



**MINUTES OF THE KCLC BREEDS COUNCIL MEETING HELD VIA  
MICROSOFT TEAMS AT 11.00 ON 26 MAY 2021**

**Present:**

Ms C Boggia	Mr S Byrne
Mr S Collier	Miss S Finnett
Mrs K Gorman	Mr N Gourley
Mrs J Iles-Hebbert	Mrs T Jackson
Mrs P Jeans-Brown	Mrs P Marston-Pollock
Mrs J Morgan	Mr E Paterson
Mr K Pursglove	Mr T Schaanning-Ling
Mrs J Sparrow	Mrs A Teasdale
Mrs B Thornley	Mr M Walshaw
Mrs SM Walton	Mr E Whitehill

**In Attendance:**

Miss D Deuchar – Head of Canine Activities  
Mr J Winnington – Manager, Breed Shows Team  
Mrs A Mitchell – Senior Committee Secretary  
Miss C Walsh – Officer, Breed Shows Team

**IN THE CHAIR:            MRS T JACKSON**

**NOTE: any recommendations made by the Breeds Liaison Council are subject to review by the Show Executive Committee and The Kennel Club Board, and will not come into effect unless and until Board approval has been confirmed.**

**ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1. Apologies for absence were received from Mrs J Holgate and Mr T Hutchings.

**ITEM 2. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON  
4 NOVEMBER 2020**

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2020 were approved as an accurate record.



### **ITEM 3. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS/MATTERS ARISING**

3. The Council noted the following updates on its recommendations:

Guest attendance

4. At its meeting held on 4 November 2020, the Council recommended that breed representatives who attend a meeting as a guest to present complex proposals should be allowed to stay for the whole meeting.
5. After consideration by the Show Executive Committee, the Board approved the following amendment to P Regulations:

Regulation P(B)4

**TO:**

Breed representatives may apply to attend a council meeting for a specific purpose. Such application, specifying the agenda item concerned, must be made in writing to the Secretary, at least one calendar month before the date of the meeting. Attendance by breed representatives will be at the discretion of the Breeds Council chairman. A representative attending for this purpose ~~will be present when the specific issue is being discussed and not for the whole meeting and~~ will have no vote.

(Deletions struck through)

(Effective 1 July 2021)

Kennel Club Liaison Council timeframes

6. At its meeting held on 4 November 2020, the Council recommended changes to the timeframes for the submission of items to the Council, and for issuing the agenda.
7. The proposal was supported by the Show Executive Committee, but as it would also have had an effect on other Kennel Club Liaison Councils, it was referred to both the Activities Committee and the Field Trials Committee. Neither of these committees were in support of any changes to the existing timeframes, and accordingly, no amendment would be made to the relevant regulations and the timeframes would remain as at present.

Communication campaign

8. At its meeting held on 4 November 2020, the Council supported a proposal to make the dog owning community more aware of its role and remit, in order to encourage engagement. The Show Executive Committee considered the proposal and whilst in support, it was noted that such an article would need to cover all six Liaison Councils and not just the Breeds Liaison Council.
9. It was in favour of an article being published in the Kennel Gazette, however consideration was still being given by The Kennel Club's marketing and communications team as to the specific content and timeframe.
10. A discussion took place as to whether such an article could be published more widely rather than solely in the Kennel Gazette, which was only circulated to members of The Kennel Club. It was suggested that it could also be published in The Kennel Club Journal, and in Our Dogs. It was accepted that The Kennel Club did not have control of what was published by external organisations, although it would be possible to make an approach to Our Dogs with a request for publication.
11. It was highlighted that the Council had previously made a suggestion that all breed clubs should have a standing item on agendas for their meetings to consider the submission of suitable matters



for discussion by the Council. It was agreed that it would be a positive step for this recommendation to be reiterated via a press release and the office undertook to raise this request with the relevant team.

12. The Council wished to stress its view that good communication links with the dog owning community were vital, and it was hoped that The Kennel Club would take any necessary steps to raise the profile of the Council and to encourage maximum engagement from breed clubs. However, the Council was reminded of the role of Council representatives and delegates in acting as a channel between breed clubs and The Kennel Club, and it was hoped that all present would take an active role in doing so.
13. The office undertook to convey the wishes of the Council to the marketing and communications team, with a view to widening the original request for publication within the Kennel Gazette to a broader range of channels.

