



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE WORKING TRIALS
LIAISON COUNCIL HELD ON THURSDAY 23 JANUARY 2020
AT 10.30 AM IN THE BOARDROOM, THE KENNEL CLUB,
CLARGES STREET**

PRESENT:

Mrs P Bann	Essex Working Trials Society
Miss J Carruthers	North East Counties Working Trials Society
Mr M Drewitt	New Forest Working Trials Society
Mr B Gilbert	ASPADS Working Trials Society
Mr N Hines	Lincolnshire German Shepherd Dog & All Breeds Training Society
Mrs J Holt	North West Working Trials Society
Mrs J Howells	Hampshire Working Trials Society
Mr M Lewindon	Surrey Dog Training Society
Mrs D Ling	East Anglian Working Trials Training Society
Ms L Marlow	Southern Alsatian Training Society
Mr G Martin	Midland Counties German Shepherd Dog Association
Mr R Musgrave	Yorkshire Working Trials Society
Mr D Robertson	Association of Bloodhound Breeders
Mr N Sutcliffe	The Bloodhound Club
Mr J West	Wessex Working Trials Club
Mr J Wykes	Leamington Dog Training Club

IN ATTENDANCE:

Miss D Deuchar	Head of Canine Activities
Mrs A Mitchell	Senior Committee Secretary - Working Dog Activities Team

IN THE CHAIR: MR B GILBERT

1. A short silence was held in memory of Mrs S Tannert, a serving member of the Council representing British Association for German Shepherd Dogs, who had recently passed away. Mr West represented the Association for the purposes of the meeting.

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. Apologies were received from Mrs K Herbert and Mr B Russell.

ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

3. The minutes of the meeting held on 24 April 2019 were approved as an accurate record.



ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

4. The Council noted that the following amendment to I Regulations was approved by the Board at its meeting on 16 July 2019:

Regulation I(C)1. Method of Handling

TO:

Although implicit obedience is necessary, dogs and handlers must operate in as free and natural a manner as possible; persistent barking, whining, etc. in any exercise other than location of person or speak on command should be penalised. The handler must not have food or a toy on their person whilst the dog is being tested. **In any exercise where the dog is required to bite a protected steward (protected consistent with safety), it must be on the right arm. Any indiscriminate biting must be severely penalised.**

(Insertion in bold)

(Effective 1 January 2020)

Kennel Club Working Trials Championships 2019

5. The Council was advised that the Activities Committee, at its meeting on 5 December 2019, had received a written report from Mr Lewindon following the Kennel Club Working Trials Championships 2019. The report had been submitted by Mr Lewindon in his role as the Kennel Club representative. A query was raised as why the report had not also been made available to members of the Council.
6. It was clarified that the report had been prepared on a private and confidential basis specifically for the use of the Activities Committee, and permission had not been granted for its wider circulation. The report would be used by the Committee as part of a review to ensure that the role of the Kennel Club representative, and his or her relationship with host societies, was clear and transparent.
7. This led to a short discussion regarding the way in which incidents occurring at working trials were dealt with by the office. It was confirmed that where a complaint was received, it would be dealt with on a confidential basis, and considered by the Activities Committee on the basis of the available evidence. Details of any penalties imposed were published in the Kennel Club Journal. In response to a query, it was emphasised that the remit of the Kennel Club representative did not include assessing the performance of the judge or querying any decisions made by the judge.

ITEM 4. ACTIVITIES HEALTH AND WELFARE SUB-GROUP

8. The Council noted a report from Mr Gilbert on the work of the Sub-Group following its meeting on 19 September 2019.
9. It was pleased to note that funding had been secured to carry out research relating to the height of the scale and the length of the long jump, with the objective of providing factual data on the landing forces on dogs, as previously requested by the Council. The research would be carried out by Nottingham Trent University (NTU) and would commence once final details of the funding arrangement had been confirmed.
10. It was acknowledged that the research would not provide definitive data which would apply in all circumstances, due to variations between different dogs, jumping styles, angles, weather and ground conditions, etc., however it was hoped that it would provide a useful starting point to indicate what may be considered to be 'normal' forces



acting in a dog. The Council agreed that it would be helpful to have quantitative information available to assist in making future decisions.

