



MINUTES OF THE KCLC BREEDS COUNCIL MEETING HELD AT THE KENNEL CLUB ON 22 MAY 2019

PRESENT:

Ms C Boggia
Mrs J Davie
Mrs L Gillhespy
Mr N Gourley
Mrs J Iles-Hebbert
Mr M James
Mrs J Morgan
Mr E Paterson
Mr T Schaanning-Ling
Mrs M Swash
Mrs B Thornley
Mrs S M Walton
Mr E Whitehill

Mr S Byrne
Miss S Finnett
Mrs K Gorman
Mrs J Holgate
Mrs T Jackson
Mrs P Jeans-Brown
Mrs E Needham
Mr K Pursglove
Mrs J Sparrow
Mrs A Teasdale
Mr M Walshaw
Mr D Winsley

IN ATTENDANCE:

Miss D Deuchar – Senior Manager, Governance & Education
Mrs A Mitchell – Senior Committee Secretary
Miss C Walsh – Officer, Breed Shows Team
Mr J Winnington – Team Leader, Breed Shows Team

ITEM 1. TO ELECT A CHAIRMAN FOR THE TERM OF THE COUNCIL

1. Mrs Jackson was proposed and seconded as Chairman for the term of the Council. No further nominations were received and Mrs Jackson was duly elected as Chairman.

IN THE CHAIR: MRS T JACKSON

ITEM 2. TO ELECT A VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE TERM OF THE COUNCIL

2. Mr Paterson was proposed and seconded as Vice-Chairman for the term of the Council. No further nominations were received and Mr Paterson was duly elected as Vice-Chairman.

ITEM 3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. Apologies were received from Mr S Collier, Mr T Foulston, Mr T Hutchings, and Mrs P Marston-Pollock.



ITEM 4. TO ELECT A MEMBER FOR THE SHOW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE TERM OF THE COUNCIL

4. Mr Paterson was proposed and seconded as the Council's representative on the Show Executive Committee. No further nominations were received and Mr Paterson was duly elected as the Council's representative.

ITEM 5. PRESENTATION TO THE COUNCIL ON KENNEL CLUB STRUCTURES AND PROCEDURES

5. The Council noted a presentation from the office which explained Kennel Club and Liaison Council structures and procedures. The need for confidentiality until the minutes were published was highlighted.

ITEM 6. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 7 NOVEMBER 2018

6. It was noted that the minutes of the above meeting stated that Mrs Jackson was shown as being present at the Council's meeting on 22 November 2017, but in fact had been unable to attend and had sent her apologies. However, this was incorrect, and the Council noted that Mrs Jackson had been present at the meeting on 22 November 2017 as originally noted.
7. Subject to this amendment, the minutes were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 7. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

8. The Council noted the following updates to recommendations from its meeting held on 7 November 2018: Proposal: Australian Cattle Dog Society of Great Britain The Society wished to propose that the KC Registration Documents be altered to allow space for the Kennel Club/British Veterinary Association Eye Panelists to stamp when they carried out annual eye certification.
9. The Council noted that the proposal had been forwarded to the Kennel Club's Health & Breeder Services team for review. It was advised that there were no plans to amend the existing registration documents as this would necessitate increasing them to A4 size which would have a financial implication.
10. However, a meeting was due to take place with representatives of the British Veterinary Association, during which the issue of eye panellists stamping registration certificates would be discussed, and whether there was any benefit in doing so.

Proposal: Southern Newfoundland Club

At the Southern Newfoundland Club's Committee meeting held in January 2018 it was unanimously agreed that the Club write to the Kennel Club to formally recommend that it consider that the spaces next to 'Health Screening – Kennel Club British Veterinary Association Schemes' and 'DNA Tests' on the registration information document should never be left blank. The Club proposes instead to add the wording 'None Recorded', or similar, if there was no test result to show.

11. The Council noted that the proposal had been forwarded to the Kennel Club's Health & Breeder Services team for review. It noted that the Kennel Club was in the process of implementing a new Customer Relationship Management system, and that the request made by the Southern Newfoundland Club would be considered as part of its development. If agreed, appropriate wording would be added to show that no test results were available, but could not state that a dog had not



undergone testing.

12. The Council was of the view that use of the wording 'None recorded' would be sufficient, but considered that leaving the space blank was ambiguous and open to misinterpretation. It requested that its comments be referred back to the Health & Breeder Services team.

