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About the Kennel Club

The Kennel Club is the largest organisation in the UK devoted to dog health, welfare and training. Its objective is to ensure that dogs live healthy, happy lives with responsible owners.

It runs the country’s largest registration database for both pedigree and crossbreed dogs and the Petlog database, which is the UK’s biggest reunification service for microchipped animals. The Kennel Club Assured Breeder Scheme is the only scheme in the UK that monitors breeders, in order to protect the welfare of puppies and breeding bitches. It also runs the UK’s largest dog training programme, the Good Citizen Dog Training Scheme and licenses shows and clubs across a wide range of activities, which help dog owners to bond and enjoy life with their dogs. The Kennel Club runs the world’s greatest dog show, Crufts, and the Discover Dogs event at Earls Court, London, a fun family day out that educates people about how to buy responsibly and care for their dog.

The Kennel Club invests in welfare campaigns, dog training and education programmes and the Kennel Club Charitable Trust, which supports research into dog diseases and dog welfare charities, including Kennel Club Breed Rescue organisations that re-home dogs throughout the UK. The Kennel Club jointly runs health screening schemes with the British Veterinary Association and through the Charitable Trust, funds the Kennel Club Genetics Centre at the Animal Health Trust, which is at the forefront of pioneering research into dog health. The new Kennel Club Cancer Centre at the Animal Health Trust will contribute to the AHT’s well-established cancer research programme, helping to further improve dog health.

The Kennel Club considers the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 to be a kneejerk piece of legislation which was rushed through in haste. The legislation has not reduced the
number of pit bull terriers in this country, nor has it reduced the number of dog bite incidents while it has had a huge impact on the welfare of many dogs. It is essential that any new legislation is properly considered and puts greater emphasis on animal welfare whilst better protecting the public.

**Question 1:** Do you agree with the three stage test set out in paragraph 3 above. If not, why not?

The Kennel Club agrees with the circumstances by which an authorised officer may issue a Dog Control Notice however has some concerns regarding the inclusion of protected animals. This is particularly in respect of point (2) the dog’s behaviour has on at least one occasion caused someone to feel apprehension about …the safety of …a “protected animal”. Whilst the Kennel Club agrees wholeheartedly with the intention of Dog Control Notices, and the expectation that the use of such orders would reduce irresponsible behaviour in respect of dogs and their owners, the Club would ask that this particular element be approached with extreme caution.

Further details on the Kennel Club’s position in respect of protected animals and reasonable apprehension of harm potentially leading to a criminal offence can be found in its response to Q14.

8. It is possible that the Bill, when introduced in 2013, may refer to the micro-chipping requirement. However, since there is currently no statutory requirement to micro-chip dogs, the Bill as currently drafted does not refer to micro-chipping.

9. Once a system of micro-chipping is in force, the person shown on the micro-chip register as being a dog’s owner will generally be the appropriate recipient of a DCN. But even with a system of micro-chipping, there will inevitably be circumstances where a dog is not micro-chipped, or where the current owner of a dog is not recorded on the micro-chip register, or where for some reason a DCN needs to be served on someone other than the person shown on the micro-chipping register as being the dog’s owner. In these cases the person responsible for the dog, or the person with parental responsibility (as set out above) will be the correct recipient.

**Question 2:** Do you agree with the categories of individuals on whom a DCN might be served. If not, why not?

Yes, the Kennel Club agrees with the categories of individuals specified to whom a Dog Control Notice may be served. However, it would also recommend that family members and other keepers of the dog should, where possible, also be encouraged to attend in order to have the most positive impact.

**Question 3:** Should compulsory training be a requirement in a DCN. If so, what types of training should be available to ensure a dog’s welfare needs are met. If not, why not?
Yes, the Kennel Club sees training as an essential part of rehabilitation in respect of improving and rectifying negative behaviour in respect of dogs and their handling by owners.

The Kennel Club Good Citizen Dog Scheme is the largest dog training scheme in the UK. Its aim is to teach and promote responsible dog ownership and in turn, enhance people’s relationship with their pets creating well trained and socialised dogs and making the community aware of the many benefits associated with dog ownership.