11. Mr Gilbert would be assisting NTU with logistical and practical issues. All dogs used in the research would be experienced, and once planning was under way, a call would be made for volunteers wishing to take part. It was hoped that the mix of breeds used would reflect those currently taking part in working trials.
12. An update would be provided in due course.
13. Study into the use of the scale jump at Kennel Club Working Trial
The Council noted a paper from Penelope Bellis (MCHIRO, MMCA, IVCA, BVCA, Doctor of Chiropractic) regarding the scale jump. The paper was provided for information only, with the permission of Ms Bellis, and would be forwarded to Nottingham Trent University for use as background to its own research as outlined above.

ITEM 5. ACTIVITIES JUDGES SUB-GROUP

14. The Council noted that the Sub-Group, at its meeting on 14 November 2019, had not discussed any matters which were of direct relevance to working trials.
15. However it was advised that Miss Carruthers would be submitting proposals for amendments to I Regulations to the Council at its July meeting, with the objective of clarifying and simplifying the responsibilities of judges.

ITEM 6. REPORT FROM THE PD STAKE PANEL

16. The Council noted that the PD Stake Panel had met on 15 December 2019, and had discussed a range of issues, including I Regulations, risk assessments, equipment, and exercises. Efforts had been made to contact as many individuals as possible who were involved in PD stakes in order to obtain their views, and this consultation process remained ongoing.
17. Risk assessments
Mr Lewindon, on behalf of the Panel, had produced a draft risk assessment document, which was already in use by some clubs.
18. It was agreed that the risk assessment produced by Mr Lewindon may be published on the Kennel Club website for use on a generic basis by any host society. However it was emphasised that the document must be updated as appropriate for the circumstances and environment at each trial, with careful consideration being given to each element and the associated level of risk, and ways in which such risks may be minimised.
19. It was stressed that it was not possible to completely eliminate all risks, but societies must be in a position to demonstrate that they had assessed them, and taken reasonable steps to minimise them. Where necessary, this may include taking advice from those with suitable experience of running PD Stakes.
20. It was hoped that all those involved in working trials would take responsibility for fulfilling their own roles, and that handlers must take responsibility for their own dogs. It was clarified that legal advice obtained by the office indicated that judges were



responsible for setting a safe test, but overall responsibility lay with the society running the trial.

21. A concern was raised that where a society had concerns regarding the safety of a test, the Trials Manager did not currently have the authority to require that the test be changed. It was suggested that the Council may wish to consider submitting a proposal to a future meeting which would give such authority to Trials Managers where there was a concern, even where a test did not contravene I Regulations.
22. A query was raised as to the Panel's views on removal of the requirement for a dog to bite. It was clarified that the majority of those consulted had not wished for this requirement to be removed.

Training for Protected Stewards

23. The Panel's consultation provided evidence of agreement among those involved in PD Stakes that protected stewards should receive training, and a number of experienced Protected Stewards and trainers were being consulted with a view to formulating a suitable format for such training.
24. It was noted that Southern Alsatian Training Society (SATS) was running a PD Helpers Weekend 16-17 May 2020 at which all were welcome. The weekend would include training on a comprehensive range of topics. Feedback gained from the above event would be used to develop further training.

Lockouts

25. The Panel had been specifically requested by the Board to review the matter of lockouts.
26. Having consulted with those taking part in PD Stakes, the Panel noted that the majority were of the view that they should be made aware of when they were expected to send their dog to bite. It was suggested that lockouts should only continue in the Quartering the Ground exercise where the dog was not expected to bite. However this may be problematic where the Search and Escort exercise followed on immediately from the Quartering exercise, as it would not then be possible to have a lockout on only the Quartering. It was agreed that the Search and Escort exercise may be run at any point in the trial so this was not an issue.
27. There was a view that lockouts were a positive part of a trial in that handlers were required to think 'on their feet'.
28. However, if lockouts were not used, it was essential that a run-through took place prior to the first competitor attempting an exercise, in order to make it fair for all and not to put the first competitor at a disadvantage. It was noted that as a general rule, most judges provided run-throughs, but not all.
29. The Panel noted the above views but wished to carry out further consultation before making final recommendations. It was agreed that it would provide a further report and recommendations at the Council's next meeting.
30. The Council thanked the Panel for its report, and wished to acknowledge the considerable amount of work which had been involved in providing it.

Recommendations from Council

31. In response to a query, it was clarified by the office that full minutes from Council meetings were submitted to the Activities Committee. Any specific recommendations made by the Council at any time were considered by the Committee, and if



recommended for approval, were subsequently referred to the Board for final approval. Any amendments to I Regulations which were approved by the Board would come into effect on 1 January of the next year.

32. The Council noted that the PD Panel would prepare specific proposals for consideration at its July meeting, with assistance from the office where necessary. However it was reminded that should a proposal be discussed but not supported, the matter may not be discussed again within a two-year period.

