blend of vintages; fortified with Australian grape spirit and aged in oak containers for different lengths of time according to the classification below. Topaque must be made from 85% Muscadelle and can be presented with a Geographical 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 litres.</p> <p>The four classifications of style are:</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: Vintage	Vintage is an Australian fortified produced from a single vintage year. They are entitled to bear the designation vintage with the corresponding year. These wines are characterised by the ability to improve with bottle age and benefit from prolonged cellaring. Vintage fortifieds are aged for a minimum of 20 months before release but can be exhibited for judging earlier than this.
Geographical Indication (GI)	Geographical Indication is a defined geographic region or locality where grapes are grown and harvested. Only GIs listed under the Wine Australia 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 is a person who operates an establishment where wine is made and/or grape extract destined for manufacturing wine, or where wine goods are processed, modified or packaged.
Moscato	In the Australian context, Moscato is a semi-sparkling wine made from at least 85% of Muscat varieties.

Organic Wine	The wine must be certified by a registered authority in Australia against Australian Standards 6000-2015 – organic and biodynamic products. Organic wine is made from grapes grown in accordance with principles of organic farming, which excludes the use of artificial chemical fertilisers, pesticides, fungicides and herbicides.
Biodynamic Wine	Biodynamic wine is made from grapes grown and using winemaking practices in accordance with the International Demeter Biodynamic protocols. The wine must be certified by a registered Australian authority linking Australian Standards 6000-2015 – organic and biodynamic products.
Regulations	Collectively refers to show, general, entry regulations and all other applicable regulations in managing a show.
Single/Individual Vineyard Wine	While there is no definition of a single vineyard wine in the Australian Grape and Wine Authority Act 2013, it is generally regarded as made from a minimum of 95% of grapes from the nominated vineyard. It can be a blend of varieties from the one site and it must have a single, continuous boundary and be easily identifiable. There is currently no limit to its size.
Sparkling Wine	Sparkling wine ≥ 5.0 g/L CO ₂ or ≥ 2.5 bar pressure. These wines can be produced by the Charmat method or bottle fermented 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 is 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 .
Sparkling production: Bottle fermentation	Sparkling wine that undergoes second fermentation in individual bottles. This includes both transfer and the traditional method as ways of removing yeast from the bottle.
Sparkling and semi- sparkling production: 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 is injected into the wine. This is a category of its own.
Steward	Stewards are organisers, support workers and/or volunteers of a show.
Trophy	Judges recognise a wine is considered the best in a specifically defined category when judged against its peers rewarding it with a trophy.
Variety	Variety is the grape cultivar. Only varieties listed by the following organisations are eligible for show judging: <ul 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)
Vintage	Vintage means the year where grapes for the wine were manufactured or harvested. However, fruit harvested after September 1 and on or before December 31 uses the following calendar year as its vintage designation.

Wine	Wine is the result of complete or partial fermentation of fresh grapes, a mixture of both or 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.
Wine of Provenance	A wine reflecting the region, the variety or varieties and the winemaker's influence. The wine must demonstrate consistency across a minimum of three vintages and spanning at least ten years.
Wine show organisers	People appointed to administer and coordinate a show. They are responsible for all facets including the style of the show. Duties cover but are not limited to the schedule and regulations, organising and accepting entries, financial management, an appropriate judging venue, appointing the chair of judges and judges in consultation with the chair of judges, preparing the results list, exhibitor tasting, awards announcements, events and publicity.

6 APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. THE 2020 ASVO WINE SHOW BEST PRACTICE RECOMMENDATIONS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND REVIEW PROCESS

The 2020 TAC members:

Chair: Louisa Rose, Yalumba, South Australia
Secretary: Dr Anthony Robinson, The Australian Wine Research Institute, South Australia

Susanne Bell, Bellwether Wines, Coonawarra, South Australia
David Bicknell, Oakridge, Yarra Valley, Victoria
Angie Bradbury, Bradbury&Co, Melbourne, Victoria
PJ Charteris, consultant & Charteris Wines, Hunter Valley, New South Wales
Samantha Connew, Stargazer Wines, Tasmania
Sarah Crowe, Yarra Yering, Yarra Valley, Victoria
Rob Diletti, Castle Rock Estate, Porongorup, Western Australia
Sally Evans, Councillor at the Royal Agricultural Society of New South Wales & chair of the Sydney Royal Wine Show committee
Jane Faulkner, wine writer, Melbourne, Victoria
David Metcalf, Royal National Capital Agricultural Society, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory
Lynda Schenk, Purple Giraffe, Adelaide, South Australia
Charlie Seppelt, Randall Wine Group, McLaren Vale, South Australia
Tyson Stelzer, Wine Press, Brisbane, Queensland
Courtney Treacher, Accolade/Houghton Wines, Nannup, Western Australia
Corrina Wright, Oliver's Taranga, McLaren Vale, South Australia

The TAC convened via telephone conferencing and subcommittees between August 2019 and July 2020. It also sought opinions from other industry members and show societies. A draft was circulated to interested parties and their comments considered by the TAC.

