

**MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB OBEDIENCE LIAISON COUNCIL**  
**MEETING HELD AT 10.30 AM ON 6 JULY 2016**  
**AT THE KENNEL CLUB, CLARGES STREET**

**PRESENT:**

Mr R Burbidge	Midlands
Mrs M Ray	Midlands
Mrs B Smith	Midlands
Mrs A Benoist	North East
Mrs D Lavender	North East
Mr M McCartney	Northern Ireland
Mr J McIntosh	Scotland
Mrs J Jessop	Wales
Miss F Godfrey	South East and East Anglia
Mr R Harlow	South East and East Anglia
Mr P Lubbi	South East and East Anglia
Mrs L Turner	South and South West

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

Miss D Deuchar	Senior Manager – Canine Activities Governance
Mrs A Mitchell	Committee Secretary – Working Dog Activities Team

**IN THE CHAIR: MR R HARLOW**

**ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1. Apologies for absence had been received from Mr J Farr, Mrs A Height, Mrs C Patrick, and Mr S Rutter. It was noted that Mrs Holness (South and South West) had resigned from the Council and that the office was in the process of seeking nominations for a replacement representative.

**ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2016 were approved as an accurate record.

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

3. Participation of YKC Members in Obedience  
At its previous meeting, the Council had considered ways in which YKC members may be encouraged to participate in Obedience.

4. The Council was advised that Mrs Turner and Mr Burbidge had been in contact with the YKC department in respect of this issue. All Council members had been requested to suggest names of individuals who may be prepared to provide training for YKC members, or to judge YKC classes. The list of names received had been forwarded to the YKC office. It was hoped that if possible some 'high profile' Obedience competitors would be prepared to offer their services. Mrs Turner had also compiled a list of 'child-friendly' training clubs in her own area and other Council members were encouraged to do the same.
5. Some concern was expressed regarding the YKC Autumn Dog Training Weekend to be held in Newark (Notts.) 28-30 October 2016. The event offered YKC members an opportunity to participate in a number of different canine activities, however it appeared that no representatives from Obedience had been invited to provide training to attendees. Mrs Lavender confirmed that she had been in contact with the YKC office regarding this matter. The office agreed to make further investigations.

#### Harsh handling

6. This issue had been discussed at the Council's previous meeting and it had been acknowledged that there were differing views on what constituted harsh handling, but that in the ring a Judge's decision was paramount. Any behaviour considered to be unacceptable should be reported to the Kennel Club, and the handler dismissed from the ring.
7. However, a concern was expressed that some judges may be misunderstanding the position on the matter, as it appeared that in some cases, handlers had been dismissed from the ring as a result of any physical handling of their dogs. It was highlighted that touching a dog in between exercises was permissible and should not be penalised unless considered to be harsh or cruel.
8. It was acknowledged that an accusation of harsh handling was serious in nature, and the Council wished to strongly emphasise that a judge may only dismiss a competitor where he or she was clearly of the opinion that harsh handling had taken place. It was also reiterated that where a competitor had been dismissed from the ring, it was essential that the judge made an immediate report in the show's Incident Book.
9. It was emphasised that it was not appropriate for a judge to dismiss a competitor solely because he or she was not in favour of the competitor's method of training or handling.
10. Should an onlooker have concerns regarding the way in which a dog was being handled, the matter should be reported to the show secretary or the Chief Steward who would make further investigations. It was highlighted that any concerns should be dealt with via the correct channels and not via comments made on social media.

#### Results of recommendations

11. It was noted that no recommendations had been made by the Council at its previous meeting.

**ITEM 4. TO NOTE THE TABLED REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE ACTIVITIES SUB-COMMITTEE DURING 2015**

12. The Council noted the report.
13. The office confirmed that an advertisement for applicants for the role of Accredited Trainer for Obedience had been issued in October 2014 but had not received a high number of responses. The criteria included the necessity for applicants to be able to demonstrate judging knowledge and experience at all levels, including Championship.