Timeframes for issue of agendas

13. At its previous meeting, the Council had discussed whether it would be possible to shorten the time frames involved in preparing and issuing Council agendas. Mr Hutchings and Mr Collier agreed to provide a proposal for an amendment to the P Regulations for consideration by the Council.
14. It was noted that as both Mr Hutchings and Mr Collier were unable to attend the meeting, a proposal would be submitted for the Council's consideration at its November meeting.

ITEM 8. MATTERS ARISING

Discussion Items:

As Kennel Club Breeds Liaison Council Officer and on behalf of the Staffordshire Bull Terrier Breed Council of Great Britain & Northern Ireland, Ms Jackson wished to propose that the registration fees for puppies from parents that are DNA tested to the minimum recommended for that particular breed, were set at a lower level (e.g. 20% less) than the registration fees for puppies that are from parents that were not tested to the recommended minimum. The differential should be a financial incentive to DNA testing which would give a better impact on all breeds health requirements, outcomes and breeding.

15. Mr Winsley presented the discussion item.
16. At its meeting held on 7 November 2018, the Council had given consideration to a proposal that the registration fees for puppies from parents that were DNA tested to the minimum recommended for that particular breed, were set at a lower level (e.g. 20% less) than the registration fees for puppies that were from parents that were not tested to the recommended minimum. It was hoped that the introduction of reduced registration fees would encourage breeders to carry out DNA testing which would benefit the breed and would contribute to the Kennel Club's objective of promoting the well-being of all dogs.
17. The Council had expressed its support of the proposal in principle. However it had not considered that the proposal was clear and had requested that the Staffordshire Bull Terrier Breed Council submit a revised proposal.
18. It considered the revised proposal, under the terms of which the registration fees for puppies from parents that had followed breed specific requirements and recommendations in relation to health testing, would be afforded the same privileged reduction in registration fees as those registered with the Assured Breeder Scheme (ABS). The registration fees would be lower in comparison to those applying to puppies that were registered from parents which were not seen to follow any breed specific requirements and recommendations as regards health screening.
19. The Staffordshire Bull Terrier Breed Council was of the view that this would promote good breeding practices. It wished to highlight its view that nonmembership of the ABS did not imply that a breeder did not conform to high standards or did not carry out all recommended health tests.
20. The Council raised some concerns regarding the logistical requirements which would be necessary to check whether a litter being registered had complied with all recommended health tests applicable



to the breed, noting that every breed had its own set of recommendations.

21. It was noted that all required health tests were currently recorded by the Kennel Club, where submitted, but that there was no provision for the system to automatically check each litter against health requirements for the relevant breed.
22. The Council was also of the view that the proposed reduction, which was currently applicable to ABS members, did not represent a significant saving in relation to the overall costs of breeding a litter, and it was unclear as to whether it would act as an incentive for non-ABS members to carry out health testing. It acknowledged that the reduced registration fee was one of the advantages offered to members of the ABS and it would not be appropriate to offer it to non-members.
23. A suggestion was made that the Kennel Club be requested to negotiate lower fees for health testing, but it was acknowledged that this was not the role of the Kennel Club and that breed clubs were better placed to do so. Further, breed clubs should make every effort to encourage breeders to carry out health testing as appropriate for their breed.
24. Having considered the matter carefully, the Council, by a majority, agreed not to progress the Staffordshire Bull Terrier Breed Council's suggestion further.
25. A concern was raised that when prospective puppy buyers obtained a list of ABS members with available puppies, no indication was given as to the level of experience of the breeder or the length of time they had been breeding, and that such information may be helpful to buyers. It was agreed that a proposal or discussion item on the matter may be submitted to the Council's next meeting for further consideration.
26. In response to a query, the Council was advised that representatives were responsible for communicating the outcome of proposals or discussion items which had been considered by the Council. However, this should not take place until such time as the minutes had been published, in order to prevent any misinterpretation or misunderstandings.