APPENDIX B. SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

4.3.2 SELECTION OF JUDGES AND ASSOCIATES, INTERNATIONAL AND SPECIALIST JUDGES.

Introduction

Judges assess wine taking into consideration style and structure in order to allocate an equitable score. Achieving that high level of skill requires judges to have some formal training and considerable experience tasting Australian and international wines.

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

- Mostly winemakers, wine writers, sommeliers, viticulturists, wine marketers, restaurateurs, retailers and educators.
- Formal Training:
Oenology and viticulture courses, sommelier courses, Master of Wine (MW) courses, Wine & Spirit Education Trust (WSET) and wine appreciation courses.
- Further training and development:
 - Working in different parts of the world and tasting widely.
 - Tastings with a range of international wines.
 - If possible, attending specialist tastings and courses such as MW events, the AWRI Advanced Wine Assessment course, and the Len Evans Tutorial.
 - Visiting international wine trade fairs to taste widely.
 - Travelling to, and tasting in, wine regions.
 - Being active in tasting groups.
 - Employment in a company that budgets for and believes in on-going training.
 - Judging international shows.

There is no one way to develop tasting skills and therefore no one way to select a judge.

Mix of Judges

Ideally shows should have a complement of judges reflecting the makeup of the wine industry. The mix may include wine educators, winemakers, viticulturists, wine marketers, retailers, sommeliers, writers and maybe expert amateurs of wine. Regardless judges must have a developed appreciation of Australian and international wine styles.

Further to the above, it is recognised the more diversity on a panel, the more relevant the results will be. While not exhaustive, the following list is a guide:

- Gender – a 50:50 ratio of women to men should be adopted.
- Geographic – state, region, international.
 - Exchange programs between capital city shows for a judge and associate work well and could be expanded to all capital city shows.
- Age - embrace the young and celebrate wisdom. Mentor/specialist judges are a good way to include experience but best limited to 1-2 per show.
- Cultural background.

It is sometimes stated that there are style judges and technical judges, but this is an oversimplified view because judges must have an appreciation of wine style. It is desirable to have a mix of judges.

Recommendation:

Refer to Section 4.3.2 Selection of Judges and Associates, International and Specialist judges.

APPENDIX C. SUPPORTING INFORMATION FOR RECOMMENDATION

4.5.6.D IN RELATION TO GI SPLITS IN CLASS JUDGING.

Introduction

It is recognised a focus on the diversity of regional (GI) styles is an important platform in the re-imaging of Australian wines in world markets. Much of the world still views Australia as lacking the regional diversity compared with European wine producing countries. In other words, Australia is effectively one region with a single style offered for each varietal or blend.

The possibility wine shows, not just the regional ones, could have a role in recognising and promoting the diversity of regional (GI) styles has been recognised and trialled at a number of shows. In 2020, there are questions as to whether judging this way has helped in re-imaging of Australian wines in world markets, or if this should be a role for wine shows.

Achieving regional focus in the judging process

Some regional shows have trialled sub-regional splits. Other shows group entries by region (GI). Regions with fewer than three entries have been grouped together and judged as others. In some cases, judges are given the regional breaks but not the name of or any other information about each region. In other cases, no information on the breaks are given. If regional breaks are implemented, it is important for the chair of judges and panel chair to emphasise that relatively few entries from a region does not equate to lesser quality.

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 GI classifications. When wines from a GI are less 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 can 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.

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 assess 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:

- Regionally focussed judging at the capital city wine shows leads to potential bias against specific regions and/or multi-regional wines.
- Regional splits, even though the regions are not revealed, may lead to potential bias as some judges will try to guess the regions, that is, they will be distracted by where is it from? rather than simply, is it good?