#### Non-standard colours

14. At its meeting held on 4 November 2020, the Council recommended a proposal, under the terms of which, non-standard colours would appear at the bottom of the drop-down list of options when registering litters.
15. It noted that this change would be made in due course, but would be dependent on other priorities so it was not possible to specify a timeframe.
16. In response to a query as to why it was possible for any dogs of a non-standard colour to be registered, it was clarified that it was necessary to provide a facility for offspring of Kennel Club registered dogs to be registered, even where they were not of a desirable colour. This allowed for breeders and other enthusiasts to access accurate information regarding any individual dog. It would not be helpful for dogs of non-standard colours to be inaccurately registered as a standard colour, which would be the case if a non-standard option was not available.
17. There was a concern that providing such an option may lead to a perception that such colours or coat patterns (such as silver in Labrador Retrievers, or merle in Great Danes) were accepted, however it was hoped that use of the terminology 'non breed standard' would go some way towards addressing this.
18. A further query was raised as to why only some non-standard colours were included in the drop-down list of options for a breed, and not others. The office undertook to check, although it was acknowledged that it would not be desirable to return to a previous situation whereby the list of options available for any particular breed included every possible colour/coat pattern, and therefore was unduly long.

#### Health results on registration forms

19. At its meeting held on 4 November 2020, the Council had noted that there had been a change in policy whereby health results would no longer be shown on registration certificates, as up-to-date results of health tests would be available on The Kennel Club website. It had expressed its concern that this was not a positive step and it would prefer that the results should continue to be shown on the registration certificates.
20. The Council noted The Kennel Club's response that this change had not been made lightly, and that the intention was to present health information in a more complete, up-to-date and dynamic way that would be beneficial to both the puppy buyer and the breeder. When The Kennel Club started to collect health data, there were limited ways in which this information could be reported and the registrations certificates and Breed Record Supplement were the best solution at the time. However, information would only be correct at the time of printing.



21. Online data for an individual dog, including estimated breeding values, could now be updated in real time either with new test results or results of any new tests that could change or become available at a later date and for this reason the decision had been made not to continue to include the results on registration documents, where the information could not be viewed in context, or with any explanation regarding their meaning or relevance. The registration certificates would contain clear messaging that health test results and further information was available via the 'Health Tests Results Finder' tool on The Kennel Club's website.
22. Noting the above explanation, a concern was raised that it was not currently possible to print off a dog's health results in a clear and concise document which could be provided to puppy buyers. The Council was advised that The Kennel Club was aware of this issue and that relevant changes would be made, when possible, which would allow health results to be presented in a single printable document.

#### **ITEM 4. PROPOSALS**

##### Lists of breed clubs for new puppy owners

##### Proposer: Chow Chow Breed Council

23. The proposal was presented by Mr Paterson on behalf of the Chow Chow Breed Council, which wished to propose that The Kennel Club issue a list of registered breed clubs specific for the breed to new puppy owners, at the time when the owner is sent a Transfer of Ownership certificate. The proposal was supported by the Bulldog Breed Council.
24. The objective was to enable new owners of a breed to contact a club relevant to their breed, and would give the club the opportunity to encourage responsible ownership and to ensure owners were aware of suitable activities which were appropriate for the breed.
25. It was confirmed by the office that digital information provided to new owners on completion of change of ownership already included a link to training clubs, via the Find a Club service. This would also allow new owners the opportunity to find relevant information on breed clubs.
26. It was also suggested that breed clubs could be pro-active. In at least one breed, an initiative had been implemented whereby where a breeder was a member of the breed club, new puppy owners received a free one-year membership. Uptake had been limited but the initiative was nonetheless considered to be a positive step.

##### Lists of breed clubs on The Kennel Club website

##### Proposer: Irish Water Spaniel Association

27. The proposal was due to be presented by Mrs Holgate but as she was unable to attend, it was instead presented by Mrs Walton.
28. The Irish Water Spaniel Association wished to request that The Kennel Club supported breed clubs on its website by providing a list of such clubs and their contact information on the breed information pages with an explanation of their purpose. Currently, locating information about breed clubs via The Kennel Club's website was not a simple process and the Association considered that, as many people were not aware of the existence of breed clubs, they would be highly unlikely to look for them unless their attention was drawn to them. For this reason it would be helpful for suitable signposting towards breed clubs to be provided for prospective puppy buyers, in order to provide an additional source of guidance and information for them.



29. Further, the Association suggested that The Kennel Club's support in this matter would go some way to provide resources to potential owners, especially those looking for information about vulnerable native breeds which was not available elsewhere and which was often sought on social media.
30. The Council, whilst acknowledging the value in the suggestion, was concerned that there would be difficulties in ensuring that contact information for breed clubs included in breed information pages was kept up to date, and that considerable resources would be required for maintenance. As an alternative it was suggested that owners could be directed to the Find a Club facility via signposting which would state 'To find your local breed club, please visit Find a Club (link to be inserted) and search under <breed>.'
31. The Council was in agreement that this approach would address the issue, and requested the office to progress its recommendation via the website team.