**ITEM 5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE ACTIVITIES SUB-COMMITTEE**

14. The Council noted that the General Committee approved the following amendment to Regulation G23 which came into effect on 1 July 2016:

**TO:**

**Control of Dogs-**

The owner, exhibitor, handler or other person in charge of a dog at Kennel club licensed events must at all times ensure that the dog is kept under proper control whilst at the licensed venue, including its environs, car and caravan parks and approaches. This Regulation applies before (at any time during the set up period at the venue), during the event and afterwards (at any time during the breakdown of the event). **The mating of bitches within the precincts of the competition, as stipulated above, is forbidden.**

(Insertion in bold)

**ITEM 6. ACTIVITIES HEALTH & WELFARE SUB-GROUP**

15. The Council noted that a report from Mrs Patrick on the recent work of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group following its meetings on 27 January 2016 and 1 June 2016 was not available.

**KC Guidelines for the Management & Training Of Dogs Taking Part In Canine Activities**

16. The Council noted that use of the finalised version of the above document had been approved by the General Committee and was available on the Kennel Club's website at:  
[http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media/742852/guidelines\\_2016\\_for\\_owners\\_and\\_handlers\\_with\\_dogs\\_taking\\_part\\_in\\_canine\\_activities.pdf](http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media/742852/guidelines_2016_for_owners_and_handlers_with_dogs_taking_part_in_canine_activities.pdf)
17. A Press Release had been issued to draw it to the attention of all competitors.

### Numbers of participants

18. The Sub-Group wished to draw the attention of the Council to a report which detailed the number of competitors taking part in different disciplines over the course of a typical weekend. The numbers were as follows:
  - Agility: approximately 4,000
  - Working Trials: approximately 100 (not 190 as stated on agenda)
  - Obedience: approximately 1,000
  - Heelwork to Music: approximately 150
19. The Sub-Group considered that the above information provided a valuable context to the number of injuries reported.

## **ITEM 7. OBEDIENCE STRATEGY WORKING PARTY**

### Meeting with Obedience Show Secretaries

20. The Council noted the minutes of the meeting with Obedience Show Secretaries held on 16 February 2016.
21. There was some concern that all of the secretaries present at the meeting had been from the South East of England, however the Council was assured that the objective of the meeting had been to gather information on the issues facing show secretaries throughout the UK. The views expressed by the secretaries present had been used to assist the Obedience Strategy Working Party in identifying important issues, and to consider how they may be addressed. Any recommendations made by the Working Party at any time would be referred to the Council for detailed consideration.
22. It was emphasised that all Council members were encouraged to hold regional meetings to assess the views of competitors and show organisers within their own areas. Any issues raised via this route may be referred either to the Working Party or direct to the Council, as appropriate.
23. It was accepted that the discipline had changed over the years and that competitors had access to other dog hobbies and sports, and that it was therefore essential for Obedience to develop and progress in a way which would retain existing competitors and attract new ones. It was anticipated that consultation with the Obedience community would assist the Council in defining and implementing a clear strategy which would achieve this objective.

### Obedience Strategy Working Party

24. The Council noted the minutes of the Obedience Strategy Working Party following its meeting on 11 April 2016, and discussed its recommendations.

### Catalogues

25. The Council discussed the Working Party's recommendation that the necessity for the publication of catalogues should be removed, and be replaced with a marked running order (for Championship Class C only) to be sent to the Kennel Club, detailing the name of each dog, and its owner(s) and handler.

26. It was noted that the Kennel Club did not require the submission of Open Show catalogues, and that the only records retained within the office were those relating to Championship C classes. Should a report be received regarding an incident at a show where details of a competitor or a dog were required, the information would be requested from the show society concerned, noting that the society was obliged to retain entry forms for a twelve-month period following the show.
27. There were mixed views on the issue. There was some concern that the removal of the necessity for publication of catalogues would have only a minimal effect on cost, as the workload of show secretaries or show processors in collating entries would not significantly change, although it was accepted that there would be a reduced cost for printing.
28. Some competitors liked to be able to check the breeding of competing dogs but the requirement for details of the sire and dam were no longer required on entry forms so this information no longer appeared in catalogues. In practice, few catalogues were purchased at shows.
29. It was noted that it would still be necessary for show organisers to provide information to judges regarding the names of competitors and their dogs for the purpose of providing write-ups of those placed in their classes. It was clarified that under the terms of the proposal, should a show society wish to produce a catalogue for its own purposes, it would still be permitted to do so.
30. After some discussion, a vote took place and the Council **recommended** for approval the following proposed amendments to Regulations G9. and G27.:

Regulation G9.

