



MINUTES OF THE KCLC SHOWS LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD AT THE KENNEL CLUB ON 11 APRIL 2018 AT 10.30AM

PRESENT

Mr S Bennett
Mr N Bryant
Mrs A Cawthera-Purdy
Mr D Creech
Mrs B Croucher
Mr R Greaves
Mr W Harris
Mrs S Jakeman
Mrs R Knight
Mrs I McManus
Mr D Moss
Mr N Price
Mrs W Reeves
Mr P Routledge
Mrs A Scutcher
Miss F Snook
Miss S R Thomson
Mr E A Webster

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss D Deuchar Senior Manager Governance & Education
Mrs I Thompson-Burton Senior Manager Education & Training
Miss K Moore Breed Shows Officer
Mrs A Mitchell Senior Committee Secretary

IN THE CHAIR: Mr R Greaves

ITEM 1. APOLOGISES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies were received from Mrs G C Chapman, Mr J McCreath, Mrs F Marshall, and Mr A Rowe.

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

2. The Council was requested to elect a new Vice Chairman following the Mrs E Stannard's election to the Board, as a result of which she was no longer able to serve as a Council representative.

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



ITEM 3. TO ELECT A MEMBER FOR THE SHOW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR THE TERM OF THE COUNCIL

4. Due to Mrs E Stannard's resignation from the Council, those present were requested to elect a new representative for the Show Executive Committee.

5. It was proposed and seconded that Mrs A Cawthera-Purdy be elected as the Council representative for the Show Executive Committee. No further nominations were received and Mrs Cawthera-Purdy was duly elected as the Council's representative.

ITEM 4. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 NOVEMBER 2017

6. It was agreed that paragraph 26 of the minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2017 should read: 'It expressed concern that lack of time for Societies to organise the classes had made the Kennel Club and the organising Societies look disorganised and unprofessional.'

7. Subject to this amendment, the minutes were approved as being an accurate record.

ITEM 5. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS – MEETING 27 NOVEMBER 2017

8. The Council noted updates from the office following its previous meeting.

Judges Competency Framework (JCF)

9. 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. 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.

10. Proposal: Under the JCF, Judges should be required to complete 6 full day stewarding appointments before becoming a Level 1 judge and then complete 2 full day appointments a year until they were qualified to award CC's. Outcome: The proposal had been passed to the Education and Training team for consideration when reviewing the JCF guidance, and it had been agreed that judges would be required to complete six full days of stewarding, as requested by the Council, prior to becoming a Level 1 judge.

Show Certificate of Excellence

11. Proposal: That the definition of shows judged on the Group system be amended to allow single group shows to be able to hold their shows on the Group system.

Outcome: The matter had been referred to the Show Executive Committee for consideration, and was being actively progressed. An update would be provided to the Council in due course. De-registration of Societies

12. Proposal: Societies that were considering de-registration should be put in contact with the relevant Shows Liaison Council representative as an additional resource for the Societies to discuss any solutions or ways that the committee could be supported until any issues were resolved. Outcome: The Kennel Club's Services team had been requested to include the representative's details when corresponding with Societies requesting de-registration. It was noted that in at least one case the Society concerned had received invaluable assistance from a Council representative. Breeders Competition



13. A query was raised regarding the position in respect of dogs competing in the Breeders Competition which were not otherwise entered into the show. Noting that owners of such dogs were required to complete an entry form on the day, there was some concern as to whether show organisers may be held responsible should an incident occur involving a dog for which an entry form had not been completed.
14. It was emphasised that the onus to ensure that all competing dogs had completed an entry form lay with the team leader and that it was not the responsibility of show organisers to check. Mentors
15. At its previous meeting, the Council had discussed mentors and proposed that a network of mentors be put in place to assist and support secretaries new to the role. It had been agreed that the Council would compile a list of potential mentors for consideration at a future meeting.
16. It was noted that action on this point remained with the Council. However, all members present at the meeting confirmed their willingness to act as mentors, and to provide support to secretaries via telephone or email should such assistance be requested. Open Show Winner's (OSW) Title
17. 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.
18. 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 a dog's name rather than in front of it.

