

**MINUTES OF THE OBEDIENCE LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON
THURSDAY 12 JANUARY 2017 AT 10.30 AM IN THE BOARDROOM, THE
KENNEL CLUB, CLARGES STREET**

PRESENT

Mrs A Benoist
Mr R Burbidge-Grant
Mr J Farr
Mrs F Godfrey
Mrs J Jessop
Mrs D Lavender
Mr P Lubbi
Mr M McCartney
Mr J McIntosh
Mrs C Patrick
Mrs M Ray
Mrs K Russell
Mr S Rutter
Mrs B Smith
Mrs L Turner

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss D Deuchar	Senior Manager - Canine Activities Governance
Mrs A Mitchell	Senior Committee Secretary - Working Dog Activities Team
Mr C Potter	Committee Support Administrator - Working Dog Activities Team

IN THE CHAIR

MRS L TURNER

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies for absence had been received from Mrs K Allen and Mr R Harlow.

ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

2. A query was raised in respect of the way in which the results of votes were recorded in the minutes. It was clarified by the office that where a vote was taken in respect of a proposal, it was not Kennel Club policy to record numbers of votes for and against, or to specify whether a Chairman's casting vote had been necessary. This was to allow delegates to vote as they wished, whether or not this reflected the

wishes of those within their areas, and to protect them from speculation as to the way in which specific individuals had voted.

3. This led to a discussion as to whether delegates' votes should reflect the views expressed in area meetings. It was accepted that whilst delegates should take into account such views, they were free to vote as they saw fit having taken into consideration other views expressed during the Council's discussions.
4. It was noted that any Council discussions remained confidential until such time as the minutes of the meeting were published. Details of comments made by specific individuals during discussions should not be disclosed at any time.
5. A concern was raised that there was no facility for proxy votes and that where a delegate was unable to attend a Council meeting, although their views may be reported, there was no mechanism by which their vote may be counted. The Council was advised by the office that there was no provision for proxy votes at any of the Kennel Club Liaison Councils, but that a proposal to make such a provision may be considered at the Council's next meeting in July 2017.
6. The minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2016 were approved.

ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Results of recommendations

7. The Council noted that the General Committee had approved amendments to the following Regulations which had been recommended for approval by the Council at its meeting on 6 July 2016:
 - Regulations G9.d. and G27. relating to the removal of the requirement for publication of catalogues.
 - Insertion of new Regulation G(A)13 relating to the introduction of capped classes at Open shows. A consequential amendment to Regulation G(A)3 had also been approved by the General Committee.

New representatives

8. The Council noted the appointment of Mrs K Allen as a representative for the South West area and of Mrs K Russell as the representative for the North West area. Mrs Allen had been unable to attend but Mrs Russell was welcomed to her first meeting of the Council.

Obedience Information Stand at Crufts

9. In Mr Harlow's absence there was no updated information available but as Kennel Club budgets had been finalised it was unlikely that separate

funding from the Kennel Club would be available. However, the stand would be present at Crufts as in previous years.

Details of sire and dam

10. At its previous meeting, the Council had suggested that following its recommendation that the necessity for show societies to produce catalogues should be removed, details of the breeding of dogs on the Activity Register should be publicly available as they were for dogs on the Breed Register.
11. The Council noted confirmation from the office that information held by the Kennel Club not already within the public domain could not be released due to data protection laws. Information on sires and dams was published in the yearly Stud Book (for dogs which had qualified for entry in the Stud Book) and in various other publications.

Proposal for a new scheduled class

12. At its meeting in July, the Council had considered a proposal to introduce a new class between Beginners and Novice. It had not supported the proposal but was sympathetic to the reasoning behind it. The issue had been further discussed by the Obedience Strategy Working Party which was of the view that it would be best addressed by means of amendments to eligibility for handlers competing in Beginners. The matter would be discussed in more detail later in the meeting (paragraphs 28-31 refer).

Crufts commentary

13. It was noted that obedience commentary at Crufts would be undertaken on all four days by Mr G Paisley.
14. No further information was available in respect of the possibility of providing a training course for commentators in future years. The office agreed to investigate the issue.