Sentience of Animals

27. At its meeting held on 22 November 2017, the Council had expressed its concern that media reports appeared to suggest that Members of Parliament had taken a vote that rejected the idea that animals were sentient. At its meeting held on 7 November 2018, the Council noted that since the vote the Government had drafted the Animal Sentience (Sentencing and Recognition of Sentience) Draft Bill. Under the terms of the draft bill, the maximum penalty for animal cruelty offences would increase from 6 months to 5 years imprisonment, and it would ensure that animals were defined in UK law as sentient beings.
28. It noted a further update from the Kennel Club's Public Affairs team, as follows: 'In essence from a legislative perspective, we are no further forward, the Animal Sentience (Sentencing and Recognition of Sentience) Draft Bill has not progressed through parliament and been implemented into UK law. Following parliamentary scrutiny it was felt the initial drafting of the Bill had been rushed and some areas needed further clarification / refinement for it to fully achieve its aims. Therefore the Government is still in the process of redrafting the Bill with a view to bringing it back to parliament. Therefore new UK laws regarding animal sentience and cruelty sentencing have not progressed further at this stage. However, it is important to note that 'animal sentience' from a legal perspective is a much greater issue for wild animals. The most important legal protection for companion animals, such as dogs, is currently and will continue to be enshrined under the various Animal Welfare Acts across the UK. These Acts place a legal duty of responsibility on the keepers of the animals to look after the welfare of these animals. This will not be directly impacted as a result of Brexit or the previous sentience vote. The Sentience Bill, if and when passed will place some form of duty on



Government to consider animal sentence when taking decisions, which will be welcome.'

Judges Competency Framework

29. The Council received a report on developments within the Judges Competency Framework (JCF) (Annex A to the minutes refers).
30. It noted that an updated booklet entitled 'An Introduction to the Judges Competency Framework' was available at www.thekennelclub.org.uk/jcf together with a number of Frequently Asked Questions. The Education and Training team was also available to answer queries via the dedicated JCF email address – jcf@thekennelclub.org.uk

ITEM 9. PROPOSALS

Proposed: Soft Coated Wheaten Terrier Club of Great Britain

The Soft-Coated Wheaten Terrier Club of GB wished to bring to the attention of the Kennel Club the fact that the recent publication of Breed Mentors' names, as part of the JCF process, had caused some issues for the Mentors in the breed.

31. The proposal was presented by Mr D Winsley. It was seconded by Mr Walshaw.
32. The Club wished to highlight its view that the list of mentors' names should be held only by the Kennel Club, the breed club, and the Breed Education Co-ordinator (BEC). The publication of the list had resulted in some unwarranted contact being made directly with mentors.
33. It was clarified that in the case of the Soft-Coated Wheaten Club, a BEC had not been nominated and the Kennel Club was acting as BEC for the breed, however, no applications for mentoring had been received by the office.
34. The Council was advised that lists of mentors had been published in the interests of fairness and transparency, and to avoid any perception that mentoring was not being carried out in an open and clear manner. The Code of Best Practice for Breed Mentoring (Section 5.3) made it clear that the mentors' names would be published.
35. However it was strongly emphasised that judges should not under any circumstances approach a mentor directly, but should request mentoring via the BEC. Where a direct approach was made, the mentor should advise the individual concerned to contact the BEC.
36. It was acknowledged that breed clubs were making considerable efforts to ensure that their members were aware of the correct procedures, and they were encouraged to continue to do so, via newsletters, websites, and social media pages. A suggestion was made that a suitable press release issued by the Kennel Club may be helpful, and the office agreed to make the necessary arrangements for this via the Press Office.
37. A suggestion was made that brief information regarding the JCF be added to judges' books, but it was accepted that this would not be practical in terms of the amount of information to be included. However, it may be possible to include further information to the Guide for Judges, and the office undertook to investigate whether this would be possible.
38. Breed clubs were also encouraged to contact all judges currently on their B and C lists to advise them of the procedures necessary for them to progress. However it was acknowledged that judges themselves must also take some responsibility for making themselves aware of the provisions of the JCF.