ITEM 6. PRESENTATION FROM TRAINING AND EDUCATION TEAM

19. The Council received an overview of the Judges Competency Framework from the Training and Education team.
20. It was noted that a revised version of the Judges Competency Framework guidance booklet, containing flowcharts and timing information, had recently been issued, and was available at: https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media/1159452/kc_judges_competency_framework_booklet.pdf
21. It was clarified that the requirement that all judges must be licenced at JCF Level 1 would now be introduced from 1 January 2020.
22. However, there had been no change to the transition period, and it remained the case that to undertake any appointment a judge must be on a B list or above or registered at JCF Level 1 by 1 January 2022. It was noted that it would not be possible for judges to upload details of their judging experience to their account until the latter part of 2019, when the system would go 'live'.
23. The Council was advised of the planned introduction of a new Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system which would result in a streamlining of the Kennel Club's internal systems and would offer an associated reduction in costs.
24. As a result it had been possible to lower the new judges licence fee for single breed specialist judges. Judges who awarded CCs in a single breed and did not aspire to judge any further breeds at any level would now pay only £10 for a yearly judging licence, and a press release to that effect had been issued. The Council was of the view that this was a positive step.
25. However, a query was raised as to whether this would apply to CC judges wishing to judge more than one breed at open show level. It was confirmed that any judge wishing to judge any subsequent breed at any level, in addition to that in which they awarded CCs would be required to pay an annual fee of £26.



26. This led to a concern being raised regarding the number of judges available to officiate at open shows, as those CC judges who wished to register as singlebreed judges would no longer be able to judge other breeds at open shows. Those judges who had asked for a reduced fee had made the case that they only wished to judge their breed, and only did so every 3-4 years. Judges currently approved for one breed would be able to decide which level of licence they wished to hold.

27. A further query was raised in respect of how the single-breed provision would apply to breeds such as Poodles, Dachshunds, Belgian Shepherd Dogs, and Chihuahuas, in which there was more than one variety. Judges of these breeds, once approved to judge one variety, were automatically qualified to judge other varieties. It was confirmed that for such breeds, a judge would continue to be permitted to judge all varieties of the breed but that they would be required to pay the £26 annual judging licence. Such judges could judge more than once every 3 or 4 years; for example, a Dachshund judge may award up to 6 sets of CCs every 18 months.

28. The Council also sought clarification as to whether a judge registered as a single breed specialist would be permitted to judge groups, or Best in Show at open shows. It was confirmed that a single breed judge may do so. However, it was unclear as to whether a single breed specialist would be permitted to judge Any Variety classes. [Afternote: It was confirmed following the meeting that such judges would be able to judge Any Variety classes but NO additional breed classes.]

29. There was some concern that the system may be overly complex which may cause confusion to judges and show secretaries. The Council wished to suggest a simple and transparent policy whereby those CC judges paying a £10 fee would be permitted to judge only the breed for which they were registered, either at championship or open show level, but may not judge Any Variety Classes, groups, or Best in Show. CC judges paying the £26 fee would be permitted to undertake any appointments for which they were suitably qualified, including breed classes, groups, Best in Show, and Variety classes.

30. It was agreed that the above suggestion would be referred back to the JCF Working Party for consideration.

31. The Council also requested that, where timeframes permitted, it should be provided with an opportunity to review press releases relating to the JCF prior to issue. This matter would also be referred to the JCF Working Party.

32. In response to a query, it was confirmed that where a judge had previously undertaken a breed-specific hands-on seminar, he or she would not be required to attend a further Breed Appreciation Day, but could use this as evidence required for JCF Level 2. However, all judges would be required to have undertaken and passed a Requirements of a Dog Show Judge examination by 2024, and every five years thereafter.

33. Special arrangements, such as provision of a reader, and additional time to complete an examination, would be permissible for candidates with conditions such as dyslexia.

34. It was accepted that where an examination was available online, there was an opportunity for cheating by unscrupulous individuals. However, it was emphasised that any judges who demonstrated an inadequate knowledge of regulations or procedures when in the ring may be required by the Kennel Club to undertake a further examination in a supervised environment.

