



## **MINUTES OF THE KCLC SHOWS LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD AT THE KENNEL CLUB ON 13 MAY 2019 AT 11AM**

### **PRESENT:**

Mr S Bennett	Area 6 - Midlands
Mr P Broadbent	Area 5 - North East
Mr N Bryant	Area 7 - South East and East Anglia
Mrs A Cawthera-Purdy	General & Group Championship Shows
Mrs B Croucher	General & Group Championship Shows
Mr P Davies	Area 4 - North West
Mrs S Duffin	General & Group Championship Shows
Mr R Greaves	Area 6 - Midlands
Miss S Kimber	Area 7 - South East and East Anglia
Mrs F Marshall	Area 5 - North East
Dr S A Marshall	Area 5 - North East
Mrs I McManus	Area 1 - Scotland
Mrs A Moss	Area 4 - North West
Mrs D Rose	Area 6 – Midlands
Mr A Paisey	General & Group Championship Shows
Mr P Routledge	Area 4 - North West
Mr A Rowe	Area 4 - North West
Mrs A Scutcher	Area 7 - South East and East Anglia
Miss F Snook	Area 8 - South / South West
Mrs J Walmsley	Area 8 - South / South West
Mr E A Webster	Area 1 - Scotland

### **IN ATTENDANCE:**

Miss D Deuchar Senior Manager, Governance & Education  
Mrs A Mitchell Senior Committee Secretary  
Mr J Winnington Breed Shows Team Leader  
Miss T Newson Breed Show Administrator  
Mr A Marett Officer, Education & Training

1. A minute's silence was held in memory of Mr D Moss, a previous member of the Council.

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

2. It was proposed and seconded that Mr Greaves be elected as Chairman for the term of the Council. No further nominations were received and Mr Greaves was duly elected as Chairman

**IN THE CHAIR:** Mr R Greaves.

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

3. It was proposed and seconded that Mrs Cawthera-Purdy be elected as ViceChairman for the term of the Council. No further nominations were received and Mrs Cawthera-Purdy was duly elected as Vice-Chairman.



**ITEM 3. TO ELECT A REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE SHOW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE REMAINING TERM OF THE COUNCIL**

4. Two candidates, Mr Webster, and Mrs Cawthera-Purdy, were proposed and seconded for the role of Council representative for the Show Executive Committee. Following a ballot, Mrs Cawthera-Purdy was duly elected to the role.

**ITEM 4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

5. Apologies were received from Mr D Bell, Mrs Y Burchell, Mrs G C Chapman, Mr J McCreath, and Ms P Martin. An apology was subsequently also received from Miss McLauchlan.

6. All members of the Council, and members of Kennel Club staff, introduced themselves.

7. The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and expressed his hope that the term of office would be a productive one. All members were encouraged to hold regional meetings in order to gauge local opinions and to formulate positive suggestions for ways in which the show scene may be improved. Feedback may also be obtained by other means, for example the use of social media pages.

8. It was highlighted that the Council would meet at least once a year, normally in April or May, provided there was sufficient business to discuss. Members were reminded of the time scales involved in Council meetings, which were that an announcement of the date of the meeting would be issued 120 days beforehand. Any items for inclusion on the agenda should be submitted 90 days prior to the meeting, at the latest. The agenda would be issued 60 days before the meeting, which would allow for regional feedback to be gathered prior to the meeting taking place.

9. All Council members were encouraged to develop proposals or discussion items with this time frame in mind, even where an exact meeting date had not been announced.

10. The office was requested to provide members with a list of the constituent clubs and societies within their own areas. It agreed to do so although it was acknowledged that for reasons of data protection it may not be possible for the list to include email addresses.

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

11. The office gave a presentation to Council representatives giving details of the Kennel Club and Liaison Council structure and procedures, and the role of Council representatives. A copy of the presentation would be circulated to all Council members following the meeting.

**ITEM 6. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY 11 APRIL 2018 (PREVIOUSLY CIRCULATED)**

12. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as an accurate record.

13. A number of matters arising from the previous meeting were highlighted, as follows: Judges Competency Framework (JCF) Proposal: Under the JCF levels 1-4 it should be explicitly stated that judges should be accepting appointments at open Shows spanning a wide geographical area.

14. Outcome: The proposal had been passed to the Education and Training team for consideration when reviewing the JCF guidance, and the Council would be advised of the outcome in due



course. The Council noted that although there was no specific requirement for judges to undertake appointments in a wide geographic area, it was strongly recommended that they did so. Open Show Winner's (OSW) Title.

15. At its meeting in November 2017, the Council had proposed that the positioning of this title at the front of a dog's name be reconsidered.

