



**MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB BREED LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD
ON THURSDAY 24 APRIL 2025 AT 11:00 AM ON MICROSOFT TEAMS**

PRESENT

Ms C Boggia	Hound
Ms D Britten	Terrier
Mr S Collier	Gundog
Ms Jean Collins-Pitman	Gundog
Mr G Davies	Utility
Mr J Horswell	Pastoral
Mr T Hutchings	Working
Mrs T Jackson	Pastoral
Ms S Leslie	Terrier
Ms K Moores	Gundog
Mrs C Morgan	Gundog
Mr E Paterson	Utility
Ms J Piper	Working
Mr K Pursglove	Hound
Mr D Roberts	Hound
Ms J Sparrow	Toy
Ms A Summers	Toy
Ms T Teasdale	Toy/Pastoral
Mrs B Thornley	Pastoral
Mr M Walshaw	Terrier
Ms S Walton	Gundog

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss D Deuchar	Senior Manager Canine Activities
Miss A Morley	Activities Liaison Manager
Miss S Hibbin	Breed Shows Liaison Advisor

ITEM 1. TO ELECT A CHAIR FOR THE REMAINING TERM OF THE COUNCIL

1. It was proposed and seconded that Mrs Jackson be elected as Chairperson for the remaining term of the Council. No further nominations were received and Mrs Jackson was duly elected as Chairperson.



IN THE CHAIR

Mrs T Jackson

ITEM 2. TO ELECT ONE MEMBER FOR THE SHOW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE TERM OF THE COMMITTEE (2025-2028)

2. It was proposed and seconded that Mr Paterson be elected as representative to the Show Executive Committee for the term of the Committee. No further nominations were received and Mr Paterson was duly elected.

ITEM 3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. Apologies had been received from Mr A Bricknell, Ms E Newton and Ms S Taylor. Mrs J Morgan had resigned from her role as breed representative for French Bulldogs and Utility delegate on the Breed Liaison Council.

ITEM 4. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 5 JUNE 2024

4. Mrs Morgan raised that the minutes from its meeting on 5 June 2024 did not include her query, raised in AOB, on when the meeting minutes would be issued, to which the office had confirmed they would be issued soon. It was requested that this be included in the minutes.
5. Subject to the above change, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 5. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS/MATTERS ARISING

6. The Council requested an update on item 3 from the previous minutes, regarding the creation of the tiered registration system, the office stated it did not have an update at that time, and would request further information in the hope this could be included as an afternote to the minutes.
7. It was raised that there had been no correspondence from breed clubs on how to move Have a Go shows forward. The Chair requested the Council take the matter back to their breeds and request ideas on how to encourage new people into dog showing through Have a Go shows.
8. Paragraph 15 was highlighted from the last minutes, regarding displaying the link to the judge's nomination form on the online club portal. The office advised that this had been added to the first page of the club account once logged in.



9. Undergraduate Criteria

The Council noted that the Shows Executive Committee and subsequently the Board approved the following regulation amendment with effect from 1 January 2025.

Regulation F(A) Definitions of Classes at Championship, Open and Limited Shows:

* applies to championship and open shows only

** applies to limited shows only

UNDERGRADUATE

* For dogs which have not won a Challenge Certificate/CACIB/CAC/Green Star or 3 or more first prizes at championship shows **in Undergraduate, Graduate, Post Graduate, Minor Limit, Mid Limit, Limit or Open Classes whether restricted or not** where Challenge Certificates were offered for the breed (Minor Puppy, Special Minor Puppy, Puppy and Special Puppy Classes excepted, whether restricted or not).

** For dogs which have not won 3 or more first prizes at open or championship shows **in Undergraduate, Graduate, Post Graduate, Minor Limit, Mid Limit, Limit or Open Classes whether restricted or not** (Minor Puppy, Special Minor Puppy, Puppy and Special Puppy Classes excepted, whether restricted or not).

(Additions in bold, deletions struck through)

(Effective 1 January 2025)

10. Term of office for Breed Education Coordinators (BECs)

The Council noted that the Shows Executive Committee, Judges Committee and subsequently the Board agreed with the suggestion to introduce a three year term of office for Breed Education Coordinators (BECs), effective 1 January 2025.

11. Amendment to Show Certificate of Excellence

The Council noted that the Shows Executive Committee did not support the proposed amendments to the Show Certificate of Excellence.