ITEM 7. REPORT FROM THE PROGRESSION PANEL

33. The Council noted that the Progression Panel was in the process of carrying out two polls, via social media, as follows:
- Do you think the Introductory Stake should remain in its current format?
 - Do you think the CD Open Stake should be mandatory?
34. An email address had been provided for those who wished to submit information or suggestions as to what the Introductory Stake should encompass, and of any changes which may be made to attract competitors to the discipline.
35. The polls would run into February/March 2020 to enable those without access to social media to contribute via the use of paper questionnaires. Paper copies were also available at trials.
36. Full results would be collated and presented at the Council's meeting in July.

ITEM 8. REPORT FROM THE EQUIPMENT PANEL

Removal of the gun test

37. As requested at the Council's previous meeting, the Equipment Panel had considered whether the gun test should be removed, and if so, whether the marks should be reallocated or a new test introduced to replace it.
38. A recent poll conducted by the Panel had shown that most respondents (47%) were in favour of removing the gun test from the schedule of exercises within working trials. 37% were not in favour, and 16% had indicated no preference.
39. Accordingly, the Panel wished to recommend an amendment to I Regulations with the objective of removing the gun test from the schedule of exercises.
40. The proposal was seconded by Mr Musgrave.
41. A concern was raised as to whether the poll was valid as it appeared that some people had been unable to access it via the social media group. However, it was emphasised that over 170 responses had been received via the group, and the Panel had also received a number of responses via email.
42. It was suggested for future reference that, when conducting polls, it would be advisable to provide only yes/no options, in the interests of clarity.



43. In response to a query as to the rationale for removing the gun test, it was reiterated that this was as discussed at the Council's previous meeting, i.e. that use of guns during trials was no longer appropriate.
44. A vote took place, and by a majority, the proposal was not supported.
45. It was highlighted that, under Council rules, the matter may not be discussed again within a two year period.
46. Noting the decision of the Council on the matter, a concern was raised that the proposal had not been recommended for approval, despite the results of the poll which had been carried out by the Equipment Panel which had indicated support for removal of the gun test.
47. It was highlighted that although Council members represented individual societies, and expressed the views of those societies, they should also take into account the content of discussions at which valid alternative viewpoints may be expressed. Council meetings offered a valuable opportunity for exploration of a wide range of views, and any decisions should be made on the basis of those discussions. It was not mandatory for Council members to vote as indicated by those they represented, but must use their own judgement.
- Reallocation of marks
48. In view of the Council's decision that the gun test should not be removed, any discussion regarding reallocation of marks was no longer relevant.
- Removal of requirement to qualify in every section
49. The Panel wished the Council to discuss the requirement to qualify in every section, which was a fundamental part of trials. However a suggestion had been made to remove that requirement and replace it with just the overall qualifying mark for the respective stakes.
50. The Panel was of the view that those individuals who did not wish to participate in any exercise, such as jumps or stays, would not have to do so, however they would still be able to qualify, providing they gained the overall qualifying mark. This would allow such individuals to take a meaningful part in trials.
51. There would be no requirement to attempt any exercise and a competitor would not have to nominate which exercises they were or were not attempting prior to entering the field of competition.
52. The Panel suggested that if supported, the measure be introduced on a three-year trial basis, at the end of which a full review may be carried out.
53. The Council was of the view that removal of the requirement to qualify in every section may be helpful in attracting new competitors to the discipline. It would give flexibility to those wishing to take advantage of it without any impact on those who wished to continue to participate in all exercises.
54. It noted that competitors would be able to qualify for championship working trials in this way, although it was anticipated that the requirement to qualify in every section would remain in place for championship working trials.
55. A concern was raised that there was a risk of potential injury to a dog which had not been trained for a particular exercise being required to undertake it should the handler wish to gain additional marks in order to qualify.