16. It was confirmed that the issue would be discussed by the Show Executive Committee in due course, and the Council would be advised of the outcome. The Council wished to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that comments made on social media appeared to indicate a general view amongst the dog showing community that the title should be placed at the end of the dog's name rather than in front of it.

17. The Council was advised that the above matter remained under consideration by the Show Executive Committee, and that an update would be provided in due course.

## **ITEM 7. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS – MEETING WEDNESDAY** **11 APRIL 2018 ROTATION OF GROUP DAYS**

18. The Council noted updates from the office following its previous meeting: Rotation of Group Days Proposal: That all General Championship shows should be required to rotate their Group days regardless of their status.

19. Outcome: The proposal was referred to the Show Executive Committee which wished to recommend all general championship shows to rotate their group days.

20. However, it had been of the view that the decision as to whether to do so should be made by each individual society taking their own individual circumstances into account, and where it would not be beneficial, there would be no mandatory requirement for rotation.

21. A press release to this effect would be issued.

22. The requirement for those shows designated as All Breed Championship shows to rotate their group days would remain mandatory. Scottish Open Shows Proposal: That Regulation F5.b be updated for a trial period of two years so that Scotland and Cornwall can be exempt from the 4 per class average in order for a society to hold a second open Show. The Council proposed that the class average be set at 3.5 in line with Northern Ireland.

23. Outcome: The proposal was referred to the Show Executive Committee, which had been sympathetic to the objective of the proposal. It had also noted that it may be helpful for a similar provision to apply to shows in Wales. No definitive conclusion had as yet been reached but the matter remained under active consideration and a further update would be issued in due course. Vulnerable Breeds Proposal: That breed judging appointments for Vulnerable Breeds at Crufts should be offered to breed specialists where possible. Proposal: That the selection process for the Vulnerable Breeds Competition qualifiers be reviewed.

24. Outcome: the Council noted that the proposals had been passed to the Crufts Committee for consideration. It was confirmed that the qualification for the Vulnerable Breeds Competition would remain unchanged for Crufts 2020 but would be reviewed for 2021. Number of Breeds Judged Per Day Proposal: That Championship show Judges should be restricted to judging a maximum of four breeds per day, with a maximum of two breeds with Challenge Certificates on offer. Group, Variety, and Imported Register classes would not be included. This would allow a Judge to judge 16 breeds over a four day show including eight breeds with Challenge Certificates on offer.

25. Outcome: The Council noted that the matter was currently under consideration by the Judges Committee and an update would be provided in due course. Suitable Tables Proposal: That Societies should be reminded of Kennel Club Regulation F(1)4.f as many Societies were not providing the correct tables.



26. Outcome: The Council was advised that a suitable press release would be issued shortly. Field Officers had also been made aware of the issue.

27. It was acknowledged that some of the above matters had not been progressed as quickly as hoped, but there had been some issues with lack of office resources which had caused delays. The Chairman would continue to liaise with the office to provide assistance and support.

## **ITEM 8. PRESENTATION TO COUNCIL ON JUDGES COMPETENCY FRAMEWORK AND OPEN SHOWS**

28. The Council received a presentation by the office with an update on the Judges Competency Framework and the new initiatives relating to open Shows. Handouts of the presentation were provided for all present, in addition to the Introduction to the Judges Competency Framework booklet which was also available from the Kennel Club website at :\_

[https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media/1159452/kc\\_judges\\_competency\\_framework\\_booklet.pdf](https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media/1159452/kc_judges_competency_framework_booklet.pdf)

29. A number of queries were raised following the presentation.

### **Open shows**

#### Show calendar

30. A query was raised as to why the show calendar included in the Kennel Club Journal did not include details of open shows held in Scotland. It was explained that this was because the Kennel Club only issued licenses for championship shows in Scotland, with licences for open shows and companion shows being issued by the Scottish Kennel Club (SKC). Further, it was highlighted that the Welsh Kennel Club (WKC) issued its own licences for companion shows.

31. The office was currently in the process of holding discussions with both SKC and WKC to investigate how the matter may be addressed to ensure that the Journal could include details of all shows.

32. It was also pointed out that venue postcodes were not always included within the Journal. It was anticipated that once the Kennel Club's new database was in place, this issue would not occur. Show secretaries would input show details onto the database themselves, and a venue postcode would be a required field.

#### Supported entries

33. Noting the requirement from 2019 for all breed clubs to support at least two General or Group open shows, some concern was expressed as to whether this measure would be effective in increasing entries.