**TO:**

9. Documentation.

At every Obedience Show the following documents must be available:

- a. The licence for the Show, which must be clearly displayed.
- b. A current Public Liability Insurance Document, which must be clearly displayed.
- c. A copy of Kennel Club Rules and relevant Obedience Regulations.
- d. A copy of the Schedule ~~and Catalogue~~ for the Show.
- e. The completed entry forms for the Show.
- f. A Kennel Club Incident Book, containing details of all incidents occurring at the show, a copy of which must be submitted to the Kennel Club within 14 days.

(Deletion struck through)

Regulation G27

**TO:**

~~27. Catalogue.-~~

~~The show organisers must publish a Catalogue for the Show containing:~~

- ~~a. On the front outside cover or title page, the name of the show organisers, the type of Show as described on the Licence, and any additional title for which~~

~~prior permission has been given by the General Committee of the Kennel Club; the names and addresses, or email addresses, of the Guarantors of the Show, except in the case of G 9 Shows where classes are provided for exhibits other than dogs, where the names and addresses need only be printed at the head of the dog section.~~

- ~~b. The classes for each test, the numbering of which must follow that of the Schedule.~~
- ~~c. Championship Obedience Shows Only, Classes with Obedience Certificates on offer must be specified.~~
- ~~d. The names of the judges of each class.~~
- ~~e. An alphabetical index containing the names of exhibitors, the number and name of each exhibit and the numbers of the classes in which it is entered, giving a separate line to the name of each exhibitor, and particulars of each exhibit as given on the entry form completed by the exhibitor. The number and name of each exhibit must be given in each class for which it is entered.~~
- ~~f. Name, address and telephone number of the Veterinary Surgeon, Practitioner or Practice supporting the Show.~~

~~Championship — Within 14 days of the close of the show, a copy of the official Catalogue for the show, containing a full and correct list of all the entries, with all the awards correctly marked, must be submitted to the Kennel Club.~~

~~Open and Limited — A copy of the official Catalogue for each show, containing a full and correct list of all the entries, with all the awards correctly marked, must be retained by the organisations for at least one year from the date of the show and must be forwarded to the Kennel Club if requested, together with any other documents.~~

**Marked Running Orders Championship Class C - The Show Society must publish a marked running order containing the following:-**

- a. On the front outside cover or page, the name of the Society, the type, venue and date of the competition as described on the licence and any additional title for which prior permission has been given by the General Committee of the Kennel Club; the names and addresses of the Guarantors of the competition, and the Secretary's name, address and telephone number where appropriate, and the name of the Chief Steward.**
- b. Championship Class C - An alphabetical index containing the names of competitors, the number and name of each exhibit and the number of the Championship Class C in which it is entered, giving a separate line to the name of each competitor, and the full particulars of the exhibit as given on the entry form completed by the competitor.**
- c. Submission of Running Order - Within fourteen days of the close of the Show, a copy of the official marked running order, containing a full and correct list of the entries in the required classes as detailed above, with all the awards correctly marked, must be submitted to the Kennel Club. (Deletions struck through. Insertions in bold.)**