ITEM 4. FEEDBACK FROM COMPETITORS

15. All Council representatives provided reports regarding activities undertaken in their area to gain feedback from competitors since the previous meeting. These included:
 - Discussions via social media groups
 - On line surveys/polls
 - Visits to local Registered and Listed Status clubs
 - Area meetings
 - Online questionnaires
 - Conversations with competitors at shows
 - Postings on Obedience UK website

- Distribution of information sheets at shows
 - Telephone and email conversations with clubs and competitors
16. It was noted that the internet was a highly effective way of gaining feedback and comment. Some representatives had used Survey Monkey but the free service only allowed them access to the first 100 responses. The office was requested to check whether the Kennel Club had an account which could be made available on a free of charge basis, and subject to prior approval, for Council representatives in order for them to obtain feedback from the obedience community.
 17. Feedback indicated that in some areas, obedience competitors were being lost to rally which was attracting a growing number of participants.
 18. It was also reported that many members of the obedience community were apathetic and were not supportive of any further changes being made to the discipline. Many had expressed a view that there was 'no need to reinvent the wheel'.

ITEM 5. OBEDIENCE STRATEGY WORKING PARTY (Pages 17 - 18)

Membership of the Working Party

19. A query was raised as to the membership and remit of the Obedience Strategy Working Party. It was clarified that the Working Party had been established by the Council in July 2014 with the remit of considering the five-year strategy for obedience. At the Council's meeting on 20 January 2016 it was agreed that the Working Party, consisting of its original members Mr Harlow, Mr Lubbi and Mrs Turner, and additional members Miss Godfrey and Mr McCartney, would give further consideration to ideas for the ongoing promotion of obedience.
20. A concern was expressed regarding the potential for regional bias in the composition of the Working Party's membership but it was emphasised that any Council representative may refer issues to the Working Party for consideration. It was further clarified that the Working Party was not a decision making body but may only make recommendations to the Council.
21. In order to address concerns, a number of options for the future of the Working Party were suggested, as follows: that the Working Party cease to meet; that it be restructured to include a representative from each area; that any proposals made by the Working Party be submitted to Council representatives prior to their being published on the agenda for a Council meeting. These suggestions were noted but no specific course of action was recommended.

Clashing shows - proposed additional wording to Regulation G5.

22. The Council noted the view of the Obedience Strategy Working Party that procedures were already in place within the office to minimise clashes of show dates, and that it did not consider that any change to Regulations would be helpful or effective.

Bonus Wins

23. This matter had been referred to the Obedience Strategy Working Party which considered that the issues relating to bonus wins would be addressed by the proposed introduction of points-based progression. The Council noted the Working Party's view that the matter did not require further consideration at this time.

Progression on points – proposed new Regulation G(A)5 and amendments to Regulations G(A)8 and G(A)9:

24. The proposal, made by Mrs Turner on behalf of the Obedience Strategy Working Party, was seconded by Miss Godfrey. The intention of the proposal was to allow an option for a dog to progress on points from Novice or Class A which it was hoped would address issues regarding progression experienced by handlers in some classes.
25. The Working Party was of the view that some handlers would welcome the opportunity to progress on points whereas others would prefer to progress on the basis of wins, and that providing an option for progression via either route would allow handlers to select their preferred route.
26. There were mixed views from Council representatives. There was some support for the proposal, especially from those competing in the lower classes, who considered it would be a positive step to be offered a choice of progression routes. However, some members of the obedience community had expressed the view that there was no necessity for any change, and that the proposal would add an unnecessary level of complexity. Others had considered that progression either via wins or points would be acceptable, but it should be one or the other without competitors being offered a choice. It was highlighted that a points system would be heavily reliant on the honesty of competitors as it would be very difficult to check or monitor how many points an individual had obtained. There was also a concern that the proposal would simply move the existing bottleneck into other classes.
27. A vote took place, and by a majority, the Council did not support the proposal.

Eligibility to compete in Beginners

28. The Council discussed an amendment to Regulation G(A)7a. which had been suggested by Mrs Turner and Miss Godfrey. It was noted that this was not a formal proposal.
29. The objective of the suggested amendment was to give handlers the option to compete in Beginners with a new dog subject to the level of

placings they had won, thus retaining handlers in the discipline and assisting them to gain valuable ring experience.

30. However, the Council expressed a concern that allowing experienced handlers to compete in Beginners with a new dog may be demotivating for other Beginner handlers. It was also noted that some competitors had provided feedback indicating that, having won out of Beginners under existing Regulations, they would not wish to compete in Beginners with a new dog.
31. There was little support for the suggestion and the Council did not recommend that it be progressed.