34. It was expected that open show societies would accept the recommendations for judges provided by breed clubs, as such judges would be attractive to exhibitors, but they were not obliged to do so. Breed awards

35. Clarification was sought from the office regarding the way in which claims for awards were checked. The Council was informed that it was not possible for the office to verify every claim, many of which were taken on trust. However, checking of points claimed from championship shows was carried out, and further checks were made on a random basis or where there was cause for concern that a claim may not be valid, in which case claimants may be requested to provide supporting evidence such as a marked catalogue, photographs of signed judging slips, or a copy of a critique.



## Judges Competency Framework

### Email accounts

36. In response to a query, it was confirmed that judges must have their own individual email address for use on the JCF system to enable judging licences to be issued. Shared addresses were not permitted.

### Breed mentors

37. It was confirmed that a list of breed mentors, if submitted by the breed, was available on the Kennel Club's website. Those breeds which had not yet submitted lists would be reminded that they must do so. It was emphasised that no mentoring may take place until a list of mentors had been supplied to the Kennel Club.

38. A query was raised in respect of 'all-rounder' judges being listed as mentors for a breed with which they did not have a direct involvement. It was confirmed that it was up to individual breeds to decide who should be appointed as mentors and the Kennel Club would have no influence on which names appeared on mentoring lists. It was also highlighted that it was up to a judge to request mentoring through the Breed Education Co-ordinator and mentors should not be approached directly. Mentors or breed clubs were not required to actively seek individuals who may potentially require mentoring.

### Breed Appreciation Days (BAD)

39. It was clarified that each breed must hold or have involvement in at least one BAD every two years. Where there were a number of breed clubs within a breed, it was expected that they would collaborate to fulfil this requirement.

### Overseas judges

40. It was confirmed that overseas judges, if they were not approved to award the equivalent of CCs in their home country, must prove to show societies that the introductory judges training in their country of residence had been undertaken, by making available the pass certificate or having written confirmation from their own kennel club. Such judges would be eligible to judge up to 3 classes (4 if one is a Puppy) or 5 classes (6 if one is a Puppy) for Stud Book Band E breeds, once they were registered at JCF Level 1.

### Time frame

41. It was anticipated that online facilities for the JCF would be available during the second half of 2019, following implementation of the Kennel Club's new database. The Kennel Club would publicise when this facility was available.

[Afternote: the above timeframe may be subject to change as a result of the forthcoming review of the JCF recently announced by the Kennel Club Board.]

42. It was confirmed that the JCF would operate concurrently with the previous system for eligibility of judges until 31 December 2021. During this period all new judges must meet the criteria for JCF Level 1 or above, or must be on a current B List, or above. Breed Club C lists would not be valid after 1 January 2020.

## **ITEM 9. PROPOSALS FROM INDIVIDUALS**

**The new criteria of 1 – 4 in each Group and Puppy Group should be in addition to the previous criteria of BOB in Breeds judged by B list judges (or Level 2 Judges under the new system).**

43. The proposal was submitted by, and presented by, Mrs Moss, who wished to raise a concern regarding the way in which exhibitors may qualify for Crufts at Premier shows. Previously all Best of



Breed winners, subject to a minimum number of classes, had qualified for Crufts but this had now been changed so that those dogs placed 1-4 in Groups or Puppy Groups would now qualify.

44. Mrs Moss was strongly of the view that this was discouraging for many exhibitors who did not feel they were likely to gain a group placing, and therefore did not have an incentive to enter Premier shows. Some exhibitors were reluctant to travel long distances to Championship shows, or found them a daunting prospect, and thus had limited opportunities to qualify for Crufts, which was an important objective for many.

45. Accordingly she wished to propose that Best of Breed winners at Premier shows (subject to a minimum number of classes) should qualify for Crufts as well as those awarded Group placings.

46. The proposal was seconded by Mr Bryant.

47. It was emphasised that following the introduction of new criteria for Premier shows, the number had increased from 9 to 40, which offered a number of additional opportunities for exhibitors to gain a qualification for Crufts.

48. It was suggested that the matter should be reviewed once the new format Premier shows had been in operation for a full year. The Council noted that the Show Executive Committee had already agreed to carry out a review of all new initiatives relating to open shows, and it agreed that it would consider the matter further once the review had been undertaken, and feedback received.

49. Show secretaries were invited to note that any feedback on the new initiatives would be welcomed as a part of post-show reports submitted to the office.

