



## **Minutes of the KCLC Breeds Council Meeting held at The Kennel Club on 7 November 2018**

### **Present:**

|                      |                  |
|----------------------|------------------|
| Mr R Allen           | Mr N Bryce-Smith |
| Mr S Collier         | Mrs J Davie      |
| Mr D Evans           | Mr T Foulston    |
| Mr T Hutchings       | Mrs T Jackson    |
| Mrs P Jeans-Brown    | Mrs E MacDonald  |
| Mr E Paterson        | Mr K Pursglove   |
| Mr T Schaanning-Ling | Mrs A Teasdale   |
| Mrs S Thomson        | Mrs B Thornley   |
| Mrs S M Walton       | Mr D Winsley     |

### **In Attendance:**

- Miss D Deuchar – Senior Manager, Governance & Education  
Mr A Marett – Education & Training Officer (Item 3 - Judges Competency Framework only)  
Mrs A Mitchell – Senior Committee Secretary  
Miss C Walsh – Officer, Breed Shows Team

### **IN THE CHAIR: MR SCHAANNING-LING**

1. Mr Schaanning-Long opened the meeting by thanking all present for attending, despite the difficulties caused by the tube strike. Delegates were reminded of the need for confidentiality until the minutes were published, and of the collective responsibility of all members.

### **Item 1. Apologies for absence**

2. Apologies were received from Ms C Boggia, Mrs R Bryden, Mrs J Iles-Hebbert, Mr M James, Mrs E Needham, Ms A Oliver and Miss S Taylor.

### **Item 2. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 November 2017**

3. It was noted that Mrs T Jackson was shown as being present at the above meeting but had been unable to attend and had sent her apologies.
4. Subject to the above amendment, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved as being an accurate record.



### **Item 3. Results of recommendations and matters arising**

#### May 2018 meeting

5. It was noted that there had been much disappointment at the cancellation of the meeting due to be held in May 2018, but it was accepted that meetings must be worthwhile with adequate business to discuss.

#### Results of recommendations

6. The Council noted the results of recommendations following its meeting held on 22 November 2017.

#### **Export of Greyhounds to Macau**

7. At its meeting held on 22 November 2017, the Council welcomed a statement from the Kennel Club's Public Affairs department which understood that the owners of the Macau Canidrome had confirmed that the track would be closing permanently by July 2018, following an ultimatum issued by the Macau Government earlier this year. The Council noted that the racecourse had now been closed. No further action by the Council was necessary.

#### **Judges Competency Framework**

8. At its previous meeting, the Committee noted an update from Mr Collier, representing the English Setter breed, which was one of 14 breeds to take part in the pilot scheme for the Judges Competency Framework (JCF).

9. Mr A Marett, Education & Training Officer, presented a report on the most recent updates to the Judges Competency Framework (Annex A to the minutes refers).

10. The Council particularly noted a number of points, as follows:

- Eye for a Dog Assessment: further assessments had been postponed until further notice. Attendance at an Eye for a Dog assessment would be mandatory only for those judges wishing to judge second or subsequent breeds at CC level.
- Breed Education Co-ordinators (BECs): A full list of BECs was published in the Kennel Club Journal (August 2018 issue).
- Breed Appreciation Days (BADs): a very interesting article had been printed in the Kennel Club Gazette (November 2018 issue) following a BAD for Afghan Hounds. The article contained information which would be very helpful to clubs wishing to organise a BAD for their own breed.

11. It was acknowledged that there was still some confusion in the dog showing community regarding the way in which the JCF should operate but feedback from those who had taken part in making arrangements such as organising BADs and providing mentoring services within their own breeds was generally very positive.

12. It was accepted that some issues would arise during the transition period but it was anticipated that these would be addressed via ongoing consultation with those involved. The Council expressed its willingness to take part in the process and would be happy to assist the office in any way. It was confirmed that feedback from all parties would be taken into account in making any necessary revisions to the JCF as it continued to develop.

13. A very interesting presentation of the JCF had been provided at the Kennel Club's Special General Meeting held on 6 November 2018, and the office was requested to provide a copy of this to Council representatives. [Afternote: It was subsequently agreed that the presentation did not offer significant insight without background information, and that relevant statistics and other information would be issued via future press releases.]



## **Sentience of Animals**

14. At its meeting held on 22 November 2017, the Council voiced concern that various reports appeared to suggest that Members of Parliament, during a vote had rejected the idea that animals were sentient.

15. The Council noted that since the vote had taken place, 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.

16. The Kennel Club welcomed the draft bill and would continue to monitor its progress. The office undertook to provide a further update to the Council at its meeting in May 2019.