Stay judging

32. Following the issue of a Press Release on 21 July 2016 relating to clarification of the Stay exercise, the Working Party suggested that a specimen Stay Marking Sheet should be provided by the Kennel Club for use by all judges in order to ensure consistency of marking.
33. The Council unanimously supported the introduction of a standardised Stay Marking Sheet. However it was not in support of the sheet which had been suggested, and it was proposed that it be replaced with the sheet which had been originally designed by Mr R Page and which was already in widespread use.
34. It was agreed that Mr Page's sheet should be adopted but with some amendments. Statements regarding the following issues were to be included on the sheet:
 - On return points should be deducted at the judge's discretion and if stay times are reduced the marks should be adjusted accordingly.
 - Judges would retain the discretion to graduate marks in between the intervals specified on the sheet.
 - **Clarification on the Stay exercise** - Minor movements such as a dog moving a foot or sniffing the ground, does not constitute a broken stay. However, should the dog move out of the position required by the judge, it should be considered to have broken the stay and should be marked accordingly. Any further action such as the dog 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 position changed and the stay broken.
35. A copy of the revised stay sheet was to be circulated to members of the Council for final approval prior to inclusion within the minutes of the meeting. [**Afternote:** the revised stay sheet is attached as Annex A to the minutes.]

36. The Council **recommended** for approval the following Regulation amendments:

Regulation G(C).4.h

- (1) Sit Stay: Dogs should remain in the sit position throughout the test. Barking, whining or minor movement such as sniffing the ground, shuffling or turning, without moving from the place where the dog was originally left, should not be considered to be a broken stay but may only be marked a nominal amount for minor movement or noise. **Marks must be graduated in accordance with the Kennel Club's specimen stay chart.**
- (2) Down Stay: Dogs should remain in the down position throughout the test. Barking, whining or minor movement such as sniffing the ground, shuffling, hip rolling or turning, without moving from the place where the dog was originally left, should not be considered to be a broken stay but may only be marked a nominal amount for minor movement or noise. **Marks must be graduated in accordance with the Kennel Club's specimen stay chart.**
- (Insertions in bold)

37. A short discussion took place as to the way in which stays were timed, with particular reference to dogs which were marked for breaking stays 'on return'. It was noted that it was not clear whether a stay exercise was deemed to be completed when handlers were asked to return to their dogs, when the handler had returned to the dog's side, or when the time for the duration of the stay had expired. It appeared that not all Chief Stay Stewards adopted the same approach to this issue.

Progression into Championship Class 'C'

38. The Working Party had discussed issues relating to progression into Championship Class 'C', noting that a relatively small number of handlers winning a high number of Open 'C' classes had led to a perception that other handlers were being prevented from winning the class and progressing into Championship Class 'C'. It had wished to seek the views of the Council as to whether the qualification required for Championship Class 'C' should be amended, and if so, in what way.
39. It was acknowledged that the number of dogs competing in Championship Class 'C' was lower than had previously been the case but this was not considered to be a major concern.
40. The Council was of the view that any reduction in the criteria for eligibility for Championship Class 'C' would result in a lowering of the standard within the class, which was not a desirable outcome. It also considered that handlers should aspire to the highest standards and that lowering the criteria would not help to achieve this.
41. Accordingly, the Council did not support any amendment to the qualification required for Championship Class 'C'.

Companion Shows

42. The Council noted a report from the office which contained a summary of the number of Companion Shows held in 2016, split by area. It was noted that the report covered all Companion Shows licensed by the Kennel Club as the records held did not allow for specific identification of those scheduling obedience classes.
43. It was clarified that Companion Shows must be run in support of a charity, and that it was not the responsibility of the charity to provide insurance for the event.
44. The Council was in agreement that every effort should be made to encourage and support Companion Shows scheduling obedience classes as they offered a valuable resource to those competing in, or wishing to compete in, obedience.
45. It was agreed that the office would circulate detailed listings, by area, of Companion Shows held in 2016 to all Council representatives, so that contact may be made with organisers with a view to encouraging them to schedule obedience classes at future shows.
46. Registered and Listed Status clubs may also organise Companion Shows, although it was acknowledged that due to practical matters such as financial risk and lack of suitable people to organise such shows, there may be difficulties in their doing so. Such clubs should continue to be encouraged to run open or limited shows.