The Kennel Club Good Citizen Dog Scheme has 31 fully registered and listed training clubs in Wales. Full details of these can be found at: http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/item/2580

The Kennel Club’s recommendation would always be that dog training should teach basic socialisation and be focused on owner responsibility. The Kennel Club Good Citizen Dog Scheme Bronze Award aims to produce a dog that will walk and behave in a controlled manner. It is a basic standard that all adult dogs can achieve with the correct handling and most closely meets the criteria of what you wish to achieve by having an individual undergo training to adhere to a Dog Control Notice.

The basic areas covered are:
  i)  Cleanliness and Identification
  ii) Collar and Lead
  iii) Walk on Lead
  iv) Control at Door/Gate
  v) Controlled Walk Amongst People And Dogs
  vi) Stay on Lead for One Minute
  vii) Grooming
  viii) Examination of the Dog
  ix) Return to Handler
  x) Responsibility and Care

The Kennel Club is also developing its Kennel Club Accreditation Scheme for Instructors in Dog Training and Canine Behaviour, the first and only scheme in the UK for instructors to be approved by City & Guilds NPTC. This gives instructors involved in teaching dog training and advising on canine behaviour the opportunity to gain a nationally recognised, credible and externally verified national standard qualification. Currently, as this is a formal qualification which takes time to achieve, we do not have a large number of fully accredited instructors in Wales, however we hope that the scheme will continue to grow in the coming years therefore being able to supply many more trainers to the area. The current list of Accredited Instructors can be found at: http://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/item/1448

Other organisations also offering dog training programmes include:
  i)  The British Institute of Professional Dog Trainers http://www.bipdt.org.uk/
  ii) Pet Dog Training Instructors http://pdti.org/ and
  iii) The Association of Pet Dog Trainers http://www.apdt.co.uk/

The Kennel Club believes it is imperative for the dog owner to complete some kind of course which is externally verified by a contactable person who can confirm this; i.e.
that the person does not just produce their own certificate or claim to have completed a course of training from a friend or relative. A Kennel Club approved examiner will always be present to certify achievement of any of the GCDS awards and completes the certificate to confirm they have been witness to it. They can then be contacted should this information need to be verified. The Kennel Club would recommend such a system be introduced for any course of training undertaken as a result of a prescribed Dog Control Notice.

**Question 4:** Do you agree that all of the requirements in sections 5 to 8 should be mandatory. If not, why not?

The Kennel Club would recommend consistent and effective control as referenced in section 5 be defined more specifically in relation to the requirements of the person issued with the Notice.

Specifically, the Kennel Club believes a Dog Control Notice should require—
(a) that the person responsible —
   i) complies with the terms of the notice to the satisfaction of the local authority which has the duty of monitoring its effectiveness and enforcing it, and
   ii) on changing name, address or phone number, notifies the authority of the change in question;
(b) that the person responsible or an entrusted person be present and in charge of the dog.

An entrusted person for the purposes of subsection (b) should be a person who—
   i) is a minimum of 16 years of age,
   ii) has been entrusted with charge of the dog by the person responsible for the dog,
   iii) has been made familiar by the person responsible with the requirements of the dog control notice, and
   iv) is willing and able to comply with those requirements.

The Kennel Club further believes that a Dog Control Notice must include—
   i) the date on which it is served and a statement that the order comes into effect on that date;
   ii) the name and address of the person issued with the Notice and the issuing authority;
   iii) a description of, and information regarding, the dog, including the identification number of the transponder device (microchip);
   iv) the reason for the authorised officer concluding that the dog has been out of control (including a description of the circumstances on the basis of which the officer has come to that conclusion);
   v) the specific requirements of the Dog Control Notice including level and type of dog training which must be undertaken by the person deemed responsible for the dog with the recommendations that additional family members or keepers of the dog also attend; and
   vi) information regarding the right to appeal, the procedure to discharge a Dog Control Notice, the powers contained by the Local Authority, and the repercussions should the individual fail to comply with the Notice;
vii) a date by which the requirements within the Notice must be completed.

The Kennel Club does not agree that it should not be a requirement for the owner of the dog to undertake the training with their dog as it believes the owner should be seen as equally responsible for the dog’s actions and allowing the dog’s negative behaviour.

**Question 5:** We have set out examples of options that a DCN can contain and this list is not exhaustive. Are you content with such an approach? Do you consider that other optional requirements could be included? If so, please provide details.

