



Competition Organizer Software

Barry DeLapp announced availability of the Beer Competition Organizer (BCO) shareware, developed to simplify the task of running a homebrew competition. It is offered to all organizers of homebrew competitions for \$25. You need a PC with 4 MB RAM, Windows 3.1 or 95, and an HP LaserJet or true compatible. This package has been used successfully at a number of competitions, including this year's first round of the AHA Nationals.

He got frustrated after helping with our club's first homebrew event, in 1994. The manual effort was staggering and he started programming immediately afterward to automate the process for the next year. With the dual role of developer and user, he got carried away and invested several man-months in software development. After each of the first few uses, he made significant enhancements (users can be very demanding) and generalized the software for use in most types of homebrew competitions. As a result, he believes anyone running a beer contest will benefit significantly from this system.

The system is used to organize brewers, entry forms, entry bottles, judges, scores assigned by judges, prizes awarded and the return of score sheets to brewers. With it, you will be able to perform the following:

Print peel-off entry number labels. Record brewer's names and addresses. Record entries for each brewer including category, subcategory and special information for judges. Collapse category/subcategories. Split tables into flights. Print Pull Lists. Print Table Signs. Print Judge Assignment Matrix for up to 3 scheduled rounds. Record judge assignments for each table/flight. Reprint the Judge Assignment Matrix after preliminary judge assignments. Record walk-ins and delete no-shows when the competition starts. Print peel-off labels for each judge. Record scores and prizes. Print Best of Show Pull List. Print a report of all Results. Print mail address labels. And much more.

No connection with Barry and his software other than a satisfied organizer who used it and recommends it.

Dave Houseman

To order, send \$25 to:

Barry DeLapp, 9 Airdrie Court, Paoli, PA 19301

For more information, contact Barry at:

(610) 644-0224 or barry@pictorl.com on the Internet.

Quick review by Dennis Davison:

I have tried and tested Barry's software. We started to use it for the Nationals in Chicago last year. Unfortunately, we didn't continue to use it because it lacked some of the details and needs for the AHA's 1st round event. However, it's a great product. I'm not saying it's perfect for everyone. It has a few shortcomings, yet is an excellent starter program or program for the database designer challenged.

This review only reflects my opinion and not that of the BJCP.

Elections

Yes, just when you thought you were through hearing about elections for this year, it's time to think about possibly getting some new blood on our BJCP board. During 1997, we'll have the second election of officers to the Board of Directors. The regions that will hold elections in 1997 are:

Mid-Atlantic (DE, DC, KY, MD, NJ, OH, PA, VA, WV)

Southeast (AL, GA, MS, NC, SC, TN)

Midwest (IL, IN, IA, KS, MI, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD, WI)

Far West (CA, NV, HA)

The Board of Directors is actively seeking people in states *other than the election states* to serve on the Election Committee. Please contact the President if you're interested.

How to become a candidate

Nominations for representatives in the above mentioned states are now open. Those seeking to hold office must submit a petition containing signatures of five or more Regular Members of the BJCP from their region. You have until February 1, 1997 to forward these petitions to the Program Administrator.

Each candidate is allowed a 500-word biography, which must be submitted along with the petition, for publication to the region in which he/she is seeking office.

Though it's not mandatory, e-mail accessibility would be preferred. Communications between board members is essential, with fax and mail requiring endless streams of paperwork flowing around the country.

Agreement reached with AHA

The BJCP Directors have approved an agreement with the AHA that will ensure the continued awarding of points for AHA-sanctioned competitions as well as supplying AHA organizers with the names of current BJCP judges. Under this agreement the AHA will contract with the BJCP to supply judge lists to the organizers of AHA Sanctioned events. The BJCP will provide those organizers with the names of local BJCP judges and with all the forms necessary for those judges to get their points recorded. AHA Organizers will be instructed to return the experience point reports directly to the BJCP for processing. No additional fees will be collected for the recording of experience points.

