



BEER JUDGE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

c/o Celebrator Beer News - PO Box 375 - Hayward, CA 94543
WWW.BJCP.ORG

Graders:

Report to Participant

Examinee Number: _____ Date of Exam: **2006**
 Location of Exam: _____

EXAM SCORE

INTERPRETING YOUR SCORE AND FEEDBACK

Your exam has been graded by two National or Master judges and their scoring and comments reviewed by both an Associate Exam Director and the Exam Director. This three step process ensures that the assigned scores are consistent with the following criteria:

- <60: Poor knowledge of brewing and/or styles with insufficient communication skills to be a judge. Generally has weak tasting skills that need development.
- 60s: A basic grasp of fundamentals. May have some big knowledge gaps, but has the minimum acceptable communication and judging skills.
- 70s: Knows basis well enough to reach the certified level, but there are some errors and gaps in the answers. Depth in answers is not necessary.
- 80s: Good knowledge of all subjects, with minor errors but no significant gaps. Some depth, and the essay and tasting portion should show similar ability.
- 90s: Excellent knowledge level with no significant errors or gaps. Good depth to answers with evidence of independent thought. Excellent tasting and communication skills.

The following sections summarize your performance on the exam, and feedback on individual questions and beers is given on the following page. When reviewing this information, keep in mind that your final score was assigned only after an assessment of the entire exam. Since our understanding of brewing science and beer styles is constantly evolving, it may be possible to argue a few technical and stylistic details; however, your final score is not likely to change since your exam has already undergone several hours of evaluation by the most experienced judges and graders in the BJCP. Questions or appeals should be directed to the Exam Director.

	Weight	Result
Essay	70%	<u>77</u>
Taste	30%	<u>72</u>
Total	100%	<u>76</u>

RECOMMENDED STUDY

- *Homebrewing Vol. 1*, Al Korzonas
- *Dave Miller's Homebrewing Guide* or *The Complete Handbook of Home Brewing*, Dave Miller
- *How to Brew*, John Palmer (<http://howtobrew.com>)
- *Beer Companion*, Michael Jackson
- *Classic Beer Style Series*, Brewers Publications
- *New Brewing Lager Beer*, Greg Noonan
- *Principles of Brewing Science*, George Fix
- *Designing Great Beers*, Ray Daniels
- *Troubleshooting Special Issue, 1987 zymurgy* (vol. 10, no. 4)
- BJCP Study Guide
- Tasting/Judging Experience
- BJCP Style Guidelines

ESSAY PORTION

Style knowledge (50%)	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Technical knowledge (45%)	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Program knowledge (5%)	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Communication skills	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Skipped or overlooked questions or parts of questions?		YES	NO		

TASTE PORTION

Perception	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Descriptive Ability	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Feedback	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Completeness	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Scoring Accuracy	Master	National	Certified	Recognized	Apprentice
Failed to add, or incorrectly added taste portion?		YES	NO		

Pete Garofalo

Steve Piatz

04/23/2007

Pete Garofalo
BJCP Associate Director

Steve Piatz
BJCP Exam Director

Date

Revised 08/23/2005



BEER JUDGE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

c/o Celebrator Beer News - PO Box 375 - Hayward, CA 94543

WWW.BJCP.ORG

Examinee Number

page 2 of 4

BJCP EXAM FEEDBACK

Congratulations! We are happy to report that you passed the BJCP exam at the Certified level.

Your exam performance was consistent, showing a slightly greater level of proficiency in the essay portion, but with a good solid score in the tasting portion as well. Your answers to the style knowledge questions were very slightly weaker than those to the technical knowledge questions. That indicates that you have a good basic understanding of the brewing process, but need to work just a little more on your understanding of the style guidelines. That will come with a combination of tasting, judging, and study.

Some specific areas for improvement are identified below.

TASTING SECTION

- American Pale Ale: You scored this beer much too low, with a total score over eleven points below the proctors' consensus. Others perceived more than "very low" hop aroma, and did not find the diacetyl you mentioned. The proctors definitely noted hop flavor, but you said it was not apparent. You did a good job in using the available space, but avoid comments like "OK for style" that don't describe the beer.
- German Pilsner: You missed the noticeable skunkiness in the aroma of this light-struck beer. You also missed the very noticeable lactic sourness. As a result, your total score was far from the proctors; you were nine points higher than their consensus. You recommended increasing bitterness, but didn't suggest how to do that.
- Bavarian Hefeweizen: You were impressed with this beer and gave it a great score with no negative aspects at all. Still, you should have said why it only got 45 points total. Others did not find the hop bitterness you described, and which is unusual in this style. Your total score was high, being seven points above the proctors' consensus.
- Russian Imperial Stout: You got stuck on the sourness in the flavor and ignored everything else. All flavor attributes should be described, even if they are missing or not detected. Is the base beer OK? When giving feedback, try to be as specific as possible. Telling the brewer to "review sanitation" is weak advice, and not very helpful. Despite the unpleasant nature of having to taste and evaluate these real problem beers, they are the ones that need the most feedback. You did fine scoring it, being only one point from the proctors' consensus. You neglected the Stylistic Accuracy, Technical Merit, and Intangibles boxes on this sheet.