Whilst the Kennel Club agrees with the principle of being able to tailor Dog Control Notices to a specific dog and owner’s needs, it has some concerns regarding the level of knowledge, skill and competency of those individuals tasked with issuing Dog Control Notices. It is questionable, for example, how qualified a local authority officer would need to be in order to be able to effectively prescribe varying types of dog training, or if a dog should be neutered in order to reduce aggression.

Other optional requirements could be considered however including the restriction of times when a dog may be taken out in public (to prevent, for example, the dog being taken out at night to be used for intimidation etc.) or a Notice to require the owner provide adequate fencing etc. to prevent their dog from escaping and getting into trouble.

More specifically, other optional requirements could include:

i) muzzling the dog whenever it is in a place to which the public have access;

ii) keeping the dog on a lead whenever it is in a place to which the public have access;

iii) neutering the dog;

iv) keeping the dog away from a place, or category of places, specified in the Notice; or

v) imposing a period of curfew.

**Question 6:** Do you agree that the appropriate mechanism to appeal against a DCN is through a Magistrates Court? If not, why not?

The Kennel Club agrees that appeal via the Magistrates Court is appropriate and that the person to whom a Dog Control Notice is issued should be able to apply to the Magistrates’ Court against—

i) their prescribed Dog Control Notice

ii) the term of such a Notice.

However it would also suggest that the ability to lodge an initial appeal to the local authority be included in the appeals process as the authority has the initial duty to discharge where a Dog Control Notice is deemed unreasonable and also currently the power to discharge a Notice if satisfied that it is appropriate to do so.
Question 7: Do you agree that the provision for a local authority to discharge a DCN is appropriate? If not, why not?

The Kennel Club agrees with the provision for a local authority to discharge a Dog Control Notice upon its completion or if it is deemed unreasonable (the dog has died for example). It would however seek clarification as to the circumstances in which a local authority may choose to utilise its power to discharge a Dog Control Notice prior to completion for reasons other than those stated in the previous two examples or by way of a successful appeal. We would also advise that such examples be stated within Guidance to local authorities.

Incidents in which a Dog Control Notice may be considered unreasonable could also include:

i) the person involved in the incident for which the Dog Control Notice was issued was committing an offence for which the penalty could be a custodial sentence;

ii) the person or protected animal was in a place where they were not permitted to be which was enclosed by adequately maintained and substantial boundaries which would reasonably be expected to be capable of containing a dog and which was clearly marked to warn such persons against entering;

iii) the dog was being used for a lawful purpose by a person licensed by a body established by the Private Security Industry Act 2001 or a person who complies with BS8517-1;

iv) the dog was being used for a lawful purpose by a constable or a person in the service of the Crown;

v) the dog was provoked by a person other than the person responsible for it;

vi) the dog was being provoked or attacked by another protected animal; or

vii) the dog is competing in recognised dog trials in which they demonstrate their working ability; but this list is not exhaustive.

Additionally, the Kennel Club would strongly recommend that a Dog Control Notice remains upheld even in the incident of a dog changing ownership, and that the requirement be transferred to the new owner, as the requirement to complete the Notice applies both to owner and the dog itself.

Question 8: Do you agree that failure to comply with a DCN should constitute an offence and be liable to prosecution? If not, why not? Do you agree with the level of the fine?

Yes, the Kennel Club agrees that failure to comply with a Dog Control Notice should constitute an offence and be liable for prosecution as those who feel their Notice was unfairly issued and therefore may not wish to comply have the right to appeal. The Kennel Club also agrees with the level of fine.

Question 9: Do you agree with the proposed court orders? If not, why not?

The Kennel Club would have some serious concerns regarding the possibility of a court order determining destruction for a dog deemed to potentially be a danger to
protected animals. It would ask who, for example, would be making such a recommendation. The Kennel Club would stress that if this proposal be retained it must be on recommendation by certified expert such as a dog behaviourist only and in no way should be determined by information supplied by the local authority or issuer of the Dog Control Notice, unless they are proven to have had sufficient training to increase their level of knowledge to that of a behavioural expert.

In relation to the disqualification order, the Kennel Club would recommend a person should be disqualified –
(a) from owning animals,
(b) from keeping animals,
(c) from participating in the keeping of animals,
(d) from being party to an arrangement under which he is entitled to control or influence the way in which animals are kept, and
(e) from dealing in animals.