**Whether or not rule changes published after the printing of a schedule, but coming into force before the date of a show, should be taken into account by Field Officers attending those shows, and whether any reference to this needs to be made in the items requiring attention at future shows section of the Field Officer's report.**

50. The proposal was made by, and presented by, Mrs Moss. It was seconded by Mrs Cawthera-Purdy.

51. The Council was advised that Fosse Data and Higham Press were always made aware of any changes to Regulations, details of which were available on the Kennel Club's website. Further, details of new or amended Regulations were highlighted in the F Regulations booklet which was issued on 1 January each year. Specimen schedules were available on the Kennel Club website. It was hoped that this would assist show secretaries in ensuring that schedules were correct.

52. It was accepted that in some cases, amendments to Regulations were announced, or came into force, after show schedules had been printed. The office advised the Council that Field Officers were aware this may occur and this did not reflect any error on the part of the show society.

53. Show societies were advised that, where a new Regulation had come into force subsequent to the printing of a schedule, they should conform to the new Regulation where it was possible for them to do so. However, it was accepted that in some cases this was not possible, in which case Field Officers would make appropriate allowances.

54. It was also suggested that the Show Executive Committee be requested to bear timing issues in mind, and the potential impact on shows, when considering changes to the F Regulations.

55. A query was raised in respect of recent amendments made to the list of class definitions relating to dogs having won CACs, CACIBs, or Green Stars. It was acknowledged that this had caused some confusion, however it was confirmed by the office that there had been no change in the eligibility criteria for the relevant classes. The amendments had been made for the purposes of clarification as some exhibitors were unclear that, as stated in Regulation F(A)3, any reference to a Challenge Certificate



included any Show award that counted towards the title of Champion under the rules of any governing body recognised by the Kennel Club.

## **ITEM 10. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**That a Champions class be scheduled in all breeds at Championship Shows as there is a view that many worthy exhibits are being prevented from gaining their titles due to multi CC winners looking for records. Winners of such classes would not be eligible to compete for the Challenge Certificate (CC) but would be eligible to compete for Best of Sex and all further competitions.**

56. The discussion item was submitted and presented by Mr Webster.

57. It was noted that the Kennel Club had introduced a Champion class which may be scheduled at breed club shows, however, winners of this class were still eligible to compete for the CC.

58. Mr Webster wished to suggest that there was considerable support within the dog showing community for the introduction of a Champion class at all championship shows. It was suggested that Champions should no longer be eligible to compete in the Open class, and the winner of the Champion class would not be eligible to compete for the CC, although it may challenge for Best of Breed/Best in Group/Best in Show. It was anticipated that such a measure would encourage attendance at shows, particularly in breeds where a prolific winner may be seen to be 'blocking' the winning of CCs by other dogs, even those deserving of gaining their title. In breeds where this was the case, entry numbers had been observed to drop.

59. It was acknowledged that this was a valid concern in some breeds, particularly those which were numerically small. However, it was also accepted that a UK Champion title was highly valued and there was some reluctance to take any action which may result in a lowering of the standard required to achieve it.

60. Further, some exhibitors found it very satisfying to win over another highly successful dog, and it was acknowledged that it may not be a positive step to deprive them of the opportunity of doing so.

61. The Council was mindful that judges may withhold the award of a Challenge Certificate should they consider that dogs lacked merit, but it accepted that many judges would find it difficult to do so.

62. An alternative suggestion was to limit the number of CCs which may be won by any one dog, but it was not considered that this would be popular with exhibitors.

63. The Council did not consider it possible to reach a conclusion without further detailed consideration, however, a show of hands indicated considerable support for the discussion item. It was agreed that a firm proposal be formulated for consideration by the Council at its next meeting. This should include proposals for any necessary amendments to F Regulations.

**That there should be a system whereby a set number of Reserve Challenge Certificates (RCCs) may become one Challenge Certificate (CC).**

64. The discussion item was submitted and presented by Mr Webster.

65. It was considered together with the previous item relating to the introduction of a Champion class, as to some extent they both addressed the same issue i.e. the possibility of a dog being able to gain the title of Champion.

66. It was noted that the wording on the RCC stated that in the opinion of the judge, the dog was worthy of being a Champion, and it was suggested that a number of RCCs (perhaps 3 or 5, all having been



awarded by different judges) may be counted as one CC for the purposes of achieving the dog's Champion title.

67. Another option may be to specify that a dog must win one, or two CCs, and that three RCCs may then be counted as being a third CC.

68. A show of hands indicated that the majority of the Council supported the discussion item, and in conjunction with the previous item, a firm proposal would be submitted to the Council at its next meeting. Whether the Council could have an input on recent and upcoming changes to regulations.

69. The discussion item was submitted and presented by Mr Broadbent.

70. In particular, Mr Broadbent wished to express his view that over-regulation by the Kennel Club was causing difficulties for societies wishing to run shows in their own way. He also highlighted the difficulties for show organisers in finding enough people willing to serve on committees and to assist in running shows. Some show secretaries were also experiencing problems in appointing judges for open shows as some judges were reluctant to travel.