ESSAY SECTION

- You did very well on the BJCP question. You had the right idea on the three primary purposes of the BJCP, although you only identified one exactly. You correctly identified all the ranks, and got the required exam scores for each rank correct, except for Grand Master (it's 90%, the same as for Master). You had the right number of total experience points for four of the ranks, along with the minimum judging points for the same ranks. You got 12 out of 15 correct on the T/F questions. Note that it is polite (and preferred) to refrain from publicly deriding a "problem" beer; the steward does not have the sole responsibility for completing cover sheets; and ink is not preferred for completing scoresheets.
- You did fairly well on the style comparison question, but left out the required comments about the similarities and differences between the styles. Some of that could be inferred from your descriptions, but it was unclear. You also failed to list a commercial example for the altbier and the Irish Red ale example should have been Moling's, not Mooley's (be careful about slips like that, or people may think you're not as well informed as you really are). Your numbers (ABV, IBU, SRM) were all low for both the altbier and the Irish red. The altbier has low, not moderate hop aroma, and it is incorrect to flatly state that it can have no diacetyl and no esters. Maltiness is not the dominant altbier flavor. The possible presence of a caramel flavor in the Irish red should have been noted.
- Your answer on the Doppelbock recipe question was quite good. The IBUs were way off, as you were shooting for 38



BEER JUDGE CERTIFICATION PROGRAM

c/o Celebrator Beer News - PO Box 375 - Hayward, CA 94543

WWW.BJCP.ORG

Examinee Number

page 3 of 4

while the style guidelines call for 16-26. You specified appropriate hops, but should have included typical alpha acid percentages for your choices. You specified a decoction mash, but failed to describe how that is done. You omitted a description of the aroma, which is very malty like the flavor. The 30-minute flavor hop addition would be very unusual, although you correctly noted that there should be no aroma hops added. You did not specify a conversion efficiency (your recipe would have been well over your target 1.080 OG with a typical 75% efficiency). You did not specify a lagering temperature or use of a diacetyl rest, and you neglected to mention clarity (from lagering) or alcohol level in the flavor.

- You answered the low gravity ales beer style question well, with just a few weak areas. When describing the flavor of the Scottish 60/- style you said the peaty, smoked character could come from the water, which is incorrect. You neglected a commercial example for the mild, and could have included more types of malt flavor in its description (there are quite a few). Note that the sourness of a Berliner Weisse is noticeable in the aroma as well as the flavor. The distinguishing character of each style was only partially described.
- You did pretty well on the troubleshooting question, although your answer was brief. Bitterness is an essential characteristic of all beers, so you can't simply say it is caused by *overhopping*. You did not discuss how bitterness is perceived by the judge. DMS in a beer can also result from infection or slow wort cooling. You only mentioned yeast as a possible source of phenolics, although other causes are possible, such as chlorinated water, plastic hoses, or oversparging. Brettanomyces yeast would not be the most likely source of band-aid, medicinal, plastic phenolics.
- You did quite well on the beer geography question, with just a little room for improvement. There was no commercial example for the classic rauchbier (Schlenkerla Märzen would have been a good one). We knew that you meant zum Uerige for the Kölsch, but aside from the spelling problem, that's the wrong style from the wrong city (it's a Duesseldorf altbier). You left out any mention of the mouthfeel for the stout.
- You answered the mashing question in some detail, and most of it was correct. The saccharification process is actually when starches are converted to sugars. You correctly identified three mash profiles in terms of temperature, but neglected to describe how the infusion mashes are actually done. You also omitted the saccharification rest of the decocted portion during a decoction mash. The amylase enzymes operate over broad and overlapping temperature ranges, not just the specific ones mentioned.
- The describe/differentiate German lagers (Dortmunder Export, German Pilsner, and Munich Helles) question was fairly complete. You mentioned the specific hallmarks of each style, but did not provide adequate discussion of the similarities and differences between them. The gravity numbers and IBUs for the Dortmunder, as well as the IBUs for the Munich helles were much too low. You left out a mention of the hop flavor component of the Dortmunder, and didn't mention the malty character of the German Pilsner.
- You had a very good answer to the body/mouthfeel question. You correctly identified most of the major factors in determining body and mouthfeel, but were a little vague in how to control the mash to achieve body results. You omitted the role of different yeasts, as highly attenuative yeasts will have a notably different result than others.
- Finally, you did very well on the old ale scoresheet question. You could have commented on the head texture and color, as well as the presence of oxidation flavors. In the style grid, you marked "2" in a couple of sections, but this was (by definition) a classic "1" example all the way.

Overall, this was a very good exam. Your technical knowledge is good, so you should have no trouble in learning to be a better brewer and judge. A reasonable amount of judging practice and a little more study should enable you to achieve a the next level of score if you decide to take the exam again in the future. We wish you luck in your judging career.