56. The Council also considered an alternative suggestion which had been submitted by Mrs J Holt, via the Equipment Panel.
57. Mrs Holt was of the view that working trials had always been aimed at dogs which were obedient, physically fit and able to use their noses effectively, and that the present qualification arrangements were therefore paramount.
58. However she wished to suggest that the following may help to address concerns regarding doing jumps, stays and overall qualifications without lowering the present standards or altering the marks assigned to individual exercises:
- For CD, UD, WD and TD open and championship, the control and agility sections were marked separately. It was suggested that the marks of the two sections were amalgamated.
 - So, for UD, WD, and TD the maximum marks would be 55 of which 70% is 39 (25 plus 14)
CD would result in a total of C/A of 70 of which 70% was 49.
 - In all cases the 70% could be achieved even if jumps or stays were failed or declined provided enough marks had been achieved elsewhere in the section.
 - Overall marks of 80% (Minimum 176 in TD, 160 in WD and UD, 80 in CD) would still be achievable by a dog of a good standard.
 - This rule change to the score sheets could be easily implemented without major alterations to the basic principle of qualification.
59. It was anticipated that the above arrangement would provide flexibility for competitors whilst retaining the requirements for obedience, fitness, and good nosework. It would also allow some older dogs, which were less able to negotiate jumps, to continue to compete.
60. The Council was in agreement that the suggestion from Mrs Holt was a practical one, and that it should be developed further. Mrs Holt undertook to formulate a detailed proposal.
61. The Equipment Panel would also formulate a proposal for the removal of the requirement to qualify in every section, and to replace it with just the overall qualifying mark for the respective stakes.
62. Both proposals would be considered by the Council at its next meeting.
- Clear Jump
63. A request was made that the Equipment Panel review the regulation relating to the Clear Jump. This currently stated that the rigid top bar may be fixed or rest in cups and the space below may be filled in but the filling should not project above the bottom of the top bar. It was suggested that it may be preferable for there to be some form of filling below the top bar so as to avoid an empty space.
64. It was agreed that the Panel would consider the matter.



ITEM 9. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

- Proposed amendment to Regulation I(B)13 Quartering the Ground
65. Southern Alsatian Training Society, represented by Ms Marlow, wished to propose an amendment to I Regulations, with the objective of enhancing helper safety.
66. The proposal was seconded by Mr Lewindon.
67. The Society was of the view that a helper, if lying down, may not have a clear view of an approaching dog, and would not be able to move quickly if necessary. Further, where a helper was seated or standing, the dog would be more able to see the sleeve.
68. It was acknowledged that Search & Rescue dogs were expected to locate missing persons who would be lying down, however it was also accepted that such dogs were not required to bite under any circumstances, which was not the case with dogs competing in PD Stakes.
69. It was noted that Regulation I(B)13 stated that in the Quartering exercise, a dog that bites the hidden person must be heavily penalised. Inevitably situations would arise where a dog failed to complete a test correctly, and the Society was of the view that it was a positive step to ensure that helpers were protected should this occur.
70. This led to a brief discussion as to whether PD Stakes should include any exercises where a dog was expected to bite. It was accepted that this was a wider issue which could not be discussed in detail at present, but may be reviewed in the future if it was considered necessary. It was reiterated that it was likely that those competing in PD Stakes would wish to retain such exercises.
71. In response to a query, it was clarified that where a protected helper had failed to remain motionless, the judge should take all circumstances into account and mark accordingly. Should the judge be of the view that the helper had moved in order to assist the dog in any way, a report should be lodged in the Incident Book.
72. A vote took place, and by a majority, the following amendment was recommended for approval:
- Regulation I(B)13
TO:
The missing person, protected consistent with safety, ~~should~~ **must** remain motionless **in a seated or standing position** out of sight of the handler, but ~~should~~ **must** be accessible on investigation to the dog when 'winded'. **The protected steward must not be lying down.** The judge should satisfy himself that the dog has found the person and has given warning spontaneously and emphatically without being directed by the handler. A dog that bites the hidden person must be heavily penalised.
(Deletions struck through, insertions in bold)
- Proposed new Regulation I26i
73. Mrs Ling, on behalf of East Anglian Working Trials Training Society, and following preliminary discussions with the PD Panel, wished to propose an additional Regulation, under the provisions of which judges of PD Stakes would be required to submit details of tests to the Trials Manager.
74. The Society noted that Trials Managers were obliged to complete risk assessments for trials, but if unaware of plans for PD tests, they were unable to address any potential risks arising from them.