12. Health Test Results on Registration Certificates

The office provided an update at the meeting and stated that the health team had confirmed that digital health results remained the most practical at this time, and the decision to remove Health Test Results from registration paperwork was made as it was considered that they would only ever be accurate at the time of printing, and many breeds required repeat health testing. It was confirmed that the most up to date results could be found on the website, and that the new Puppy Packs automatically included all the relevant health test results.



13. There was confusion that the results in the Puppy Pack would also only be accurate at the time of printing, although it was confirmed that the health tests in the Puppy Packs were the parents rather than the puppy itself.
14. Amendment to the 'Progeny not eligible for registration' endorsement
The office provided an update on the request to reinstate the progeny not eligible endorsement for registration, noting that it was believed that Mr Lambert, Health, Welfare & Breeder Services Executive had spoken to Mr Hutchings directly. It was recorded that at the current time, the Kennel Club would not reinstate endorsements once they had been lifted as it was considered that this would be adding another level of complexity.
15. It was queried why the update had come from the health executive when it appeared to be a registrations query, and there was concern that this had not been given proper consideration, given the support the Council had given to the initial proposal. It had been hoped that endorsements could be looked at as a whole, as it was a contentious topic.
16. It was queried who had discussed the topic, and the office agreed to investigate the matter further. The Council raised that it was a policy decision, and so should not be decided by an Executive, but Committees and the Board.
17. The Council felt very strongly that the proposal should be reconsidered by the Board, and if the proposal remained unsupported, that the Council should receive an explanation as to the reasons why.
18. The Council wished to raise its disappointment that the matter had not been followed up within sufficient time following the Council meeting in April 2024. The Council highlighted that the November meeting had often been cancelled and it requested that the 2025 meeting goes ahead as scheduled in future, even if it was just to provide an update on matters arising.
19. It was suggested that if necessary a Working Party be formed to highlight the proposal's benefits, to ensure it was considered correctly.
20. Matches and Special Events
The Council noted that due to changes of staff, the matter had not been discussed in detail by the Shows Executive Committee until its meeting in April 2025. Although it has been to the Show Executive Committee, it was yet to be discussed by the Board. An update would be provided in due course.



ITEM 6. PROPOSALS

21. Special Beginners Eligibility

Proposed by Mrs Jackson

The Council considered a proposal from Mrs Jackson to discuss the eligibility for Special Beginners. It was noted that a similar proposal had been on the agenda for the Shows Liaison Council. The chairs of both liaison councils requested the Council discuss the suggested amendment for the class. Ms Walton seconded the proposal.

22. It was agreed that the proposal appeared to be acceptable for both the Shows Liaison Council and Breed Liaison Council views.

23. There was concern that the proposal was trying to resolve an issue that did not exist, and it may discourage exhibitors who only show on occasion, or don't win often, and could in turn reduce the level playing field the Special Beginners class gave.

24. The Council had concerns that while the proposal made sense for numerically larger breeds, it could negatively impact numerically smaller breeds.

25. It was noted that the seven year rule would be policed by the breeds themselves. It was suggested that it should be added that if you had judges CCs, you were not eligible to enter Special Beginners, however it was raised that judges who judged CCs would have been showing for seven consecutive years.

26. The Shows Liaison Council supported the proposal at its most recent meeting, and wished to encourage exhibitors to remain in Special Beginners classes to encourage people to continue showing their dogs. Concern was raised with the inclusion of Best of Sex and Reserve Best of Sex for non CC breeds due to low entry numbers, meaning a first time handler could have a chance of winning Best in Sex due to those low entry numbers. The Shows Liaison Council had queried whether it should just be a CC and RCC related award instead.

27. The Council agreed with the rational and subsequently an alternative proposal was presented by Mr Walshaw, and seconded by Ms Sparrow, as follows:

For owner, handler or exhibit not having won a Challenge Certificate or Reserve Challenge Certificate, ~~or for those breeds not allocated championship status, Best of Sex or Reserve Best of Sex at a championship show.~~ **Owners or handlers who have exhibited or handled a dog at**



shows over the previous seven consecutive years are not eligible for this class.