### Capped Classes

31. The Council noted the Working Party's proposal for the introduction of capped classes whereby organisers of Open and Limited shows would be able to set a capping level on the entries to be accepted in any standard or special class, and to decline entries received after the capping level had been reached. The main objective of the proposal was to offer flexibility in the way in which shows were run, and to encourage the running of Open shows by societies which had access to limited space at venues, as the provision of capped classes would result in a predictable number of entries which would enable easy planning of logistical arrangements such as the number of rings and judges required. Consequently, it was hoped that the number of shows would increase, and that as results would count towards progression, such shows would be attractive to competitors.
32. It was also hoped that the option of holding Obedience shows with capped classes would prove attractive to organisers of Open and Championship breed shows, noting that in the past many such societies had held Obedience shows but no longer did so due to the unpredictable nature of entries and the resulting implications in respect of planning issues.
33. It was noted that show organisers may choose to cap entries in one or more classes but would not be required to cap entries for all classes unless they wished to do so.
34. In response to a query it was confirmed that a show may consist of a single class should that be the wish of the organising society, but it was noted that this was already the case under the current Regulations.
35. There was a concern that there may be difficulties for competitors with more than one dog, for example in the case of a handler with three dogs, where the entries for two of them were accepted but not the third. However it was noted that show organisers would have discretion to adjust the capping level by a maximum of 10% after the closing date of entries.
36. Another concern related to the issue of progression as some people, although not against the concept of capped classes, did not consider that wins should count towards progression.
37. There were mixed views on the issue but it was acknowledged that the proposal would allow for a greater degree of flexibility for show societies. It was accepted that there would be no advantage to those societies which had access to adequate facilities but that societies in this position, or those which were not in favour of capped classes for other reasons, were not obliged to schedule them.
38. After a discussion of the issues concerned, a vote took place, and the Council **recommended** for approval the introduction of new Regulation G(A)13 as follows:

Insertion of new Regulation G(A)13

**TO:**

### **Regulation G(A)13 Capped Classes.**

- a. **Organisers of Open Obedience shows and Limited Obedience shows may set a capping level on the entries to be accepted in any standard or special class, and may decline entries received after the capping level has been reached.**
- b. **Wins and places in standard classes capped in accordance with this Regulation will count towards progression and Obedience Warrant points.**
- c. **The capping level must be set at a minimum of 35 entries received. There is no maximum level at which a cap may be set. Capped classes may be split into two or more divisions in accordance with Regulation G30.b.**
- d. **The capping level for each capped class must be clearly specified in the show schedule.**
- e. **The capping level applied may be adjusted upwards by a maximum of 10% after the closing date of a show at the discretion of the show organisers. Capping levels may not be adjusted downwards after publication of the schedule except with the prior permission of the General Committee of the Kennel Club.**
- f. **Where total entries received exceed a capping level, entries must be processed in the order received. Processing of entry forms, and of online entries where applicable, must be managed so that the date of receipt of each entry is recorded. (It is permissible to set different opening and closing dates for online entries from those applying to postal entries.)**
- g. **Entry fees for entries which are received after the capping level has been exceeded must be refunded in full.**
- h. **Entry forms must allow competitors to specify, if their entry for any capped class is declined because the capping level has been reached:-**
  - (i) that they wish the dog to remain entered in all other classes, or**
  - (ii) that they wish their entire entry for the dog in question to be cancelled, or**
  - (i) that they wish their entire entry for all dogs they have entered at the show to be cancelled.**

**In such cases the relevant entry fees must be refunded in full.**
- i. **Notifications under Regulation G24.g (dogs which have progressed to the next class) must be processed in order of the date of receipt of the notification.**

(Insertions in bold)

### Running orders

39. The Council noted the Working Party's view that conducting draws was very time consuming for show secretaries, and considered its recommendation that it would be beneficial to reduce running orders to 5 dogs. The Working Party was of the view that this would reduce the administrative burden on show secretaries, and would have no adverse effect on delays in judging.
40. The Council accepted that reducing the running order would reduce the workload for show secretaries, but considered that doing so may result in increased delays in judging. It was suggested that rather than reducing the running order, in some



cases a longer running order may be beneficial, or one based on a sliding scale depending on the number of entries in the relevant class.