75. It was accepted that most judges already provided details of tests, but should the proposal be approved, it would become mandatory.
76. The proposal was seconded by Ms Marlow.
77. In response to a query regarding the time frame, it was confirmed that it would be quite acceptable for the judge to provide details of the tests on the day of the trial, however this must take place prior to commencement of the test.
78. Where a Trials Manager had any concerns regarding a test, these should be discussed with the judge and appropriate changes made if necessary. However, a Trials Manager did not have the authority to enforce any such changes, and where agreement could not be reached with the judge, a report should be made within the trial's Incident Book to note that the judge had been advised of any concerns.
79. The proposal also included a provision whereby, if the Trials Manager had insufficient experience of PD tests, the society must nominate an appropriate person with PD experience to assist him/her. The Council was of the view that although it was advisory for a Trials Manager to seek assistance where necessary, such a requirement should not be included within the regulation. Mrs Ling confirmed her agreement to the removal of the following wording from the proposed Regulation: 'If the Trials Manager has insufficient experience of PD tests the Society must nominate an appropriate person with PD experience to assist him/her.'
80. A vote took place, and the Council unanimously recommended for approval the following amendment:
- New Regulation I26i
TO:
Patrol Dog stake judges must, before commencement of the Patrol Dog test, provide Working Trials Managers with sufficient detail of the tests, the risks arising from them and measures to manage those risks, to be included within risk assessments completed in respect of the events.
(Insertion in bold)
81. Should the above amendment be approved by the Board, Mr Lewindon undertook to make relevant changes to the generic risk assessment which had been discussed earlier in the meeting.
- Proposed amendment to Regulation I(A)9.
82. The proposal was submitted by Mr Wykes, who requested the Council to consider a proposal to increase the track mark in PD from 60 to 90.
83. The minimum Qualifying Mark for the Stake i.e. 70% would increase from 224 to 245 and 80% would increase from 256 to 280. The Overall Mark would increase from 320 to 350.
84. The proposal was seconded by Mr Martin.
85. Mr Wykes was of the view that increasing the track mark to 90 would bring it into line with other stakes, and would give more importance to nosework.
86. A view was expressed that as PD stakes included a number of exercises which were not included in other stakes, there was no necessity to bring the track mark into line with others. There was also a concern that nosework and tracking should not be given more emphasis within a PD Stake than was currently the case.



- 87. The Council was keen to ensure that the standard of tracking within PD remained high, but it did not consider there would be any benefit to increasing the mark from 60 to 90.
- 88. A vote took place, and by a majority, the proposal was not supported.

ITEM 10. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Progression through the stakes

- 89. Yorkshire Working Trials Society, represented by Mr Musgrave, requested that the Council discuss making the progression through the stakes more obvious, and ways in which this may be achieved.
- 90. The Society considered that it was important that there was a clear progression from the initial stakes through to the later ones, with a clear but gradual increase in difficulty. This may be reflected in, for example, the number of legs/angles in track patterns, the size of articles in the nosework section, and the length/type of sendaways, etc.
- 91. It also suggested that the agility section may benefit from having a less difficult test, such as removal of the scale from CD, instead of the present system which required the same in CD as in TD.
- 92. The item was discussed in conjunction with a linked item which had also been submitted by Yorkshire Working Trials Society, as below.

Encouragement of new competitors

- 93. Yorkshire Working Trials Society wished the Council to consider having two certificated stakes prior to CD in order to facilitate new dogs/handlers to start in trials.
- 94. It was suggested that trials should start at a level which would be perceived as less daunting than CD. This may include, for example, a stake without jumps which would allow dogs into a trial environment at a much lower age than at present. The new stakes would follow the same format as existing ones, with open and championship levels. A dog could continue to compete in that stake until it qualified for the next one. The Society suggested a Beginners Stake and a Novice Stake, with a defined range of exercises aimed at newer competitors.
- 95. The Society noted that special stakes were working well but were not always available, and varied in terms of content.
- 96. In response to a query, the Society clarified its intention that qualifying in the suggested new stakes would be a pre-requisite to competing in CD Stakes.
- 97. The Council acknowledged that special stakes were not certificated and did not count towards progression, however they were popular with competitors and attracted good entries. Given the level of support for them, it agreed that the Society's suggestion warranted further consideration, although there was a view that any such new stakes should not be mandatory, and that it may be preferable for a new competitor to be eligible to compete in CD should they wish to do so.
- 98. It agreed that the matter should be referred to the Progression Panel for consideration, and that it would be discussed again at the Council's next meeting.



ITEM 11. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY

99. The Council noted the Five Year Strategy document. The issues included on it had been considered as part of the discussion on other items during the course of the meeting.