71. The Council expressed some concern that the provisions of the JCF would result in the removal of C Lists. Many shows had promoted the appointment of C List judges who had gained valuable experience from judging a limited number of classes at both open and limited shows. It noted with regret that this would no longer be the case and that those judges not on a B List/JCF Level 1 would not have these opportunities to gain useful experience of hands-on judging, and of ring procedures.

72. Noting the above comments, there was still some optimism that open and limited shows would continue to be popular with exhibitors. It was hoped that those shows offering a positive experience to exhibitors, with carefully-selected and qualified judges, would encourage good entries. Good venues with adequate facilities were also an important factor. How the Council can be involved in maintaining a connection with potential new exhibitors.

73. The discussion item was submitted and presented by Mr Broadbent.

74. Mr Broadbent noted the popularity of companion shows, and wished to suggest that members of Kennel Club staff should attend such shows in order to encourage exhibitors, particularly young ones, to attend open shows. However this was not considered to be practical.

75. A suggestion that open shows should be permitted to schedule a 'pay on the day' class for young exhibitors as this might encourage them to take part was noted.

76. It was highlighted that the YKC offered a wide range of activities for young handlers, and that they should be encouraged to join.

77. The Kennel Club's 'Have a Go' shows had proved popular and had been well attended. Marketing had been aimed at individuals who had recently acquired a Kennel Club registered puppy which was now 6 months of age. The intention of the shows was to attract new exhibitors who had not previously taken part in dog showing.

78. The Council acknowledged that show societies, ringcraft clubs, and current exhibitors played a major role in attracting and encouraging new exhibitors and it was hoped that they would continue to do so. Judges who have passed any form of breed-specific assessment under the current judging system or the Judges Competency Framework, and have successfully completed all other JCF requirements, but are unable to achieve the requirements of the current judging system to award CCs, or make use of the 'grandfathering' option would need to pass another assessment under JCF. Could the previously passed hands-on assessment be accepted for progression to JCF Level 4? This would allow more judges in the interim to progress and assist in the transition period between the current judging system and JCF, as well as speeding up the process of Judges awarding CCs.



79. The discussion item was submitted and presented by Mr Bennett.

80. Mr Bennett noted that many judges had already undertaken a breed assessment and was concerned that such judges, having fulfilled the other requirements of the JCF, would be required to undertake another hands-on assessment before becoming qualified to award CCs. It was acknowledged that a hands-on assessment taken at any time may count towards Level 2 qualification but not towards Level 4.

81. The Council was in support of the proposal, and agreed that the Judges Committee should be requested to review the position of those judges who had successfully completed all other JCF requirements, including the multi-choice examination.

## **ITEM 11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### Closing dates

82. Mr Webster raised the issue of closing dates, and the repeated extensions for online entries offered by some societies. There was some concern that the practice was now so widespread that it had become the norm, and that some exhibitors were finding it confusing.

83. However, the Council was also sympathetic to the position of show societies and the necessity for them to maximise their entries. In some cases a significant number of entries were received by societies in the extended period which had a positive impact on the financial success of the show.

84. It was highlighted that societies should seek permission from the Kennel Club before extending online closing dates. The office had delegated authority to grant permission, which was normally agreed as it was accepted that it was helpful to show organisers. Postal entries may not be extended. 85. The Council was of the view that a consistent approach should be taken which would be applicable to all championship and open show societies, and which would provide clarity to exhibitors. By a majority, it recommended that a policy should be put into place whereby each society should continue to be free to set an online closing date, according to its own criteria, but that no extensions should be permitted.  
Kennel Club Code of Conduct

86. The Council noted Mr Broadbent's view that the Kennel Club Code which related to all volunteers acting on behalf of the Kennel Club should be subject to a review. General Championship Shows

87. Mr Webster wished to enquire as to how non All Breed Championship shows were being supported by the Kennel Club.

88. The Council was advised that the Show Executive Committee would conduct an ongoing review of all Championship shows over the next 12 months, and that the matter may be discussed again by the Council at its meeting in 2020. Additional meeting

89. Mr Broadbent wished to suggest that a second Council meeting should take place in November, at which issues raised at regional meetings may be discussed. However, this was not considered to be practical due to the timeframes involved. It was also acknowledged that a second meeting could only be considered should there be sufficient business to warrant it.

## **ITEM 12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

90. An announcement confirming the date of the next meeting would be made in September 2019.

The meeting closed at 15.05 pm. with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

**Mr R Greaves**  
**Chairman**