**Question 10**: Do you agree that a period of at least one year should pass before any further application can be made to discharge a disqualification order or where any further application can be made, to discharge an order following an earlier unsuccessful appeal? If not, why not?

The Kennel Club would recommend that where a person can prove they have taken appropriate steps to improve their behaviour, for example through training, then they may reapply in a period under one year from the last application.

**Question 11**: A level 3 fine is one where a court may impose a fine of up to a £1,000. Are you content with this approach? If not, why not?

Yes, the Kennel Club agrees with the suggested approach.

**Question 12**: To enable effective sharing of DCNs between enforcement authorities, is it right that some form of database should be set up?

Yes, the Kennel Club agrees that the development of a data sharing system is essential in order to ensure that information is passed between local authorities both effectively and seamlessly.

**Question 13**: Do you agree with this approach about who will serve DCNs? If not, why not?

The Kennel Club maintains that it is essential for individuals serving Dog Control Notices to have appropriate skills, qualifications, training or experience. As such the wording should be ‘The Welsh Ministers must… prescribe conditions that are to be satisfied by a person…’ as opposed to ‘may’. Detailed in its response to Q.5; the Kennel Club has some concerns regarding the level of knowledge, skill and competency of those individuals tasked with issuing Dog Control Notices. It is
questionable, for example, without specific training, how a local authority officer would be able to effectively prescribe varying types of dog training.

**Question 14:** Do you agree with this approach? We would be grateful for your views of extending the 1991 Act to include private places and making it an aggravated offence (with higher penalties) to attack another animal.

The Kennel Club supports the principle of making dog bites on private property an offence. Greater responsibility would therefore be placed on owners to ensure that their dogs are not out of control in any place. It is not acceptable for an owner to allow their dog to behave aggressively either in the home or out in a public place. The application of law to private property should however include exemptions to cover certain circumstances, such as:

i) a bite as a result of provocation by another animal,  
ii) on a person whilst that person is committing an offence, or  
iii) as a result of provocation.

The Kennel Club would stress the need to ensure that the only owners to be penalised and dogs seized/destroyed would be those acting irresponsibly and not just as a result of other people’s irresponsibility. Questions must also be raised, for example, whether an owner would be culpable if a child trespasses in a well fenced and signed garden. Postal workers etc regularly visit private properties without necessarily being known to the dog or landowner, and should be able to do so safely. Equally the Kennel Club would not wish to extend such protection to anyone involved in criminal activity. It is important that the emphasis is on the owner’s responsibility to avoid injury to anybody carrying out their lawful activities.

The Kennel Club would highlight that animal behaviourists would argue that it is impossible to expect a dog to understand the difference between an intruder with lawful or unlawful intent. The Kennel Club therefore feels it is essential that penalties should be considered on a case by case basis and that it must be left to prosecutors to use their discretion in individual cases to decide to bring charges against an owner of a dog which has bitten an intruder.

In respect of proposals to make it an aggravated offence (with higher penalties) to attack another animal, particularly in reference to an offence being committed if there is reasonable apprehension that the dog will attack a protected animal, the Kennel Club has significant concerns.

The Kennel Club does not feel that incidents involving protected animals should necessarily be classed as an aggravated offence. Circumstances surrounding incidents involving protected animals are often very individual. Examples include:

i) a dog could be injured as a result of their owner’s irresponsibility, rather than an aggressive dog, if the injured dog is not sufficiently trained yet being allowed to walk off lead and approaches and antagonises another dog responsibly held on its lead who subsequently injures the dog’  

ii) dogs exhibiting playful behaviour could result in injury if the playing becomes too boisterous and could allow over-zealous owners to seek criminal prosecution for what should be a resolvable, low level incident,
iii) a dog exhibiting natural patterns of behaviour, such as chasing a cat, could also be unfairly penalised.

A common concern in respect of the extension of the law to cover all places is the possibility of a dramatic increase in owners being criminalised under the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 for low level incidents on private land, as opposed to being prosecuted using the Dogs Act 1871. This is because unlike the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991, the Dog Act 1871 Act does not allow for victims to receive compensation. The Kennel Club would therefore draw the Welsh Government’s attention to this point.

**Question 15:** The Welsh Government takes the view that these proposals will lead to greater responsible dog ownership, enhanced animal welfare and provide for better prevention of injury to adults and children. Do you agree? If not, why not?