41. A vote took place and the proposal was not supported by the Council.

Discussion item - Bonus Wins

42. The Council discussed the issue of bonus wins, or 'freebies' whereby, due to entries closing well in advance of shows, handlers having qualified out of a class were obliged to continue to compete in that class for some time, and as a result, in some cases, blocked wins by other handlers.
43. It was requested to consider suggestions from the Obedience Strategy Working Party in respect of the possible introduction of a system similar to that used in Agility whereby dogs qualifying out of a class within a set period prior to a show would be required to contact the show secretary and would be moved into the next class.

The main points suggested by the Working Party were as follows:

- Any wins gained up to 2-3 weeks prior to a show to be counted for the purposes of class eligibility
  - Any handler achieving a class win within this time frame to advise the show secretary who would move them into the appropriate class
  - This would allow show secretaries adequate time to prepare running orders, especially as these were now published online rather than being sent out individually
  - No necessity for any amendment to closing dates which could still be 6-8 weeks prior to the show
  - Similar system already operated in Agility
  - Use of 'ghost entries' in order to allow for freshly-qualified dogs to be allocated spaces within a class
44. The suggestion received a mixed reaction from the Council. It was accepted that the issue of progression was problematic for some handlers and that it was necessary to address the issue, but it was essential that any solution must be fair to all involved.
45. Some show secretaries had been concerned that there may be additional work involved in the run-up to the show and that there may be possible effects on running orders, and also that show processors involved in a number of shows may face an overwhelming volume of work at certain times. In geographical areas where there were few shows, competitors welcomed the opportunity to work 'freebies' to gain additional experience in a relatively relaxed manner before moving up to the next class. There was also some confusion as to the suggestion for 'ghost entries' and the way in which this would work. It was clarified that 'ghost entries' were blank spaces within a class.
46. It was acknowledged that it was not possible simply to prevent handlers from working in classes for which they had entered, even if they had qualified out of that class.

47. A number of suggestions were made as to ways in which the issue may be addressed. These included:
- Introduction of an optional system for progression on points. It was noted that the Obedience Strategy Working Party would be discussing this issue.
  - Where there was a run-off for first place, both handlers (being on equal marks) could claim a first place for the purposes of progression regardless of the outcome of the run-off.
  - Encouragement for shows to move the date for closing of entries as close as possible to the date of the show as this would reduce the number of 'freebie' classes available to a handler. It was noted that closing dates varied greatly, some being 8 weeks or more prior to the show, whereas others closed much nearer to the date of the show. However it was agreed that it would not be possible to be too prescriptive on the issue as it should be borne in mind that show secretaries worked on a voluntary basis in addition to full-time jobs, and that in some cases long lead times were necessary to allow them adequate preparation time. There was also a concern regarding show processors and their ability to handle a heavy workload at busy times should lead times be shortened. It was agreed that the views of show processors should be sought as to the practicalities of doing so.
48. The Council agreed that the matter should be referred back to the Obedience Strategy Working Party for further detailed consideration. A report would be provided to the Council at its meeting in January 2017.

#### **ITEM 8. ACTIVITIES JUDGES WORKING PARTY**

49. The Council noted a written report from Mrs Garner on the Judges Working Party following its meeting on 19 April 2016.

#### **ITEM 9. PROPOSALS**

##### Proposed additional wording to Regulation G5.

50. The proposal, which had been submitted by Newbury and District Dog Training Society, was proposed by Mrs Turner and seconded by Miss Godfrey.
51. The Society wished to propose an amendment to the above Regulation in order to address the issue of clashing shows.
52. It was confirmed that the current policy in respect of show dates was that any show may object to another show likely to take place on the same day within a 100 mile radius. In many cases issues regarding clashing shows were dealt with by means of agreement between the societies concerned, but where this could not be achieved, the date would be allocated to the society which had historically held it. Where a resolution could not be reached by this means, and where the societies were unable to reach agreement, the matter would be referred to the Activities Sub-Committee for a final decision.