### Reciprocal agreement with FCI

17. At its meeting held on 24 May 2017, the Council had discussed the reciprocal arrangement with the FCI in respect of judges, which had been signed in March 2017. The Council had raised concerns that, despite the new agreement, difficulties remained in checking the qualifications of overseas judges. A further concern was raised in that, under the terms of the new agreement, the onus was on nominating societies to exercise due diligence in ensuring that only suitably qualified judges were appointed, but that this may prove problematic if sufficient information could not be obtained in respect of a judge's experience.

18. The Council had agreed that no further action should be taken at the time but that the impact of the new agreement should be assessed over the course of the coming twelve months.

19. Council representatives were reminded that any examples of unacceptable judging involving overseas judges should be submitted to the office so that any such instances may be used as a basis for requesting that specific aspects of the agreement be re-examined, if necessary.

## **Item 4. Proposals**

### **Proposal: Ms K Jackson, Staffordshire Bull Terrier Representative**

**'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 are not tested to the recommended minimum. The differential should be a financial incentive to DNA testing which will give a better impact on all breeds health requirements, outcomes and breeding.'**

20. The proposal was presented by Mr Winsley, who also seconded it.

21. It was emphasised that consultation had taken place with representatives from a number of breeds. 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.

22. The Council noted that registration fees were already slightly lower for members of the Assured Breeder Scheme (ABS), but it was acknowledged that not all breeders wished to join the Scheme.

23. A concern was raised that the proposal only referred to DNA testing and did not cover other tests such as hip and elbow scoring. It was also unclear as to whether it would cover those dogs which had not been DNA tested but were 'clear by inheritance'.



24. It was noted that a list of required health tests applicable to each breed was available within ABS documentation, and it was suggested that this may be used as the basis on which discounts on registration may be based. This would ensure that all appropriate health tests for each individual breed were included and not just those based on DNA testing.

25. The Council expressed its support for the principle of the proposal, being of the view that providing incentives to all breeders to carry out appropriate health testing would be a positive step, however it did not consider that the proposal in its current form was sufficiently clear. Accordingly it wished to request that the proposal be referred back to the Staffordshire Bull Terrier Breed Council of Great Britain & Northern Ireland with a request that it submit a revised proposal which provided greater clarity, and which addressed the issues raised above.

**Proposal: Ms L Cook, Hungarian Puli Club of Great Britain**

**‘A Judge can only give a dog/bitch 1 CC during that specific dog’s show career at any General Championship Show in the U.K; with the exception of Crufts and/or Breed Club Championship Shows.’**

26. The proposal was presented by Mrs Jackson.

27. The Hungarian Puli Club of Great Britain was of the view that the introduction of the above policy would have a number of benefits, including the maintenance of high standards of professionalism from exhibitors campaigning dogs at a high level, and ensuring the CCs were not devalued and that they retained their high status in the UK and overseas showing fraternities.

28. It was noted that should the Council be in agreement with the proposal, it would be necessary for it to be reworded to state that it would not be permissible for an exhibitor to enter a dog under a judge who had already awarded it a CC, with the exception of Crufts and breed club championship shows. It did not consider that it would be appropriate for the onus to be placed on the judge not to award a CC to a particular dog.

29. The Council acknowledged that in many breeds it was custom and practice not to enter a dog under a judge who had already awarded it a CC, with the exception of Crufts. However it accepted that the F Regulations did not stipulate that a dog may not be entered under such circumstances, but it was of the view that such occurrences were rare with most exhibitors choosing to adhere to existing etiquette.

30. A seconder for the proposal was not forthcoming, and accordingly the Council did not consider the matter further. However, it requested that the office write to the Hungarian Puli Club of Great Britain to state that the onus was on exhibitors not to enter a dog under a judge who had previously awarded it a CC, and that it was generally not considered acceptable to do so.

**Proposal: Australian Cattle Dog Society of Great Britain**

**‘The Society would like 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 do annual eye certification.’**

31. The proposal was presented by Mrs Jackson.

32. The Council noted that at present there was no specific space available on the registration certificate for the stamp, especially in the case of older dogs who may have had a number of eye tests. In some cases the stamp was illegible.

33. The proposal was seconded by Mr Bryce-Smith. The Council agreed that the proposal was a sensible one, and following a vote, unanimously recommended it for approval.



### **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. ‘**

34. The proposal was presented by Mrs Davie. It was seconded by Mrs Jackson.

35. The recommendation from the Southern Newfoundland Club followed feedback and queries from new owners to the breed, which had led to the realisation that a blank space next to these headings could mislead them into mistakenly believing that health tests had been carried out. The Club was of the view that absolute clarity was necessary in order to remove the possibility of ambiguity or confusion.