35. The Council raised a concern that some breeds did not schedule breed specific seminars on a regular or frequent basis, which meant that for some judges it was difficult to acquire the necessary experience. In such cases, where a judge had acquired sufficient experience of judging a breed by virtue of numbers judged, or was close to doing so, the previous system of qualification may be used during the transition period up until 31 December 2021. [Afternote: It was confirmed after the meeting that all breeds must hold a Breed Appreciation Day once every two years, from 2019.]



36. It was noted that in future, all breed clubs or councils would be required to have open and transparent education systems in place. Those that did not do would be monitored by the Kennel Club.

37. Clarification was sought regarding those breeds currently on the Imported Register. It was confirmed that such breeds would not be able to progress off the Imported Register until they had appointed a Breed Education Coordinator (BEC). All other breeds were also required to appoint a BEC. It was highlighted that although breeds must specify a single BEC who would be the liaison point with the Kennel Club, the tasks associated with the role may be carried out by more than one person, or by a small sub-group appointed by the breed for the purpose.

38. A seminar for BECs would be held by the Kennel Club on 15 July 2018. An additional day may be held at a later date for those unable to attend in July, but this was subject to confirmation.

39. It was hoped that the Kennel Club would offer as many JCF Question and Answer sessions as possible, in a wide range of locations. It was confirmed that such sessions would be provided, subject to the availability of speakers, and that any requests for Q&A sessions would be accommodated if possible.

40. The 'Eye for a Dog' assessment was briefly discussed. A suggestion was made by one representative that certain canine healthcare professionals, such as veterinary surgeons or hydrotherapists, should be excluded from having to attend sessions on canine movement as they would already have sufficient experience on this issue. However, the majority viewpoint was that there should be no such exclusions.

41. In respect of mentoring sessions, it was anticipated that the mentor would be able to log into the JCF system in order to provide confirmation that a session had taken place.

42. It was noted that Level 1 judges were required to have demonstrated a proven interest of a minimum of 5 years in one or more aspects of the breeding and exhibiting of pedigree dogs (including exhibiting/breeding/stewarding/show administration).

43. The office was unable to confirm how first-time CC judges would be advised whether or not they had been approved for an appointment as this was contingent on the new software used for the purpose. However it was likely that both nominating societies and judges would be notified of approval. Implications on the current requirement for a society to have a three-part judging contract would be considered in due course but it was not considered likely that there would be any major issue with this. However, it was highlighted that each judge registered on the system must have their own individual email account and that a shared account would not be acceptable.

44. It was confirmed that the office would continue to provide ongoing guidance, in the form of updated FAQs available online. An advisory note relating to open shows was currently being drafted and would be released as soon as possible.

45. Mrs Thompson-Burton was thanked for her helpful presentation.

ITEM 7. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES

Proposed: West Country Dog Club

That the initial registration fee to join the Kennel Club Academy for judges should remain at £26.00 however the renewal fee be only a nominal amount each year thereafter.

46. The Council considered that in view of the recent announcement by the Kennel Club relating to the revised fee for single breed specialists, as discussed earlier in the meeting, no further discussion of the proposal was necessary.



47. It was noted that the registration fee covered not only the costs of ongoing development and maintenance of the JCF system itself, but also the development of educational material placed on the Kennel Club Academy, which played a vital role in the education and training of judges. The fee was payable by all judges, including members of the Kennel Club, and Kennel Club Board members. Accredited Trainers were provided with free membership for a limited period, and only for use for training purposes.

Proposed: Plymouth & District Kennel Association

That Entry Level Judges under the JCF should be required under 'Other requirements that must be met (all points must be achieved) before progressing to the next level' to serve as an active Committee member of a Kennel Club registered Dog Club or Society for a minimum period of 24 months.