Dog Training Weekly 'Dog of the Year'

47. At its meeting on 27 October 2016, the Working Party had discussed a suggestion that contact be made with 'Dog Training Weekly' magazine to discuss whether its 'Dog of the Year' award should revert to the previous system of being awarded to the dog having won most OCs during the year, rather than its present system which included wins in Open 'C' classes.
48. Noting that the award was made by Dog Training Weekly and not by the Kennel Club, it was understood that it would be awarded at Crufts in 2017 to the dog having won the most points during the 2016 season, but that in future two additional new awards would be provided in future for the dog and bitch winning the most OCs in the preceding year.

ITEM 6. YOUNG KENNEL CLUB

49. The Council noted a report following the meeting held on 17 October 2016 between representatives of the Council and the YKC.
50. The meeting was attended by Mr R Burbidge-Grant, Mrs D Lavender and Mrs L Turner representing the Council, and by Mrs V McAlpine

(Events & Education Executive) and Mrs C English (Young Kennel Club Membership & Website Co-ordinator) on behalf of the YKC.

51. It had discussed ways in which the Obedience Liaison Council and the YKC could work together to encourage the participation of young handlers in competitive obedience.
52. Mr Burbidge-Grant had been designated as the YKC representative and would act as a liaison point for young handlers.
53. Mr Burbidge-Grant had contacted a number of club secretaries in relation to YKC issues, and had submitted responses to the YKC office. It was noted however that the responses received from clubs had not been encouraging.
54. It had been agreed that lists of child-friendly trainers, judges and clubs would be made available on the Kennel Club and YKC websites. All Council representatives were requested to send such information regarding clubs in their own areas to Mr Burbidge-Grant.
55. The YKC would also be very happy to accept suggestions for suitable trainers and judges to officiate at its own events.
56. Involvement and input from Council representatives from all areas was vital.
57. It was noted that Mr Burbidge-Grant had agreed to act as a communication point on behalf of the Council, and would provide input regarding obedience to any YKC events such as competitions and training weekends.
58. The Council noted that the meeting had discussed the proposed new Regulations and a number of amendments were agreed. The revised Regulations had come into effect on 1 January 2017.
59. It was confirmed that the Rebecca Pointer Trophy was now awarded to the winner of the YKC Pre-Beginner Stakes final held at Crufts. However, it could be reallocated to its previous use in future if necessary, with the input/agreement of Rosie Pointer. Under previous rules, members were able to collect and submit points from wins and places throughout the qualifying year at a wide range of Obedience shows.
60. The Council suggested that it would be helpful if details of show schedules could be publicised on YKC social media pages and on the YKC website as this may encourage more young people to enter shows. It was agreed that this would be a positive step.

ITEM 7. ACTIVITIES HEALTH & WELFARE SUB-GROUP

61. The Council noted a written report from Mrs Patrick on the work of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group following its meetings on 27 January 2016 and 1 June 2016. It was noted that the main focus of the Sub-Group's meetings had been on matters relating to agility.
62. However, the Sub-Group's research issues list included the body position of dogs during heelwork in obedience. It had noted that the issue did not relate to head carriage, but to the necessity for dogs to work in a happy and natural manner whilst holding their natural topline. The matter would be discussed further at the Sub-Group's next meeting on 22 February 2017. It was hoped that a detailed research project may be undertaken but this was subject to funding being available.
63. The Council wished to express concern regarding the amendments to Regulation G(C)1.a. and to the rewording of the relevant section of the descriptions and explanatory notes for obedience tests, with particular regard to the revised wording used in *Notes for Judges*. The Council was of the view that the reference in the notes to rear pasterns was confusing.
64. It was accepted that it had been necessary for the Kennel Club to address the matter without prior consultation with the Council as it related to the wider issue of the health and welfare of dogs. However, the issue was a sensitive one and the Council remained concerned that the announcement was open to misinterpretation, especially in relation to the definition of a dog working 'in a happy and natural manner whilst maintaining its natural topline', noting that each dog was different and that there were inherent difficulties in identifying dogs which did not maintain a natural topline.
65. However, it was hoped that the rewording of the relevant section of the descriptions and explanatory notes would influence future training techniques and would ensure that dogs were not trained to work in positions which were not consistent with their natural conformation.
66. It was stated that guidance had been sent to regional team managers in respect of how the guidelines should be applied to the selection of dogs to compete in the Inter-Regional obedience competition taking place at Crufts in 2017. [**Afternote:** it was clarified that the guidance had consisted of a copy of the press release which had been sent by Mrs Garner to all of the regional team managers.]