The Kennel Club greatly welcomed the passing and implementation of the Control of Dogs (Scotland) Act in 2010 which legislated to put greater onus on owners to control their dogs. The rest of the UK is also in need of urgent dog law reform in respect of encouraging responsible dog ownership and tackling dangerous dogs, or perhaps more accurately, their owners including families and children. We therefore welcome the Welsh Government’s proposals as a huge step towards encouraging greater responsible dog ownership; particularly in regards to dog control notices and the extension of the law to private property.

The Kennel Club is pleased to see a focus on prevention, concentrating on responsible ownership, through dog training and education. At the Kennel Club, we believe Dog Control Notices are a good preventative measure that place more responsibility on the owner to ensure they are controlling their dogs in an appropriate way; whether this is through training, keeping the dog on a lead, muzzling, refraining from entering certain areas and so on.

The Club also considers the introduction of Dog Control Notices to be of great benefit in preventing the escalation of lower level dog aggression to more serious incidents where injury occurs.

**Question 16:** The draft Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) provides an estimate of the costs and benefits associated with the proposed legislation. Do you agree with the assessment? If not, why not?

The Kennel Club does believe that some areas have been overlooked or are inaccurate in regards to costs associated with the implementation of the proposed regulations.

The costs associated with the potential increase in prosecutions following the amendment of the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 to include private property do not account for the possible increased prosecutions in regards to protected animals. This will also need to be factored into costing projections.
The assumption that approximately 10% of Dog Control Notices will be appealed relies on a consistent level of competency in respect of those enforcing the regulations and issuing Notices. Until a standard of training can be ensured and is a requirement within the regulation, the Kennel Club would have significant concerns regarding this.

In reference to the projected cost implications for dog owners, the cost suggested for training does not reflect the average figure of those affiliated with the Kennel Club’s Good Citizen Dog Training Scheme, which is the largest training scheme in the UK. This figure is more accurately £5-8 per session in a group training environment. The figures suggested may more accurately reflect the cost of individual training however the Kennel Club would stress that this would not be necessary in the majority of cases and indeed that group training involving interaction with other dogs and owners can bring additional benefits.

The Kennel Club wholeheartedly supports the document’s assessment of the benefits linked to microchipping. Microchipping encourages responsible dog ownership by linking dog and owner more effectively and highlighting that owners are responsible for the actions of their dogs. To show its commitment to microchipping, the Kennel Club has pledged to give a microchip scanner to each Local Authority in England and Wales.

The Regulatory Impact Assessment’s assumption in regards to the cost of developing a new centralised database would, in the Kennel Club’s opinion, appear low. The Kennel Club manages Petlog, the UK’s largest reunification database for lost and found pets and has significant experience in this area. Costs associated with developing a database must also take into account staffing costs, ISO compliancy costs, technological costs to ensure multi-level accessibility depending on the level of access an authorised user may have, the cost of ensuring a robust security system and so on.

Setting up any database from scratch will take time and if done properly will need a certain level of resource. However, depending on the requirements of the database (level of interactivity etc.), an existing database may be able to offer the service for a relatively modest price. More detail would need to be made available to anyone interested in bidding on the work before a definite level of cost could be suggested.

The Kennel Club would support the document’s assessment that the Bill may generate broader animal welfare improvements by making individuals more conscious of the responsibilities associated with owning a dog; however it does believe that linking this to a prediction that it will encourage dog owners to clean up after their animals may be somewhat tenuous.

Reference to the number of hospital admissions due to someone being bitten or struck by a dog should be treated with some caution. These statistics do not accurately reflect dog aggression as cases involving incidents where the dog was not necessarily at fault are also recorded under the same data capture.

Finally, whilst the Kennel Club would agree with the predicted impact of the Bill on the more vulnerable age groups, it would highlight the equal importance of education
regarding safety around dogs to ensure further prevention of dog bite incidents. The Kennel Club has developed the Safe and Sound Scheme which focuses on the educational issues connected with staying safe around dogs. It can never be taken for granted that any dog will be 100% safe with everyone all of the time. The Kennel Club therefore believes it is essential that children are taught how to behave in the company of even the best trained dog. This is achieved through school visits, downloadable resources for teachers and fun interactive games.