39. The Soft-Coated Wheaten Terrier Club was to be advised that it should take steps to ensure that its members were aware of the correct procedure in respect of mentoring. Proposed: Golden Retriever Breed Council The Golden Retriever Breed Council wished to propose amendments to Regulations B 2.c: that the Kennel Club should not continue the current practice of registering puppies of either 'impure or unverified origins' in the Breed Register but instead consider only registration in the Activity Register; or as an alternative, to publish such litters in a clearly different section of the Breed Records Supplement. Also, it requested that the statement on the front of the Breed Records Supplement, "Where asterisks are shown after the registered name, this identifies the dog of either impure or unverified origins" be included on the home page of the Health Test Results Finder
40. The proposal was presented by Mrs S Walton.
41. The Golden Retriever Breed Council was of the view that many people were unaware that puppies that were of either 'impure or unverified origins' may be registered on the Breed Register, which may lead to misunderstanding and/or misrepresentation. It was also concerned that the parents' / grandparents' health screening may be incomplete or untested. Such litters were published in the Breed Records Supplement with the puppies' names marked only by an asterisk(s).
42. Noting that the issue related to all breeds and not just Golden Retrievers, the Council was sympathetic to the Golden Retriever Breed Council's concerns, and agreed that it would be beneficial to both the general public and all of those involved in a breed, to ensure that there was complete clarity. It agreed that many of those reading the Breed Records Supplement, or viewing the Health Test Results Finder would not fully understand the significance of the asterisks.
43. It went on to consider how the issue may be addressed. It was not of the view that such dogs should only be eligible for registration on the Activities Register.
44. It considered whether it may be possible to include dogs of impure or unverified origins in a separate section of the BRS, but it concluded that this was not an ideal solution.
45. A suggestion was made that it would be preferable to ensure that the significance of the asterisks be made clearer both in the BRS and on the Health Test Results Finder, for example by the use of bold and/or larger text, and a clearly visible explanatory note either in a prominent position at the front of the publication, or as a running footer on each page. This proposal was seconded by Mr James.
46. The Council's views were noted, and the office agreed to investigate the matter further in order to identify ways of ensuring that the significance of asterisks against a dog's name was clearly explained.

Proposed: Kirsteen Farrar – Chair, the Newfoundland Club

The Kennel Club Assured Breeders Scheme is a significant step forward in promoting responsible breeding in pedigree dogs and enabling purchasers to have a framework by which to make decisions about the suitability of breeders. The proposal is that the specific breed club that the breeder is a member of is listed with their details on the Kennel Club website under any advert for puppies that they currently have available.

47. The proposal was presented by Ms J Davie.
48. The Council was requested to consider concerns regarding listings on the Kennel Club website which indicated whether the Assured Breeder was a member of one or more breed clubs. Many puppy purchasers assumed that the breed club membership related to the breed in which they were currently advertising puppies for sale, which may not necessarily be the case. The Newfoundland



Club was of the view that this may mislead puppy buyers into making assumptions regarding the breeder's level of knowledge of the breed, and their compliance with that specific breed club's Code of Ethics.

49. It was highlighted that under the terms of the Assured Breeder Scheme, in order to obtain a Breed Club Accolade, a breeder must be a member of at least one breed club for each breed for which they were listed and that therefore the scenario outlined by the Newfoundland Club should not arise. 49 In response to a query as to whether the breed club membership of those ABS members holding a Breed Club Accolade was checked, it was confirmed that applications were taken on trust, however, where the Kennel Club was notified of any query concerning an Assured Breeder's membership of a breed club, the office would contact the relevant breed club to make appropriate checks.
50. The Council was advised that, should there be substantive grounds for concern that an Assured Breeder was not compliant with any of the requirements of the Scheme, the Kennel Club should be advised so that an investigation may be carried out.
51. The Council did not consider that any further action was necessary.

Proposed: Irish Setter Breeders Club

A DNA test for PRA RCD4 (late onset PRA) was made available to the breed in 2011. The Joint Health Group for Irish Setters which was comprised of representatives of all 8 UK breed clubs and headed by Professor E D Hall, has previously requested that the Kennel Club issue a definitive policy document regarding acceptable breeding combinations of all stock (clear, carrier & affected). Can the Kennel Club now address this and provide breeders with a definitive statement? It was also very concerned (as were all responsible breeders) that litters continued to be registered by the Kennel Club where the status (clear, carrier & affected) of both parents was unknown, despite the availability of the DNA test and requested that the Kennel Club refuse to register such litters in future.

52. The proposal was presented by Mrs J Iles-Hebbert.
53. The Irish Setter Breeders Club wished to request that the Kennel Club provide guidelines to breeders in respect of PRA RCD4, and further, that it refuse registration of litters from parents which had not been DNA tested for the condition. It had previously requested such guidelines, but these had not been forthcoming.
54. It was noted that the Kennel Club provided a document listing breed specific requirements and recommendations, including health screening, for Assured Breeders. This may be downloaded from: https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media/9846/abs_breed_specific_requirements_and_recommendations_web.pdf
55. It was acknowledged that the Council could not address specific health issues relating to a breed, and it was suggested that the matter be referred back to the Health & Breeder Services team.

Proposed: the Irish Setter Breeders Club

The ISBC was concerned that the effect of the JCF policies would lead to the demise of breed specialists and would like to hear the views of other breeds.