ITEM 8. ACTIVITIES JUDGES WORKING PARTY

67. The Council noted a written report from Mrs Garner on the work of the Activities Judges Working Party following its meeting on 19 April 2016. The following issues were particularly highlighted:

Online Learning Platform

68. It was noted that the Kennel Club Academy was now live for all breed show judges. The office, in conjunction with the Accredited Trainers for obedience, was currently in the process of preparing suitable content relating to obedience. All scripts would be considered by the Training Board which was due to meet again in March 2017. It was hoped that obedience content would be placed on the KC Academy during 2017.

Appointment of Accredited Trainers

69. Mrs Kay Allen had been welcomed to the pool of Accredited Trainers for obedience.
70. In the absence of Mr Harlow, no update was available on discussions by the Judges Working Party at its meeting on 14 November 2016.

ITEM 9. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

Proposed amendment to the timing of stays for Championship Class 'C'

71. Mr Burbidge-Grant, on behalf of Mrs A Neal, wished to propose the introduction of a new Regulation under the terms of which stays for Championship Class 'C' would take place when all competitors in the class had completed ringwork exercises, but allowing 15 minutes after the last dog had worked. Stays would take place either before or after the scent exercise at the discretion of the judge. The objective of the proposal was to ensure fairness to all competitors and to assist in the smooth flow of the running order.
72. Mrs Ray seconded the proposal.
73. After a brief discussion a vote took place and the Council, by a majority, **recommended** for approval the following amendment to Regulations:

New Regulation G(C)4.h.(5)

For Championship Class C, stays must take place either before or after the scent exercise at the discretion of the judge.

(Insertion in bold)

Proposed amendment to Regulation G30.f(1)

74. Mr R Clowes, represented by Mr Burbidge-Grant, wished to propose an amendment to Regulation G30.f(1) to address the issue of exhibitors competing with multiple dogs who were drawn consecutively, or close together, in Championship Class 'C', which resulted in disruption to the flow of judging and disadvantaged the handler.

75. Miss Godfrey seconded the proposal.
76. The Council was reminded that at its meeting on 30 June 2015 it had been clarified that Regulation G30.f.(7) stated that: 'The Chief Steward may, in exceptional circumstances, relax the running order. All such decisions must be recorded in the Show's Kennel Club Incident Book.' There was no Regulation which prevented the relaxation of the running order in Championship classes and the Council had agreed that where there was an issue with the running order, the Chief Steward may make an appropriate change to it, in consultation with the judge. Alternatively, judges may take a short break to allow handlers to swap dogs.
77. However, there was some support for the proposal although the Council considered that ensuring a minimum of 10 dogs between two dogs handled by a single individual was impractical, and a revised proposal specifying a minimum gap of 5 dogs was put forward by Mr Rutter and seconded by Miss Godfrey.
78. A discussion took place as to the nature of the draw for Championship Class 'C' and the way it was conducted. It was confirmed that the draw was carried out by the office on receipt of a list of competitors and their dogs together with their merit scores. It was clarified that the proposed amendment would not place any additional burden on show secretaries, although it would be helpful to the office if competitors were listed in alpha order instead of merit point order, thus allowing for easy identification of handlers with multiple dogs.
79. It was acknowledged that although the proposed amendment may be of benefit to handlers with multiple dogs in a Championship Class 'C', it would not resolve issues where the same handler also had dogs entered into Championship Class 'C' for the opposite sex, or in any other classes at the same show.
80. A vote took place, which indicated no support for the proposal in its original form. A subsequent vote took place in respect of the revised proposal for a minimum gap of 5 dogs, and as a result, the Council **recommended** for approval the following amendment to Regulation G30.f(1):

Regulation G30.f(1)

TO:

A draw for the running order in Championship Class C must be made prior to the Show. The Kennel Club will conduct the ballot for this running order **ensuring that exhibitors who have entered multiple dogs should have a minimum of 5 dogs between them.** Show Secretaries must forward the names of the exhibitors and dogs involved, together with their merit scores, **highlighting any exhibitors who have entered multiple dogs within Championship Class C** to the Kennel Club by recorded delivery, registered post or e-mail within seven working days of the closing of entries.