53. Applications for show dates were requested by the office well in advance of the shows taking place. The office confirmed that it was currently requesting applications for dates for Open and Limited shows due to take place in 2018.
54. It was noted that office resources did not allow for routine checks to be made on every application to check whether a date was historically held by a particular society. It was accepted that there was a potential problem for societies which had applied for a particular date, but where a subsequent application for the same date was subsequently made by another society. In such cases the first society would not be aware that another application had been made for the date and it was therefore not in a position to object. The office confirmed that there was no resource within the system to flag up such situations, and that the onus therefore remained on societies to lodge objections to any shows within a 100 mile radius if there was any likelihood of them being held on the same date.
55. It was noted that a 'Find a Show' facility was currently under development which would be available on the Kennel Club website, and which would allow any individual to search for any shows of a particular type taking place on that date. Once this facility became available, it was intended that a further facility would be developed which would allow for show secretaries to apply for show dates online. The Council agreed that this would be a helpful resource.
56. The Council agreed to **defer** further consideration of the proposal which would be referred to the Obedience Strategy Working Party for discussion, after which a report would be made to the Council at its meeting in January 2017.

Proposal for a new scheduled class

57. Miss Godfrey proposed and presented the item on behalf of Ms Clare Williams. The proposal was seconded by Mr McCartney.
58. Ms Williams wished the Council to consider the addition of a new class between Beginners and Novice, suggesting that it be named Pre-Novice or Intermediate.
59. It was acknowledged that Ms Williams had put considerable effort into preparation of the proposal and she was thanked for this. The rationale was based on feedback from competitors regarding the difficulty of making the transition from competing in Beginners classes to Novice classes.
60. The Council did not support the proposal as outlined by Ms Williams but it was sympathetic to the reasoning behind it, and to its intentions. It acknowledged the difficulties faced by competitors moving from Beginners to Novice, and was in agreement that it was important to support and encourage such handlers in order to prevent them from becoming disillusioned and leaving the discipline.
61. Miss Godfrey agreed to submit an alternative proposal to the Council at its January meeting in order to address the issues highlighted by Ms Williams.

## **ITEM 10. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

62. No discussion items had been received from individuals or societies.

## **ITEM 11. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY**

63. The Council was of the view that a number of important issues were currently under consideration and that it was not necessary to add additional items to the Five Year Strategic Plan at present.

## **ITEM 12. OBEDIENCE INFORMATION STAND AT CRUFTS**

64. The Council received a report from Miss Benoist and Mrs Lavender regarding the Obedience Information Stand at Crufts.
65. The stand had proved to be very successful and had attracted a number of positive enquiries from handlers with a wide range of experience. The pictures used had been well received, and the 'Introduction to Obedience' leaflet had been popular.
66. A suggestion was made that videos of dogs working would be of interest to visitors to the stand, but that this would require the use of a small screen. A free-standing tablet would not be suitable for the purpose for security reasons.
67. The Council discussed the position regarding seats in the Obedience ring at Crufts as it appeared that some people had been discouraged from spectating as it had not been clear that some seating was available free of charge. Noting that the suggestion to charge for seating had originally come from the Council, it was agreed that more effort should be made to attract spectators to the areas of free seating. This could be achieved by way of pop-up boards at ring entrances welcoming spectators, and making it clear that free of charge seats were available. However there was some concern that spectators entering and exiting should not cause any disturbance to dogs working in the ring at the time.
68. It was noted that there was currently no budget available for the stand from the Kennel Club but it was suggested that efforts could be made to attract sponsorship to cover any necessary costs, or that a budget could be provided by Crufts. Mr Harlow agreed to raise the issue with the Chairman of the Crufts Sub-Committee, and a report would be provided for the Council at its next meeting.

## **ITEM 13. CRUFTS COMMENTARY**

69. The Council discussed the commentary provided at Crufts during the Obedience Championships.
70. It was accepted that there had been some difficulties in providing commentary and that although it had generally been welcomed by spectators, there was room

for improvement. It was considered that this could be achieved by way of careful planning and preparation, and that good communication with other parties involved in the event was essential. Training for future commentators would also be of value in improving the quality of commentary.

71. The Council was in agreement that commentary during the Obedience Championships had been a positive development and was of the view that subject to the above considerations, it should take place again in future. A number of suggestions were made regarding suitable commentators.