**Question 17: Do you have any alternative information that would help to inform the final RIA?**

The Kennel Club corresponded with the Scottish Government Cabinet Secretary for Justice, Kenny MacAskill MSP in February 2012 regarding the success of the Control of Dogs (Scotland) Act 2010, which extended the law to cover any place. He outlined that: ‘in 2010-11, the number of convictions under sections 3 and 4 of the Dangerous Dogs Act 1991 was 83. As a result of the 2010 Act coming into force, The Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (COPFS) introduced a new charge code that records incidents that occur in any place (the charge code data does not separate out incidents that occur on private property and public places). Latest figures from COPFS advise that court action was instructed in respect of 237 separate charges with 61 charges resulting in a conviction. 138 cases are still subject to court proceedings and have not yet had a verdict.’

Due to the short time in which the Control of Dogs (Scotland) Act 2010 has been in place it is difficult to get a full picture of the success of the legislation as well as the cost implications for the police, court service and Crown Prosecution Service. However, as the Act has introduced preventative measures in the form of Dog Control Notices the expectation is that incidents involving irresponsible dog ownership will decrease as owners are encouraged to keep their dogs under control, therefore having a positive financial impact with fewer cases involving police, court service or Crown Prosecution Service. The Kennel Club would expect to see similar results if preventative measures were introduced in Wales.

**Question 18: We have asked a number of specific questions in relation to the Bill and the RIA. If you have any related issues which we have not specifically addressed, please use this space to report them or provide comments separately. Please note, this consultation does not relate to dog fouling, rehoming, or kennelling. These matters may be given separate consideration at a later date.**

Whilst supportive of the main proposals regarding the extension of the law to cover all places and the introduction of Dog Control Notices in order to prevent the escalation of lower level dog aggression to more serious incidents, the Kennel Club has serious concerns regarding suggested measures in relation to ‘protected animals’ as defined under the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

Under the proposed Bill, owners of dogs which injure a protected animal could be subject to criminal prosecution for an aggravated offence which carries a maximum sentence of up to 2 years imprisonment and/or an unlimited fine. This is in contrast
to the maximum penalty for deliberate cruelty to an animal under the Animal Welfare Act which is only up to 6 months imprisonment and/or £20,000 fine.

Within the draft Bill it could also be a criminal offence if an incident takes place where an individual reasonably believes a dog would do harm to a protected animal – even if no injury takes place. The Kennel Club is also concerned that the Bill does not allow any defence for a dog biting a burglar or if the victim causes a dog to injure them by provocation.

Whilst the Kennel Club wholeheartedly welcomes the intention of the Welsh Government to improve legislation surrounding dangerous and out of control dogs, it is seriously concerned regarding some of the negative implications for perfectly responsible dog owners within the proposals, many of which it believes are not intended. Measures must be in place to ensure, for example, that a dog is not unfairly sanctioned for justly defending its owner or their property where illegal trespass occurs.

In regards to Dog Control Notices, the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 currently allows enforcement authorities powers to ban dogs from certain areas of public land but is not specific to problem dogs. By allowing enforcement authorities to ban specific dogs from areas this may reduce the number of blanket bans affecting all dog owners (many of which are responsible) and instead just target those acting irresponsibly. The Kennel Club commends the Welsh Government for seeking to introduce Dog Control Notices which target the minority of irresponsible dog owners. It is also pleased that the proposals recognise the need for the owner to be allowed to appeal or overturn the ban once the dog and owner can be shown to have completed some form of behaviour training to warrant being allowed to use the area again. It also must be kept in mind that a dog needs appropriate exercise under its owner’s duty of care and so there must still be adequate areas that the dog can have access to.

In respect of microchipping, the Kennel Club views its management of and link to Petlog as a significant strength and of great benefit to the aims and objectives of both the government in terms of promoting responsible dog ownership and the wider public. Petlog is the only database which can also communicate the level of information and expertise associated with the Kennel Club to those whose data it manages. Not only can it offer the lifetime management of the dog and owner’s information but also best practice through the previously mentioned Good Citizen Dog Scheme – the UK’s largest dog training scheme, and the Safe and Sound Scheme - the Kennel Club’s education initiative to teach children how to be safe and interact around dogs. The Kennel Club is committed to continuing this work now and in the future for the benefit of dogs and their owners alike.