BJCP competition program nearly ready

Meanwhile, the BJCP continues to develop its own competition program. Tom Fitzpatrick has been installed as BJCP Competition Director. He and the Competition Committee are continuing to revise the materials packet and the policies of the program. Items up for revision include the registration and re-

Continued on page 2

cording fees (which will be combined into a single up-front charge), the formula for awarding experience points (which seems to be moving toward a more equitable plan which awards points relative to the number of sessions judged, with ceilings based on the competition's size), and the style guidelines. News of changes to the Competition Program will be reported as they occur.

Where are they now?

Please help us find these missing judges. If you know any of them, tell us their current address, or better yet, ask them to contact us directly.

All information should be sent to:

BJCP Database Administrator

c/o Celebrator Beer News

P.O. Box 375

Hayward, CA 94543

You can also contact us by e-mail at:

rad_equipment@rad-mac1.ucsf.edu

Oscar Almeida
Steve Biggs
Stephen Bohler
Erick Borbons
Brad Brumit
Chris Cannon
Stephen Content
J. deMoor
Tom Dub
Scott Eppelman
Bill Fallon
James Haughey
Thomas Hawkins
Rodney Hitch
Paul Holman III
James F. Ingram Jr.
Aaron Jaben
Alan J.V. Knight
James Lueders

James MacGuire
Dan Marsh
Richard Maurer
Ted Mina
Jeff Palmer
Clement Pellani
David Pyle
Eileen Reilly
Paul Ronning
David J. Rose
Louise Scalleat
Mike Scanlon
Jeb Sturmer
Leo P. Trapp
Glenn Van Graafeiland
Philip Watney
John Watt
Keith Wilbourn
Paul Wood

Beer flavor analysis

When was the last time you did a serious experiment in beer flavor recognition to help newcomers to the wonderful world of judging? We do it in our club about twice a year, and it's always appreciated by those attending.

Get some bottles of cheap, neutral beer (I usually use something like Keystone Light) and set aside enough for each person to have one good bottle as a "control" sample. Doctor, recap, and serve the remaining bottles in various ways: Light-struck: Leave a bottle out in full sunlight for a day. Diacetyl: A few drops of supermarket butter extract. Oxidized: Expose to air, leave in a hot place for 2 weeks. DMS: Mix in some Leinenkugel or PBR.

You can think of others. Use only pure, food-grade ingredients, and ask your local experts to comment about each sample as you present it. Most people are more than willing to contribute their share of the cost of samples in order to learn how to identify beer flavors and off-flavors.

Some older, but still useful information about doing this sort of thing in a scientific way is available on the Web at <http://alpha.rollanet.org/library/DrBeer.html>

Exam Questions

by Scott Bickham

The exam format has been public for a long time now, but we still get nervous inquiries about it all the time. Please help make sure that anyone considering taking the exam is aware of exactly what it will look like.

There will always be a BJCP question, 4 style questions, 4 technical questions and one "mixed" question. Here's a sample format:

1. Describe the purpose of the Beer Judge Certification Program, how the judging levels are organized and how a judge progresses within the program.
2. Identify, describe and differentiate four common members of the <insert category here> family. Give commercial examples of each style.
3. Describe, differentiate and compare the taste and aroma characteristics of the following beer styles. Give commercial examples of each style:
a) Style A b) Style B c) Style C
4. Describe and differentiate the taste and aroma characteristics of: Namebrand A, Namebrand B and Namebrand C. Also discuss their styles.
5. Identify, describe and give commercial examples of a major beer style associated with:
a) City A b) City B c) City C
6. Describe and discuss the following beer characteristics. How are they perceived? What causes them and how are they avoided and controlled? Are they ever appropriate and if so, where and when?
a) Flavor A b) Flavor B c) Flavor C
7. Describe the hopping schedule for <Style A> and <Style B>, explaining why you have selected specific amounts and varieties of hops and how your schedule fits the style.
8. Open ended question on a brewing ingredient or process.
9. Provide a complete five gallon ALL-GRAIN recipe for <Style>, listing ingredients and procedure. Give original and final gravities. Explain why the recipe fits the style.
10. Discuss the following brewing techniques. How do they affect the beer?
a) Technique A b) Technique B c) Technique C

Yes, there are questions that don't directly affect one's judging ability. So?