- Judges are biased against smaller splits as they may be assumed to be representing less relevant regions despite the chair of judge's instructions that all splits must be judged as equals.
- Because regional wine shows are focussed on wines from a region, it is sufficient to ensure regionality in the show system.
- Judging classes with regional splits is of no advantage if the terroir/varietal expression is strong as this will show in the results of multi-regional judging.
- With the smaller groups of wines, around 30, now being judged in many shows, the shadow effect is no longer a major issue.
- The other grouping does not enjoy the focus claimed for individual regions and this is unfair on the wines that fall into that category.
- The best wines should be awarded anyway, particularly as there is an increased focus on great wines in a diversity of style when judging.

Summary

More shows have adopted judging using regional splits with either the splits known or not. There are still mixed feelings about judging this way, although it seems less judges are in favour of GI splits than previously as they have seen instances of bias, sometimes conscious but often sub-conscious, in themselves or other judges. The recommendation Section 4.5.6.d has been changed for the 2020 review.

Recommendation

Refer to Section 4.5.6.d.

Class judging using GI splits. Also see Appendix C.

It is recommended judging by GI remain subject to ongoing review. If shows continue using the practice, it is up to the discretion of the show but splits between GIs must not be identified.

APPENDIX D. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR WINE SHOW JUDGES

A wine show is conducted to provide a professional and independent assessment of wines submitted and provide feedback to the exhibitor.

Professional standards

A judge represents the show and should not act in a way that brings the show into disrepute.

A judge must act in a professional and respectful manner towards other judges, the wine show organiser, stewards and anyone else working for the show. Inappropriate behaviour may result in the judge's dismissal.

A judge must be punctual, respect the start time for judging each day and endeavour to maintain a steady pace to ensure other judges and stewards are not inconvenienced during the judging day.

A judge must assess each wine impartially and on its merits. The judge must evaluate independently without discussing the wine with other judges until scores have been collated and the panel meets to discuss them. However, an associate may seek guidance from the panel chair.

Confidentiality

Wine show results are confidential until released by the show organiser.

A judge must not comment on the show to outsiders, including on social media, without the consent of the show organiser. In particular, the judge must not disclose the result of any wine to anyone outside the show until results are released.

After results are released, the judge may discuss the results of a particular exhibit with the exhibitor and anyone else. However, the judge may only disclose the points awarded in relation to a wine to the exhibitor.

The chair of judges, or a panel chair, may disclose to an exhibitor another individual judge's comments.

Conflict of interest

A judge must avoid any conflict of interest during judging. If the judge has or believes to have a conflict of interest, it must be disclosed to the chair of judges and the show organiser as soon as practicable.

APPENDIX E. CODE OF CONDUCT FOR WINE SHOW STEWARDS

A wine show is conducted to provide a professional and independent assessment of wines submitted and provide feedback to the exhibitor.

Professional standards

A steward represents the wine show and should not act in a way that brings the show into disrepute.

A steward must act in a professional and respectful manner towards the judges, the wine show organiser, stewards and anyone else involved in the wine show. Inappropriate behaviour may result in dismissal.

A steward must be familiar with the show and judging schedule. The steward must be punctual, adhering to the start time for judging each day, and perform the steward's duties in a way to ensure the judges, other stewards and anyone else working for the wine show are not inconvenienced during the judging day.

A steward must not be intoxicated during the judging day.

Confidentiality

Wine show results are confidential until released by the wine show organiser.

A steward must not comment on the show to outsiders, including on social media, without the consent of the show organiser. In particular, the steward must not disclose the identity of an exhibit to a judge during the wine show and must ensure that exhibits are kept out of sight of the judges.

A steward must not disclose the result of any exhibit to anyone outside the wine show until the results are released.

After the wine show results are released, the steward may discuss the results of the wine show or a particular exhibit with anyone else but must not disclose any information about the show that is not publicly available.

Conflict of interest

A steward must avoid any conflict of interest during the show. If the steward has a conflict of interest, the organiser must be informed as soon as possible.

APPENDIX F. JUDGE ASSESSMENT

Feedback form for judges and associates

Name

Position on panel

Assessor

Please Rate 1-4 with

1 = poor – unlikely to succeed

2 = below expectations – needs more experience

3 = meets expectations most of the time

4 = excellent

_____ Alignment with consensus score

_____ Spread of scores

_____ Confidence

_____ Ability to argue the case for their wine

_____ Overall assessment

_____ For panel chair and judge – how well do they mentor judges and associates?

_____ For judge and associate – how well do they take feedback?

_____ Suitability to position in panel (PC / J / Assoc.)

Other comments

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Please circle your answer

Invite back if eligible? YES NO

If YES: In same position Promote

AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY
OF VITICULTURE AND
OENOLOGY