(Insertion in bold. Deletion struck through)

28. The Council unanimously voted for the amended proposal and therefore **recommended** it to the Show Executive Committee for approval.
29. Junior Warrant Points Amendment
Proposed by Mr Hedges
The Council considered the proposal from Mr Hedges to introduce a half point for attending an open show and taking part, regardless of whether the dog was the only entry, as exhibitors travelled a long way and may not get anything for their efforts. Mr Hedges did not attend the meeting.
30. There was no seconder for the proposal, so the matter was not discussed further.
31. Judge critique displayed
Proposed by the French Bulldog Club of England presented by Mrs J Morgan Ling
The Council considered the proposal from the French Bulldog Club of England to see any judge who failed to produce a critique, having been warned or fined, to have their judging profile marked accordingly, in the hope that it would stop repeat offenders.
32. It was noted that Mrs Morgan Ling has stepped down from her position on The Liaison Council. Mrs Jackson presented the proposal on her behalf. Mrs C Morgan seconded the proposal.
33. It was noted that judges who had not completed their critiques would be given the opportunity to provide a reason for the non-submission before any warnings or fines were issued and that the names of judges which had been fined were published in the Kennel Club Journal. The Council agreed that the proposal should just relate to judges that had been fined and therefore suggested that the word 'warned' should be removed from the proposal.
34. The Council highlighted that when judges signed their judging contract, they were signing that they agreed to supply critiques for first and second in all breed classes. It was raised that failing to submit a critique was a breach of Kennel Club Regulations.
35. Clarity was requested as to whether the 'Find A Judge' profile would be marked on the first fine, or whether it would state 'previously fined' if it was to



be marked on the second offence. It was noted that this would need to be considered when reviewing the proposal.

36. Although the information on penalties and fines was issued in the Kennel Club journal, which the public had access to, it was noted that if secretaries were looking for judges to appoint using the 'Find A Judge' function, it would be simpler to include the information there.

37. Following some discussion, the Council discussed amending the proposal to:

"Any judge failing to produce a critique and having been fined would have their judging profile marked accordingly".

38. It was queried whether this was in the remit of Judges Committee to not approve those judges if they were repeat offenders. It was confirmed that once a judge had been fined for not producing a critique, judges would not be approved for challenge certificates until such time that they had paid the fine and completed the missing critiques. However, it was noted that marking of the judging profile may be a better deterrent for the regulation breach.

39. It was highlighted that any previously approved appointments that had already been approved by the Judges Committee would still stand and only future appointments would be penalised if a judge was fined.

40. It was queried whether this mark would remain for their full judging career or if it would be removed after a certain amount of time.

41. A second amendment was proposed by Mr Horswell, to include that the mark be removed after five years, providing there were no further fines issued. Mr Walshaw seconded the amendment.

"Any judge failing to produce a critique and having been issued with a fine will have their judging profile marked accordingly. The penalty will remain visible for five years".

42. The Council unanimously voted for the amended proposal and therefore **recommended** this to the Show Executive and Judges Committees for approval.

ITEM 7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

43. Communication Platform



Presented by Mrs C Morgan

The Council considered the discussion item from Mrs C Morgan, regarding alternative options for a communication channel for delegates, as not many delegates used the existing Slack channel.

44. The Council agreed that it would benefit from having a channel to communicate, to receive updates and keep the momentum of the Council going.
45. There was concern that it would be difficult to find something universally acceptable for everyone, as it was unclear if all members were on Facebook to join a group. The Council noted WhatsApp may be the most effective communication platform as it was universal, and easy to use.
46. Mrs Jackson raised that you could not make channels on WhatsApp or Facebook, which is why Slack was preferred. It was further noted that the Slack channel was for all members of the Council, not just delegates.
47. It was noted that Facebook was used for other Councils, and worked well as different threads could hold different discussion points.
48. The Council noted that those present were all on Facebook, and this would be the preferred communication platform.
49. The office agreed to confirm if a list of contact details could be circulated to the Chair in order to set up an appropriate channel of communication. It would also share the group name with the Council.
50. Mrs Morgan and Mr Walshaw offered to assist Mrs Jackson with administering the Facebook group.

ITEM 8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

51. Digitalised Breed Record Supplement
The office confirmed it was being discussed, and would request an update. The office did not have an update at that time.

ITEM 9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

52. The Council noted that the date of the next meeting was scheduled for **4 November 2025**. The submission deadline for items for the agenda is **6 August 2025**.



53. It was raised that it would be beneficial to have the meeting regardless of whether there had been any proposals or discussion items submitted.
54. The office highlighted that the Field Trials Liaison Council were issued with a results of recommendations document as they only had one meeting a year, which may be a suitable way for the Breed Liaison Council to receive an update if there wasn't enough business to hold a meeting. The office also highlighted that this would also be a published document.
55. It was raised that as the meetings could be held via Microsoft Teams, there were no financial restrictions to holding the meeting in November, if only to provide an update.
56. The Council unanimously voted for the meeting in November to go ahead, regardless of proposals.
57. The meeting closed at 12:37pm.

MRS T JACKSON
Chairperson