The style questions should be easy for someone who has read Jackson, and the technical questions can be answered adequately with Papazian, better with Miller and still better with Noonan and Fix.

Question 6 is useful to measure knowledge of troubleshooting.

Questions 7 and 9 are sort of stylistic questions, but from a brewer's point of view.

Question 10 tests knowledge of the brewing process. It is helpful to have an open-ended question on malt, hops, water or yeast to let expert brewers show their stuff.

If you're able to access the World Wide Web on the Internet, there are some wonderful study guides available to download.

You'll find links to them, and much more at the BJCP home page:

<http://www.execpc.com/~ddavison/bjcp.html>

Staying connected

If you have issues, concerns, suggestions, questions, comments, or just deep, philosophical musings that nobody else will read, send them to the appropriate person.

Chairman & Midwest: Dennis Davison
4025 S. 65th #14 Greenfield WI 53220
E-mail: ddavison@execpc.com

Secretary: Darryl Richman
15600 NE 8th #B1-327 Bellevue WA 98008
E-mail: darrylri@microsoft.com

Western: Martin Lodahl
4966 Bell Road Auburn CA 95602
E-mail: malodahl@pacbell.com

Mid-Atlantic: Greg Walz
3327 Allendorf St. Pittsburgh PA 15204
E-mail: walzenbrew@aol.com

Southeast: Roman Davis
6234 Caslon Ct. Charlotte NC 28270
E-mail: xzymurgist@aol.com

Gulf Coast: Steve Daniel
902 Dellore Lane League City TX 77573
E-mail: steve@cent.com

Northeast: Bob Gorman
1A Dexter Ave Waltham MA 02154
E-mail: bob@rsi.com

Program/Database Administrator: Russ Wigglesworth
c/o Celebrator, PO Box 375 Hayward CA 94543
E-mail: rad_equipment@rad-mac1.ucsf.edu

Exam Director: Scott Bickham
7507 Swan Point Way Columbia MD 21045
E-mail: bickham@dave.nrl.navy.mil

Competition Director: Tom Fitzpatrick
728 Concord St. Aurora IL 60505
E-mail: fitz@fasicsv.fnal.gov

BJCP World Wide Web home page :
<http://www.execpc.com/~ddavison/bjcp.html>

BJCP voice mail: 414-299-9145

BJCP Reporter editor: Ed Westemeier
P.O. Box 258 New Richmond, OH 45157-0258
E-mail: hopfen@iac.net

If you have Internet e-mail access, consider subscribing to JudgeNet Digest. Send an e-mail message to judge-request@synchro.com with the following:
subscribe address firstname lastname bjcp rank if any
For example:
subscribe chuck@synchro.com chuck cox master
subscribe bhmail@discovery.com michael jackson apprentice
Don't worry, if you make a mistake, you'll get a help message with detailed instructions.

Upcoming Exams

The current exam schedule is listed below. There are several exams in the works, but the dates have not been firmly set. If you have any questions, please get in touch with either Scott Bickham or the contact person.

Scheduled

Date	Location	Contact Person	Phone Number
9/21	Boston, MA	Jay Hersh	(617) 641-0704
12/7	Madison, WI	Dave Norton	(414) 694-7591
1/18	Mountain View, CA	Jeremy Bergsman	(415) 988-0118
1/19	Staten Island, NY	Ken Johnson	*
2/8	Brighton, MI	Bill Pfeiffer	(810) 229-0727
3/8	Dallas, TX	Steve Russell	(214) 308-0176
3/15	Sacramento, CA	Martin Lodahl	(916) 823-0202
3/22	Irving, TX	Steve Russell	(214) 308-0176
5/3	Orlando, FL	Mac Monroe	(407) 253-2534

In the works

The exam schedule fills up fast, so be sure to get your requests in early.