(Insertions in bold).

81. It was agreed that the office would provide suggestions as to how draws should be carried out in future in order to implement the minimum gap of 5 dogs, if approved. It was noted that G Regulations did not specify that the draw must be random.

Proposed amendment to Regulation G(A)3

82. Mr Rutter, on behalf of Mrs J Greene, proposed an amendment to Regulation G(A)3 which would allow a dog to be entered into a special class without the necessity for it to be entered into a standard class. It was anticipated that this would attract entries from those with dogs which had retired from mainstream competition and also newer competitors, together with those about to start in Novice with a new dog. Handlers and their dogs would be able to gain valuable ring experience without any pressure.
83. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Ray.
84. The Council was in full agreement with Mrs Greene's views, and unanimously **recommended** for approval the following amendment:

Regulation G(A)3

TO:

A dog not qualified to enter Championship Class C must be entered in the lowest available class for which it is eligible and may also be entered in another class if desired plus one additional class at the society's discretion. Only qualified dogs may be entered in Championship Class C and these dogs may also enter Open Class C and one additional class at the society's discretion. (Note the qualifications for Championship Class C and Obedience Warrant.)

Exemptions from this regulation are:-

A dog entered in a Good Citizen Dog Scheme Special Pre-Beginner Obedience Stakes Class or

A dog entered into a Young Kennel Club (YKC) Obedience Class which may also be entered in a maximum of two other scheduled classes (including YKC classes) for which it is eligible **or**

A dog entered only into a Special class (or classes)

(Insertions in bold)

Content and Marking of Obedience Exercises

85. The Working Belgian Shepherd Dog Society, represented by Miss Godfrey, requested that the Council review the current structure and approval process of amendments to the G Regulations, noting that the Activities Committee and the Board may vote against an amendment referred to them by the Obedience Liaison Council. The Society wished to suggest that the Obedience Liaison Council should be in sole charge of making decisions on the content and marking of exercises and that the Activities Committee should be unable to overrule them.

86. No seconder was available and no further discussion took place.

ITEM 10. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY

87. Representatives were invited to propose further items to the Council's Five Year Strategic Plan.

88. A number of representatives stated that they had received feedback indicating a wish for a period of stability with no changes being made to the discipline.

89. One suggestion was for stays to be placed on the Five Year plan as a topic for future consideration, specifically with a view to suggesting that in any class, and at the discretion of the judge, either a sit stay or a down stay would be required, but not both. Alternatively the Council may wish to consider introducing reduced times for stays as it had been three years since a previous proposal to reduce stay times had been considered, but not recommended for approval, by the Activities Committee. Mr Rutter agreed to prepare a suitable proposal to reduce stay times in Class 'B' and Class 'C' for consideration by the Council at its next meeting.

ITEM 11. REWORDING OF DESCRIPTIONS AND EXPLANATORY NOTES FOR OBEDIENCE TESTS

90. This issue had been discussed under item 7 (paragraphs 63-66 refer).

ITEM 12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Correspondence from Mr J Higgins

91. The content of a letter from Mr J Higgins was noted. Mr Higgins wished to raise concerns regarding the decision-making process within the Kennel Club, whereby it appeared that decisions were being made in respect of obedience issues with no prior consultation with the obedience community.

92. The Council was advised by the office that a flow chart which detailed the organisational structure of the Kennel Club, and the way in which decisions were made, was available. A copy would be published in the obedience newsletter to assist in explaining the decision-making process.

93. It was agreed that it was not within the remit of the Council to discuss the issue further. Mr Harlow, as the recipient of the letter, would be requested to reply to Mr Higgins advising him that his comments had been noted.

Late submission of agenda items

94. The office confirmed that it was not able to accept items for discussion under Any Other Business where the item had been submitted to the office after the stated deadline for agenda items. Any such items received, unless urgent or time-critical in nature, would be included on the agenda for the next available meeting of the Council.

ITEM 13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

95. The Council noted that the next meeting would take place on 20 July 2017 and any items for the agenda must be submitted by 21 April 2017.
96. Those present were thanked for attending, and Mrs Turner was thanked for chairing the meeting.

The meeting closed at 4.10 pm

MRS L TURNER
Chairman

THE KENNEL CLUB'S MISSION STATEMENT

'The Kennel Club is the national body which exists to promote the general improvement, health and well-being of all dogs through responsible breeding and ownership'