#### Health schemes

##### Proposer: The Yellow Labrador Club

32. The Yellow Labrador Club, represented by Mrs Walton, wished the Council to consider a number of issues in relation to health schemes.
33. **Timeframes and costs:** many breeders had experienced long delays in obtaining hip and elbow scores via The Kennel Club (KC)/British Veterinary Association (BVA) scheme, and had chosen instead to carry out scoring via overseas schemes, in particular using schemes in Australia, the USA, and Sweden. Turnaround times using these schemes were very quick, and the costs low, in comparison to the UK scheme. The Club wished to highlight the potential for considerable confusion in the future, alongside concerns regarding possible detriment to the health of dogs, and it was hoped that breeders could be encouraged to continue to use the KC/BVA schemes.
34. For these reasons, the Yellow Labrador Club wished to propose that The Kennel Club should reassess the KC/BVA hip and elbow schemes in order to bring the costs and turnaround times to be more in line with the overseas schemes, and to ensure that the working of the scheme should be sufficiently robust enough to withstand any future events which may occasion the BVA office in London to close down.
35. Further, it suggested that The Kennel Club should consider facilitating the installation of an IT system at the BVA linked to The Kennel Club's registration database which could enable online submission by a breeder's veterinary surgeon of a form with the dog's details and digital images which could then be read and scored remotely by the BVA scrutineers. The turnaround time from submission to results being sent by email should be a maximum of three weeks. The Club was aware of the high standards and quality of the KC/BVA hip and elbow schemes and stressed that it should not be compromised.
36. The Council was advised that The Kennel Club was aware of the issues highlighted, and that the BVA had already provided assurances that it was currently reviewing the hip and elbow schemes in order to improve both turnaround times and had committed to improving the overall customer experience via the use of a digital process.
37. The Council was pleased to note that this was the case, but reiterated the necessity to ensure that the process was sufficiently robust. It requested that an update on progress be provided at its next meeting.
38. **Recording of results:** The Yellow Labrador Club proposed that The Kennel Club should keep a record of all hip and elbow results whether under the BVA scheme or under an equivalent scheme abroad. It should be possible to access these records via The Kennel Club website along with the



BVA results. Caveats should be published alongside non-UK results and, where possible, an equivalent, if the result had been scored by the KC/BVA scheme.

39. The Council noted that results obtained via the use of overseas schemes were currently noted on a dog's record, but could not be published as they were not directly comparable to results from the KC/BVA scheme.
40. Further, a concern was raised that in the case of a dog which had undergone hip or elbow scoring in its country of origin and had then been imported into the UK, the results were not visible on the dog's record. It therefore appeared that the dog had not been tested, which may lead to an incorrect perception that the owner had been lax should the dog be used as part of a breeding programme.
41. It was accepted that scores from overseas schemes could not be used to calculate Estimated Breeding Values (EBVs) due to the lack of direct comparability and the potential for EBVs to be distorted, however it was suggested that it would be considered helpful if such scores could be published under an 'other results' section so that the health status was able to be verified.
42. The Council was in full support of the publication of all hip and elbow scores, albeit with caveats as necessary. Following a vote, by a majority, the proposal was recommended for approval.
43. A further suggestion was made that the same rationale should be applied to testing schemes for all health tests, which should be published even if not carried out by a laboratory approved by The Kennel Club. This was noted.
44. **Comparison between schemes:** It was suggested a study should be carried out to establish the comparability of each overseas scheme to the KC/BVA scheme. Scores from KC/BVA and the overseas scheme on plates for hips and elbows for the same dog should be compared, a report prepared and published in the relevant health section of The Kennel Club website.
45. The Council was pleased to note that some comparison work was already being undertaken, and it hoped that the results would be available in due course.

## **ITEM 5. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

46. No items for discussion had been submitted.

## **ITEM 6. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### Kennel Club website

47. A query was raised as to progress in regard to addressing the issues being experienced with the website. Mrs Jackson reported that following two meetings with The Kennel Club, and other correspondence, some progress was being made, albeit slow. It was not possible to provide any time frames as to when all outstanding issues would be resolved, as this was dependent upon priorities and the available resources.
48. The Council was pleased to note that the issue of three-generation pedigrees being accessible when checking the health status of a dog had now been resolved. Issues relating to the use of asterisks after a dog's name in the Breed Records Supplement and on The Kennel Club website, to



denote puppies of 'impure or unverified origins', which was highlighted at the Council's previous meeting, had also been resolved.

Future meetings

49. It was not yet clear as to whether future Council meetings would be held in The Kennel Club office, or remotely. There was some support for online meetings which removed the necessity for time-consuming travel for delegates. It was likely that the Council's November meeting would be held once again via Microsoft Teams, but this would be confirmed nearer the time.

**ITEM 7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

50. The next KCLC Breeds Council meeting would be held on 3 November 2021. Agenda items must be received by 5 August 2021.

The meeting closed at 12.15 pm with thanks to all present.