11/23	Woodland Hills, CA	Brian Vessa	*
11/24	Toronto, Ont.	Craig Pinhey	(905) 529-4388
1/97	Charlotte, NC	John Mitchell	(704) 864-3450
2/97	Harpers Ferry, WV	Scott Bickham	(410) 290-7721
3/97	Anchorage, AK	Shane Docherty	(907) 345-4099
3/97	Omaha, NB	Frank Sobetski	(402) 593-9171
8/97	Cincinnati, OH	Ed Westemeier	(513) 553-3213
?	Burlington, VT	Tom Ayres	(802) 434-2939
?	Albuquerque	Brad Kraus	(505) 471-6472
?	El Paso/Alamogordo	Brad Kraus	(505) 471-6472

* Contact Scott Bickham for more info

New Price Structure

We have a new BJCP point recording price structure to simplify things for competition organizers.

There is now a one-time fee of \$35 to cover everything. By the way, be sure your club's competition director knows that we don't record points for people who have yet to take the exam.

We will allow them to pick up the points retroactively when they do take the exam (for points earned during the previous 12 months) which is why you should include them in your organizer's report regardless of their BJCP status at the moment. We keep the reports on file and research the retroactive points as needed.

Please pass the information in this newsletter on to your friends, fellow club members, local suppliers, and anyone else you think might be interested in taking the exam. Consider making a photocopy or two for your club's competition organizer, and another to pass around at club meetings.

Feedback

Dear Editor:

Thank you for the copy of the *BJCP Reporter*. I was interested in the proposal to use the BJCP as a vehicle to castigate judges who we feel have not performed well. Possibly an OK idea, although it seems to me that more direct feedback may be more effective. In any case, it stimulated me to pass along some comments I recently provided to the organisers of a contest that I both entered and judged in. Maybe you'll find some of my comments helpful.

Brian Read, Calgary

[The second letter that Brian included was too long to print verbatim, so I'll summarize his points briefly. He writes both well and politely; the terseness of the following comments are due to the editor's heavy hand.]

Dear _____,

Thanks for having me to help judge in your contest. It was valuable and educational, and I always enjoy meeting you all and visiting _____, particularly with the *[various compliments deleted]*.

From my observations of the contest, and the evaluations I received on my own entries, I have some suggestions. I'll be making the same suggestions to our own club for our contest next year.

It would have been more useful to the entrants if the judges wrote out all their comments and scores without communicating with each other and then didn't erase or change them after discussing the beers to arrive at a final score. Con-

sistency in comments and scoring doesn't look any better than diversity if the results don't seem to be accurate. Most entrants are aware that beer judging is a very inexact and subjective undertaking, and would prefer as much independent feedback as possible to an artificial consistency. As an example, one of my entries had double the appropriate IBUs, and was extremely bitter. It received a score of 27 (far too high), but, more significantly, all three judges commented that it had excessive astringency, which was not due to hop bitterness. This consensus likely arose from discussion and, as such didn't provide credible and useful feedback. Another entry was a good Scottish ale that saw all three judges call it phenolic. It's possible that one bottle was infected, but more likely that the apparent consistency came from discussion.

Independent evaluation, followed by discussion and a consensus score, is a good concept, but altering individual scores and comments after discussion diminishes, rather than enhances the credibility of the evaluations.

I also feel it helpful to provide the exact category and subcategory the beer is supposed to be, even if that means several different types are judged against each other in the same round. For example, five different types of stout were given to the judges as simply "stouts," and a kriek was judged as a framboise.

A third problem is judges' unfamiliarity with some of the styles. This is exacerbated by the fact that most judges have entries in the categories they're most knowledgeable about, and therefore can't judge them.

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
CINCINNATI, OH
PERMIT NO. 4852

ADDRESS CORRECTION
REQUESTED

BJCP Reporter
P.O. Box 258
New Richmond OH 45157-0258