48. The Association, represented by Miss Snook, was of the view that requiring entry level judges to serve on a committee would ensure that they understood a wide range of organisational issues and related regulations. It was also anticipated that it would assist societies in appointing active committee members, and that in some cases this may be essential to the ongoing existence of such societies and their ability to run shows. It was also hoped that the proposed measure may encourage people to volunteer their services to committees.

49. However, some concern was expressed as to the practicalities of the proposal. Although an individual may undertake to serve on a committee, there would be some difficulties in defining what constituted an 'active role' and in monitoring whether or not the person concerned could be deemed to have been active. It was also noted that some individuals, such as those declared bankrupt, were excluded from serving on committees.

50. As noted earlier in the meeting, Level 1 judges were required to have demonstrated a proven interest of a minimum of 5 years in one or more aspects of the breeding and exhibiting of pedigree dogs, and it was suggested that serving on a committee may be used as evidence of such interest. Aspiring judges would be requested to provide specific evidence of their proven interest and if necessary, club secretaries may be requested to ratify details of an individual's active involvement on a committee. Alternatively a BEC may be able to provide such ratification.

51. The Council agreed that it was not necessary to introduce a mandatory requirement for entry level judges to serve on a committee, but they should be encouraged to do so. The office was requested to issue a suitable press release in the near future in order to encourage aspiring judges to begin acquiring suitable experience.

Proposed: Langstone & District Canine Society

That in the case of Vulnerable Breeds being judged at Crufts, the appointments where possible, should be given to breed specialists and not all-rounders.

52. The proposal was presented by Mr Price. It was noted that Crufts was a highly prestigious event and accordingly it was proposed that judging appointments for breed classes for Vulnerable Breeds should be offered to breed specialists wherever possible.

53. The Council was in agreement that generally this should be the case, and the office undertook to raise the matter with the Crufts office.

54. The Vulnerable Breeds competition held at Crufts was also discussed. It was noted with some concern that all of the qualifying heats were currently held at Group shows in England, with none taking place in Wales, Scotland, or Northern Ireland. This was considered to be unfair on those exhibitors living in more remote areas who were not able to attend any of the qualifying heats. It was suggested that the



shows holding qualifying heats may have been selected on the basis of the numbers attending but it was not possible to confirm this.

55. The Council also suggested that if possible, it would be desirable for qualifying heats to take place in or near the country of origin of the breeds concerned. It also wished to request that consideration be given to the possibility of qualifiers being held on a rotational basis at shows in a variety of locations, possibly at General Championship shows as well as at Group shows. However it accepted that entry numbers must also be taken into account when allocating qualifiers.

56. It was agreed that the Crufts office should be requested to review the selection procedure in order to ensure fairness to all exhibitors.

Proposed: Langstone & District Canine Society

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, per day. 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.

57. Mr Price, on behalf of the Society, wished to express concerns regarding the situation where a single judge was appointed to judge a number of breeds on the same day. This was especially applicable in the case of overseas judges who were often requested by show societies to judge a high number of breeds. Mr Price provided an example of a show at which a single judge was scheduled to judge seven breeds on one day. This was considered to be unfair on exhibitors, many of whom had experienced a long wait before showing their dogs. The delay was especially problematic for puppies which were easily tired. Such a workload was also considered to be unduly onerous for the judge. The Society was of the view that there may well be breed specialists who would be willing and able to accept appointments rather than their being offered to non-specialists as part of a package of breeds.

58. It was noted that the Kennel Club's current policy regarding overloading of judges was as follows: The maximum number of dogs of breeds with Challenge Certificates that should be judged by one person in one day was: One breed – up to 250 dogs Two breeds – up to 200 dogs Three or more breeds – up to 150 dogs

59. There was no limit on the number of breeds with CCs that may be judged in one day, provided that the number of dogs entered across the breeds did not exceed 150. However, it was noted that under the terms of the policy, there was no limit on the number of non-CC breeds which may be judged by a single judge in one day.

60. The Council accepted that there were economic reasons for allocating a number of breeds to a single judge, particularly if he or she was an overseas judge where it was necessary for the show society to justify the cost of travel, and it acknowledged that it was reasonable for this to be taken into consideration. However, this should be balanced against the needs of exhibitors.