#### **ITEM 14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

##### Stay judging

72. The Council was requested to consider an issue regarding the marking of stays. It appeared that some judges were of the view that should a dog change position during a stay, such as moving during the sit stay from a sit to a down and then back into a sit, the dog should only be marked for the time it remained in the incorrect position. This practice, whilst not widespread, was causing some confusion and the Council was requested to provide clarification.
73. The Regulation made it clear that a minor movement such as a dog moving a foot, or sniffing the ground, did not constitute a broken stay. However, the Council wished to reiterate that should the dog move out of the position required i.e. the sit or the down, the stay should be considered to be broken from that point, and marks deducted accordingly. Any further behaviours from the dog from this point forward, such as returning to its original position, leaving the ring, or interfering with another dog, should not result in any amendment to the number of marks deducted at the point at which the stay had been broken. It was agreed that a press release should be issued as soon as possible to provide clarification on this issue.
74. However, although it considered that the current Regulation regarding stays was quite clear, the Council agreed that that it might be helpful for it to include a statement to the effect that stays must be marked according to a marking chart provided by the Kennel Club and which would be available on the Kennel Club website.
75. It was agreed that the Obedience Strategy Working Party would prepare a formal proposal for an amendment to G Regulations for consideration by the Council at its next meeting. Guidance would also be provided as to how stays should be marked when stay times had been shortened due to circumstances at a show.
76. A brief discussion took place regarding the proposal recommended by the Council at its meeting in January 2014 to reduce stay times in classes B and C. The proposal had not been approved by the Activities Sub-Committee despite it having been unanimously supported by the Council. It was noted that there was a two year moratorium on any proposals which had not been approved by the General Committee being discussed again. Where such an issue was discussed again, any further recommendations made to the Activities Sub-Committee

should be accompanied by a clear rationale explaining the reasons for the proposed amendments.

Competitors leaving the ring to feed their dog and returning to the ring during training rounds

77. The views of the Council were sought regarding the above practice. It was agreed that it should be at the discretion of individual judges, but that if doing so, competitors should show consideration to others and should ensure that pots of food remained outside the ring at all times, and did not cause a distraction to other dogs.

Amendments to Regulations on a trial basis

78. A query was raised as to whether it would be possible to consider, where appropriate, the introduction of amendments to Regulations being made on a trial basis, on the understanding that the basis of the trial would need to be clearly defined. The objective was to allow time to assess the results of an amendment before implementing it on a permanent basis.
79. It was noted that there was no precedent for such a process, but that some F Regulations relating to breed showing had been suspended for a trial period in order to assess the effects prior to any formal amendments being made. It was likely that the General Committee would consider any such proposals on their own merits and the possible implications on the discipline in question, and on other disciplines.

Details of sire and dam

80. Noting that the Council had recommended earlier in the meeting that the necessity for show societies to produce catalogues should be removed, a query was raised as to whether it would be permissible for societies to continue to request information regarding the sire and dam of competing dogs on entry forms. It was confirmed that they may do so if they wished. It was suggested that details of the breeding of dogs on the Activity Register should be publicly available as they were for dogs on the Breed Register. The office agreed to investigate the possibility although it was unclear as to whether a genuine necessity for this existed.

**ITEM 15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

81. The Council noted that the date of the next meeting would be confirmed in September 2016.
82. Those present were thanked for attending. There being no further business, the meeting closed at 16.35 p.m.

**R HARLOW**  
**Chairman**

## THE KENNEL CLUB'S STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

**“To raise the relevance of the Kennel Club in the eyes of the public at large, dog owners and those who take part in canine events, so as to be better able ‘*to promote in every way the general improvement of dogs.*’ This objective to be achieved through:-**

- **Ensuring that the Kennel Club is the first port of call on all canine matters.**
- **Improving canine health and welfare.**
- **Popularising canine events focusing on the retention of existing participants and the attracting of new.**
- **Achieving a widening of the Kennel Club membership base.**
- **Encouraging the development of all those concerned with dogs through education and training.**
- **Encouraging more people to provide input in the Kennel Club’s decision making process.**