ITEM 12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Out of sight stays

100. At its meeting on 5 December 2019, the Activities Committee had discussed the out of sight stay exercise in both working trials and obedience, noting information received from the Australian National Kennel Council Limited which was in the process of reviewing out of sight stays in obedience tests, and the American Kennel Club, which had replaced the exercise in its obedience tests with other exercises designed to test the dog's ability to stay.
101. The removal of out of sight stays from the Good Citizen Dog Scheme Gold test with effect from 2020 was also highlighted.
102. The Committee had requested the views of the Council, with particular reference to the following questions:
- Whether any stay exercise should be carried out with the dog on or off lead
 - Whether it was appropriate for out of sight stays to continue to be scheduled
103. Noting concerns that a dog which was not within sight of the handler may be considered to be out of control, from a legal perspective, all present were requested to email Mr Gilbert with their views on the matter as soon as possible.

Training sessions

104. A concern was raised regarding the availability of weekly training classes for working trials. It was noted that of the clubs represented at the meeting, six offered such training. A number of commercial trainers also offered training services.

Regulation I(D)1. Bloodhound Working Trial Certificates

105. Mr Sutcliffe wished to seek clarification regarding an amendment to the above Regulation, which had recently been announced via a press release. The revised Regulation, which became effective on 1 January 2020, stated that: 'Handlers who choose to work/hunt their hounds leashed must drop their leash within 300 yards of the line up, so that a natural identification takes place that is free from any handler interference.'
106. It was clarified that handlers were required to drop the leash within a distance of 300 yards (or less) from the line up, not at, or more than, 300 yards.



ITEM 13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

107. The Council's next meeting would take place on 16 July 2020. Any items for the agenda must be submitted by 17 April 2020.

The meeting closed at 3.40 pm

MR B GILBERT
Chairman

NOTE: any recommendations made by the Working Trials Liaison Council are subject to review by the Activities Committee and the Kennel Club Board, and will not come into effect unless and until Board approval has been confirmed.

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'



Liaison Societies for Non-Championship Working Trials Societies

Working Trials Society

Australian Shepherd Club of The United Kingdom
Aveley Obedience & Working Trials Society
Avon Working Trials Training Society
Aylesbury Canine Training Society
Banbury & District Dog Training Society
Billingshurst Dog Training Club
Birmingham & District German Shepherd Dog Association
Central Bernese Mountain Dog Club
Chipping Norton & District Dog Training Club
Cynllan Lodge Dog Training Club
Deveron Dog Training Club
Donyatt Dog Training Club
Grampian Gundog Club
Haslemere & District Dog Training Club
High Peak Dog Training Society
Hucknall & District Canine Training Society
Lochaber & District Canine Society
Midlands Border Collie Club
Mid Wales Working Gundog Society
National Australian Shepherd Association
Newlands Working Dog Society
North of England Weimaraner Society
Northants & Bedfordshire Working Trials Dog Training
Northern Alsatian & All Breeds Training Society
Northern Newfoundland Club
Portland Dog Training Club
Rough & Smooth Collie Training Association
Scottish Kennel Club
Six Counties Working Trials Society
Slovakian Rough Haired Pointer Club (Provisional)
South Devon Agility & Dog Training Club
South Leeds Working Trials Dog Training Club
Spanish Water Dog Club (Provisional)
Spey Valley Dog Training Club
Sporting Irish Water Spaniel Club
Stonehouse Dog Training Club
Weimaraner Club of Great Britain
Weimaraner Club of Scotland
Working Belgian Shepherd Dog Society
Ynys Mon Dog Training Society

Representative Society

Yorkshire Working Trials Society
Essex Working Trials Society
Wessex Working Trials Club
ASPADS Working Trials Society
Leamington Dog Training Club
Southern Alsatian Training Society
Leamington Dog Training Club
ASPADS Working Trials Society
British Association For German Shepherd Dogs
Welsh Kennel Club
Scottish Working Trials Society
Wessex Working Trials Club
Scottish Working Trials Society
Surrey Dog Training Society
North West Working Trials Society
Midland Counties German Shepherd Dog Association
Scottish Working Trials Society
Midland Counties German Shepherd Dog Association
Welsh Kennel Club
Iceni German Shepherd Dog Club
Surrey Dog Training Society
North East Counties Working Trials Society
ASPADS Working Trials Society
Yorkshire Working Trials Society
British Association for German Shepherd Dogs
Poole & District Dog Training Society
Leamington Dog Training Club
Scottish Working Trials Society
North West Working Trials Society
Yorkshire Working Trials Society
Poole & District Dog Training Society
Yorkshire Working Trials Society
Lincolnshire German Shepherd Dog & All Breeds
Scottish Working Trials Society
North West Working Trials Society
British Association for German Shepherd Dogs
Essex Working Trials Society
Scottish Working Trials Society
ASPADS Working Trials Society
Welsh Kennel Club