61. The Council was of the view that the overloading of judges was a serious issue, and considered how it may be addressed.

62. It was highlighted that pressure from exhibitors may be instrumental in addressing the issue and that exhibitors should contact show societies to express their views, and to request that the number of breeds allocated to a judge should be limited. Show societies should also be aware of the capabilities of individual judges and should take this into account when issuing invitations. However it was emphasised that judges themselves had a role to play and should not accept appointments for an unduly onerous number of breeds in a single day.



63. The Council went on to discuss whether further measures were necessary. It was of the view that specifying a maximum number of two breeds with CCs, as specified in the original proposal would be unduly restrictive. However, an amended proposal was made by Mrs Jakeman whereby an addition be made to the Kennel Club's existing policy to state that a judge should not be allocated more than five breeds (CC or non-CC) in total on any one day. The number of dogs which may be judged in one day would remain as stated in the existing policy. The amended proposal was seconded by Mr Bryant. The Council considered that this was a simple and reasonable solution, and following a unanimous vote, recommended it for approval.

64. The proposal would be referred to the Judges Committee for consideration.

Proposed: Humberside Hound Association

That Societies should be reminded of the Kennel Club Regulation F(1)4.f as many Societies do not provide the correct tables. 'For breeds which are customarily judged on a table, a separate table of suitable size and stable construction with a rubber mat adequate for the breed or a non-slip surface should be provided in all rings in which these breeds are to be judged'

65. Unfortunately no presenter was available to speak on behalf of the Association. However, the Council accepted that in many cases the tables provided were inadequate for their purpose. The proposal outlined as above was made by Miss Thomson and seconded by Mrs Cawthera-Purdy, and following a unanimous vote in favour, the office was requested to issue a press release reminding championship and open show societies of the requirement to provide tables which conformed to Regulation F(1)4.f. as outlined above. 66. It was also agreed that Field Officers should be made aware of the issue and should consult exhibitors to ensure that tables provided were suitable.

ITEM 8. PROPOSALS FROM INDIVIDUALS

Proposed: Mr S Bennett

That Regulation F4 be amended as follows to allow dogs of breeds that are not allocated Challenge Certificates in the UK, which have become Champions overseas to compete in Limited shows and Matches:

'*Dogs which have won a Challenge Certificate or obtained any award that counts towards the title of Champion under the rules of any governing body recognised by the Kennel Club are not eligible for entry at these Shows **Note: This does not apply to breeds that have not been allocated Championship status regardless of overseas wins.' (Addition in Bold)**

67. Mr Bennett explained that a breed club, once registered with the Kennel Club, was required to run two Limited shows before it was permitted to run an Open show. It was accepted that this was the case in order to provide an opportunity for a new club to demonstrate that it was capable of running shows before being permitted to run an open show. However, under the current Regulation F4, champions, and all dogs having won an award which counted towards the title of champion, were not permitted to exhibit at a Limited show. In the case of rare breeds, Mr Bennett was of the view that this caused an undue restriction on the number of dogs permitted to enter Limited shows, and that this was to the detriment of the breeds concerned which would benefit from the opportunity to showcase the maximum number of dogs.

68. The Council was sympathetic to the principle of the proposal as it accepted that for rare breeds it was advantageous for the maximum number of dogs to be able to compete. However, it was also of the view that it may be perceived as unfair to other exhibitors should overseas champions, or those with relevant award/s, be permitted to compete at Limited shows. It also considered that the issue was self-limiting as once a club had successfully run two Limited shows it may run an Open show hence the issue would only occur over a two year period for any one club.



69. The Council also suggested that breed clubs for non-CC breeds should contact general show societies to offer supported entries for their breeds, as this would encourage such show societies to schedule classes at open shows, at which there was no limitation on participation by champions or those with awards counting towards the title of champion. 70. No seconder was available for the proposal and no further action was recommended.

Proposed: Mrs J A Goldberg

That all General Championship Shows should be required to rotate their Group days regardless of their status.

71. It was noted that from 2020, All Breed Championship shows would be required to rotate their days. However, other general championship shows were not currently required to do so.