## Kennel Club Obedience Liaison Council Representatives

1 January 2016 to 31 December 2018

**Midlands**, Ms B Smith, 99 Highfields Road,  
Chasetown, Staffs, WS7 4QS, Tel: 01543 674238  
Email: [beverley.j.smith@bt.com](mailto:beverley.j.smith@bt.com)

**Midlands**, Mr R Burbidge  
(Contact details to be confirmed)

**Midlands**, Mrs M Ray, 13 Helmdon Close, Rugby,  
Warks, CV21 1RS, Tel: 01788 561253  
Email: [draped@aol.com](mailto:draped@aol.com)

**South & South West**, Vacant

**South & South West**, Mrs L Turner, The  
Bungalow, 25 Sandys Close, Basingstoke, RG22  
6AR Tel: 01256 816388  
Email: [lilian.doghouse25@btinternet.com](mailto:lilian.doghouse25@btinternet.com)

**South East & East Anglia**, Mr R Harlow,  
Starhaven, Sundridge Road, Chevening,  
Sevenoaks, Kent TN14 6HB, Tel: 01732 462216  
Email: [rharlow@btconnect.com](mailto:rharlow@btconnect.com)

**South East & East Anglia**, Mr P Lubbi, Layash, 2  
Celia Crescent, Ashford, Middlesex, TW15 3NW,  
Tel: 01784 258334  
Email: [layash2@aol.com](mailto:layash2@aol.com)

**Wales**, Mr J Farr, Cilfynydd, Llanddowror, St  
Clears, Carmarthen, Carmarthenshire, SA33 4HH,  
Tel: 07858 679053  
Email: [johnfarr\\_101@fsmail.net](mailto:johnfarr_101@fsmail.net)

**Wales**, Mrs J Jessop, Broad Eaves, Chepstow  
Road, Langstone, Newport, Gwent, NP18 2JP, Tel:  
01633 411449  
Email: [jenniferjessop@aol.com](mailto:jenniferjessop@aol.com)

**Scotland**, Mrs C Patrick, 10 Glencaple Avenue,  
Dumfries, Scotland, DG1 4SJ, Tel: 01387 259783  
Email: [cpatrick1984@outlook.com](mailto:cpatrick1984@outlook.com)

**Scotland**, Mr J McIntosh, 45 Shawstonfoot Road,  
Bellside, Cleland, N Lanarkshire ML1 5NY, Tel:  
01698 860358

**North East**, Miss A Benoist, 43 Canterbury Way,  
Wideopen, Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE13 6JH, Tel:  
07702 469743  
Email: [girlsplusone@yahoo.com](mailto:girlsplusone@yahoo.com)

**North East**, Mrs D Lavender, 63 Weetshaw Close,  
Shafton, Nr Barnsley, S72 8PZ, Tel: 01226  
715980 or 07719 664792  
Email: [debralavender60@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:debralavender60@yahoo.co.uk)

**North West**, Mr S Rutter, 59 Chorley Road,  
Blackrod, Bolton, Lancashire BL6 5JU Tel: 07812  
654240 Email: [steve.rutter@tiscali.co.uk](mailto:steve.rutter@tiscali.co.uk)

**North West**, Mrs A Height, 40 Church Road, Platt  
Bridge, Wigan WN2 3TB Tel: 01942 867010  
Email: [ann.pete1@virginmedia.com](mailto:ann.pete1@virginmedia.com)

**South East & East Anglia**, Ms F Godfrey, 25  
Kevington Drive, Orpington, Kent BR5 2NT Tel:  
01689 876112  
Email: [fran.godfrey@uk.pwc.com](mailto:fran.godfrey@uk.pwc.com)

**Northern Ireland**, Mr M McCartney, Glen-Craig,  
28 Moneybroom Road, Lisburn, Co. Antrim, BT28  
2QP, Tel: 028 9262 2992  
Email: [glenrcraigdogs@hotmail.com](mailto:glenrcraigdogs@hotmail.com)