56. The proposal was presented by Mrs J Iles-Hebbert.



57. The Club wished the Council to discuss its concerns that an increasing number of Open shows were appointing a single judge to judge several breeds. Consequently, this had limited the opportunities for single breed specialists to judge and be assessed within the JCF system.
58. The Club was keen to encourage the development of breed specialists who were aware of the finer points of their breeds, to replace experienced judges as they retired. It wished to ensure that breed clubs were able to contribute fully to the JCF assessment program, but in order for it to do so, it was necessary for judging appointments to be available to aspiring judges.
59. The Council was advised that the JCF would not differentiate between breed specialists and non breed specialists and that all judges would be required to progress through the system in a logical sequence, undertaking all of the educational requirements for each breed.
60. It was also highlighted that all breed clubs were required to support two general/group Open Shows per year from 2019 onwards which would allow breed clubs to have more influence over the selection of suitable judges.
61. A query was raised as to the way in which the Kennel Club's 'Find a Judge' system would assist show secretaries in appointing suitable judges. The Council was reassured that all judges would be listed on Find a Judge at each JCF Level, and that societies would be able to filter searches by breed, JCF Level, and by distance from the show venue.

Proposed: Shetland Sheepdog Breed Council

The Shetland Sheepdog Breed Council proposed that the Kennel Club reviewed the illustrations on the Kennel Club's Breed Standard website and considered changing the artist's impressions to actual photographs.

62. The proposal was presented by Mrs Thornley on behalf of the Shetland Sheepdog Breed Council which was concerned that some of the illustrations used on the website did not demonstrate good specimens of the breed, and in some cases portrayed faults or undesirable features.
63. The Council was sympathetic to the concerns raised, and considered whether photographs may be used instead. It acknowledged that there may be some difficulties in agreeing on a suitable photograph which would meet with the approval of all breed clubs in the relevant breed. Furthermore, the use of a photograph of a current top-winning dog may be problematic due to a perception that this may lead to unfairness where the dog was still being shown.
64. However, the Council was advised that the office would consider any requests for the use of a particular photograph or illustration on a case-by-case basis, and any suggestions should be submitted for consideration.
65. A proposal was made by Mrs Sparrow that the same photograph could be used on the website as used in the Kennel Club's 'Illustrated Breed Standards' book. Where a dog may be easily identified, and was still being shown, it would be possible to use a photograph from a previous edition of the book.
66. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Thornley and by a large majority, the Council recommended it for approval.
67. This led to a query regarding the use of some photographs which appeared in the Kennel Gazette, which were not always good representations of a breed. It was clarified that whilst the Kennel Club was mindful of breed standards when selecting photographs for editorial content, it was not possible



for it to be unduly prescriptive regarding photographs used by advertisers.

Proposed: Karen Tregaskis, Pointer Exhibitor

Transitioning from the Show Certificate of Merit (ShCM) and the transfer of points to the new Show Certificate of Excellence (ShCEX). Under the terms of the proposal, it would be possible for points gained prior to 1 January 2018 to be counted towards the ShCEX award.

68. The proposal was presented by Mrs S Walton.
69. Ms Tregaskis wished to highlight that only points won from 1 January 2018 onwards may be counted towards the recently introduced ShCEX award, as a result of which exhibitors who had been collecting points for several years and had not achieved the required number for the title of ShCM would effectively lose any points won before 1 January 2018. Ms Tregaskis was of the view that this was not fair on those exhibitors finding themselves in that situation.
70. The Council was advised that the matter had been extensively discussed by the Dog Show Promotion Working Party and the Show Executive Committee prior to the introduction of the ShCEX award, and a transition period agreed, under the terms of which, during 2018 points may be used to claim for either a ShCM or a ShCEX, but not both.
71. The Council was of the view that it had been necessary to set a cut-off point, and that it was not practical for any retrospective review to be carried out. It was also highlighted that the Show Executive Committee would not consider any changes until a 2-year period had passed. The proposal was not supported.

ITEM 10. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

72. No items for discussion had been submitted.

ITEM 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Publication of agendas and minutes

73. Mrs Walton wished to query why the agenda for the meeting had not been published on the Kennel Club's website. It was confirmed that this had been due to an oversight by the office and that it was normal policy to publish both agendas and minutes.
74. Mrs Walton also noted that the minutes from Council meetings in previous years no longer appeared on the website. The Council was advised that due to a change in policy, Council documentation would remain available on the website for a period of 12-18 months in future.