72. The Council acknowledged that some exhibitors would prefer all general championship shows to rotate their group days, but that in some cases there were practical or logistical reasons, such as local facilities, traffic conditions, car parking etc. as to why this was not possible. The financial impact on shows should also be borne in mind, with some show societies understandably choosing to maximise their entries by scheduling certain groups at weekends.

73. It was agreed that imposing mandatory rotation on all general championship shows would be unduly prescriptive, and could not be enforced. No seconder for the proposal was available.

74. However, an amended proposal was submitted by Mrs Croucher and seconded by Mrs Cawthera-Purdy that: 'All General Championship Shows should be recommended to rotate their Group days regardless of their status.'

75. By a majority, the motion was carried, and the amended proposal was recommended for approval.

ITEM 9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

76. There were no items submitted for discussion.

ITEM 10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Proposed: Falkirk and District Kennel Club and Ladies Kennel Association of Scotland

That the Kennel Club agree that Scotland be exempt from the 4 per class average in order for a society to hold a second open show. (Miss Thompson and Mrs McManus declared an interest.)

77. It was explained that in Scotland there was no issue of two or three shows being held within close proximity to each other, due to the Scottish Kennel Club's rule that there must be 60 miles between shows held on the same day. In view of this, and of the geographical issues which made it difficult for some exhibitors to attend shows, the Club and the Association were of the view that an exemption should be made to the requirement for the 4 per class average for shows in Scotland.

78. The Council acknowledged that due to geographical constraints, numbers of exhibitors at shows in some areas of the country such as Scotland and the south west of England were limited. Further, due to the difficulties in getting to championship shows from remote areas, open shows had a particular importance to exhibitors in those areas. It was accepted that show societies did have the option of running Limited shows, but these were not popular in these areas as they did not offer exhibitors the opportunity to gain points for awards such as the Junior Warrant or the Show Certificate of Merit.



79. Having considered the above points, the Council was sympathetic to the intentions of the proposal, but considered whether there were other ways of supporting exhibitors in remote areas, noting that at present a moratorium was in place on any discussion regarding removal of the 4 per class average across the board.

80. It was highlighted that an exception was already in place from the 4 per class average for shows held in Northern Ireland, under the terms of which the class average was set at 3.5 per class. It was noted that this provided a precedent for a similar exception in other areas and it was suggested that it be extended to apply to shows held in Cornwall and Scotland, on a two-year trial basis.

81. The Council agreed that this would be a positive step, and a proposal was made by Mrs McManus, seconded by Miss Snook, that an amendment be made to Regulation F5.b as follows:

Regulation F5.b.

TO:

5. Permission to hold Shows.

b. A General Canine Society may apply for a licence for one Open Show per year. An application for a second Open Show licence will be considered if the Society's two most recent Open Shows (at time of application) have achieved an average class entry of 4 dogs or more. For General Canine Society Open Shows **held** in Northern Ireland, **Cornwall and Scotland**, the average class entry of 3.5 dogs will apply. (Insertion in bold.)

82. The above Regulation amendment would be subject to review two years from date of implementation.

83. Following a unanimous vote in favour of the proposal, it was **recommended** for approval.

General Data Protection Regulation

84. Mr Moss wished to draw the attention of the Council to the imminent introduction of new regulations relating to data protection due to come into effect on 25 May 2018, and which would affect registered clubs and societies.

85. It was highlighted that the Kennel Club had issued guidance to clubs and societies via a press release issued on 26 February 2018. The guidance was available on the Kennel Club's website at: <https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/media/1159182/clubs-and-societiesgdpr.pdf>

ITEM 11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

86. The Council noted that the date of the next meeting was subject to the 2019 Boardroom bookings, and that an announcement confirming the date of the next meeting would be made in due course.

87. The Chairman thanked all for attending a very positive and constructive meeting. He also pointed out that this was the last meeting of the current term of office, and wished to thank all those who had contributed to the work of the Council over the last three years.

The meeting rose at 13.40 pm. with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

Mr R Greaves

Chairman