36. The Council was in agreement with the proposal but suggested that the terms ‘none published’ (for example where a test had been carried out by a laboratory not recognised by the Kennel Club) or, where appropriate, ‘not applicable’ may also be provided as options. It was agreed that the specific terminology may be defined by the Kennel Club’s health department.

37. Subject to the above, a vote took place and the Council unanimously **recommended** the proposal for approval.

### **Item 5. Items for discussion**

38. No items for discussion had been submitted.

### **Item 6. Any other business**

#### **Liaison Council Representatives**

39. The office circulated a list of those breeds which had not nominated a representative. Delegates were requested to encourage them to do so. ‘Find a Judge’

40. All present were reminded of the importance of checking details of judges listed on the Kennel Club’s ‘Find a Judge’ facility, and representatives of all breeds were requested to check the relevant information. There had been instances of show secretaries attempting to make contact with judges

who were retired, or in some cases, deceased, which was distressing to all concerned. The names of any judges who should no longer appear on the Kennel Club’s list should be referred to the office.

#### **Accessibility of the Council**

41. A query was raised as to the way in which the Council was perceived by the dog showing community, with some concern being expressed as to whether it may be seen as being inaccessible and rather remote. The Council wished to consider whether there were ways in which the dog showing community may be made to feel more involved.

42. A particular concern was the length of time between a proposal being discussed by the Council and the publication of the minutes. One suggestion was that where a proposal had been submitted to the Council, the proposer may be invited to attend the meeting in a guest capacity to present the proposal, and to listen to the discussion so that he or she may understand the reasons for a decision being reached. It was anticipated that this would provide more immediate feedback to a proposer.



43. It was noted that all Liaison Councils were covered by the provisions of Kennel Club P Regulations. In the case of the Breeds Liaison Council, Regulation P4. stated that 'Breed Representatives may apply to attend a Council meeting for a specific purpose.' However it was not normal practice for anyone other than a Council Delegate to attend a meeting, it being the role of a Delegate to represent the breeds which fell within his or her remit. The Regulations did not refer to the attendance of guests at a meeting.

44. It was agreed that a proposal to allow the attendance of guests at a meeting, in order to allow them to present their own proposals, may be submitted to the Council at its next meeting.

45. It was noted that any proposal for an amendment which affected only the Breeds Liaison Council would be referred to the Show Executive Committee, and if recommended for approval, the Board. Promotion of the Council

46. The office was requested to revise the wording on the Kennel Club website in relation to the Council in order to encourage the submission of proposals and discussion items from both clubs and individuals, as it was of the view that the current wording did not make it clear that they may do so. It considered that every effort should be made to promote the engagement of the dog showing community with the Council in order to maximise its efficacy.

47. This led to a further query regarding the time frames involved in the submission of proposals, and why it was necessary to impose a long timescale.

48. It was clarified by the office that the timescales were set within the provisions of the P Regulations, which stated that: 'The date, time and place of each meeting shall be published at least 120 days prior to the meeting. Through its Representative, each eligible Society may submit items for the Agenda to the Secretary of the Council, which are subject to the approval of the Chairman of the Council. Items for the Agenda must reach the Secretary of the Council at least 90 days prior to the meeting and the Agenda must be circulated and published at least 60 days prior to the meeting.'

49. It was clarified by the office that the time scales as defined above were necessary in order to provide adequate time for preparation of the agenda, noting that it was often necessary to consult with those submitting items to resolve any queries prior to inclusion on an agenda. The 60-day period in between publication of the agenda and the date of the meeting was required in order to provide adequate time for delegates to consult with breed clubs and other interested parties in order to ascertain their views prior to discussion and voting at a Council meeting.

50. In response to a query, it was emphasised by the office that items for an agenda may be submitted at any time, and that should a club or an individual wish to raise an item for the Council it was not necessary for them to wait until details of the meeting had been published.

51. The Council was of the view that in view of current technology which allowed for very quick dissemination of information, it should be possible to shorten the time frames outlined above, and Mr Hutchings and Mr Collier agreed to provide a proposal for an amendment to the P Regulations for consideration by the Council at its next meeting.

### **Item 7. Date of the next meeting**

52. The next KCLC Breeds Council meeting would be held on 22 May 2019. Agenda items must be received by 21 February 2019.

53. The Chairman wished to record his appreciation for the work of all Council delegates over their three year term of office. Elections would take place in early 2019 for the next term of office. Mr Schaanning-Ling pointed out that this would be his final meeting as Chairman, a role he had fulfilled since November 2009, due to the age restriction applying to those serving on the Show Executive



Committee. He considered it a privilege to have served the Council as Chairman and thanked all for their support.

54. Mr Bryce-Smith proposed a vote of thanks to Mr Schaanning-Ling for his valuable contribution to the work of the Council.

55. The meeting closed at 12.30 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**

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](http://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**