List of breed representatives

75. It was noted that the office would circulate a list of the representatives for each breed to all Council delegates.

ITEM 12. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING

76. The next KCLC Breeds Council meeting would be held on 6 November 2019. Agenda items must be received by 8 August 2019.
77. The meeting closed at 13.45 p.m.



ANNEX A TO THE MINUTES

Report on Judges Competency Framework (JCF) progress

It was announced in April 2018 that the JCF IT platform would be delivered during the second half of 2019 to allow this to be built into the Customer Relationship Management (CRM) resulting in a significant cost reduction. As a result of this the Kennel Club has introduced a two-tier system along with the concept of judging licenses. For those judges who only wish to judge one breed at Challenge Certificate level a concessionary fee of £10 per annum will be introduced and for those judges wishing to judge more than one breed at any level of judging the annual licence fee will be £26. These fees will be inclusive of KC Academy membership.

Crufts 2018

Membership of the KC Academy saw a spike following Crufts 2018, at which the Education and Training team were promoting the platform. A concise guide to the JCF was also launched and well received.

JCF pilot scheme

Fourteen breeds covering all groups and Stud Book Bands, including rare breeds, piloted the Breed Appreciation Days, Multiple-choice Breed Standard Exams and mentoring elements of the JCF. Feedback from these breeds was taken on board by the JCF Working Party and amendments made to Codes of Best Practices and requirements amended as necessary.

Critique Writing seminar

The Critique Writing seminar on the KC Academy was launched at Crufts 2018 as a requirement for JCF Level 1 criteria and to date over 500 users have watched the online video, which contains a PowerPoint presentation with voiceover by Training Board Chairman Gerald King, and passed the multiple-choice exam.

Eye for a Dog assessment

A pilot Eye for a Dog assessment took place in April at the Kennel Club Building, Stoneleigh Park. Candidates taking this assessments were a mix of new judges and experienced allrounder judges and all places were booked within three days. This assessment, developed by the Finnish Kennel Club, is not breed-specific and is an extension of the basic Conformation and Movement seminar.

Kimmo Mustonen from the Finnish Kennel Club, whose country had developed this assessment, acted as an assessor alongside Jeff Horswell and Frank Kane. A total of 65% of the 68 candidates passed the assessment which had a pass mark set at 70%. Future assessments are due to take place in November 2018 and February 2019 with a request by the Scottish Kennel Club to host an event.

Appointment of Breed Education Co-ordinators (BECs)

All breed clubs and councils were written to in January 2018 to ask for a BEC to be appointed for each breed. By July all CC breeds (and the majority of non CC breeds) had appointed an individual to undertake the role resulting in 180 appointments.

BEC training

14 A BEC training day was held in July 2018 for all appointed BECs and 150 attended for an induction to the role with speakers from the various JCF pilot breeds and KC Working Party members and KC staff covering all areas of the role and JCF in general.

A follow up event was held at City of Birmingham Championship Show in September.



Both events showed great enthusiasm for the BEC role and established a dialogue between the appointed personnel and the Education and Training team.

Breed Appreciation Days (BADs)

A number of breeds have planned BADs in the coming months, following the submission of a bank of questions for the Multiple-choice Breed Standard Exam to the KC office. A Code of Best Practice on the running of these events was made available in February 2018 at www.thekennelclub.org.uk/jcf

Mentoring

Some breeds have already agreed a list of proposed breed mentors, and passed those names to the KC office. These breeds have begun the JCF mentoring process for those judges who have passed a Multiple-choice Breed Standard Exam under JCF or are on a B list on the current judging system. There has been very encouraging feedback from both mentors and mentees. A Code of Best Practice is available for this online.

Regulations for 2020

It is intended that from 1 January 2020 KC regulations will require all judges officiating to be listed on a B judging list or above on the current system or registered at JCF Level 1 or above.

JCF Question and Answer sessions

Five new Accredited Trainers are now able to deliver presentations on JCF, alongside current Working Party members and staff. A number of presentations have taken place around the country to publicise the system and answer questions.

In addition, a member of the Education and Training team has been present at shows where the KC Roadshow is attending to answer questions in addition to 'drop in' sessions at Birmingham National, Scottish Kennel Club and City of Birmingham Championship Shows.

Breed Competence Assessments

A Code of Best Practice is currently being developed for the Breed Competence Assessments which will be run by the KC. It is anticipated that these will be piloted towards the end of 2019 before full implementation in 2020.

ADRIAN MARETT

3 September 2018