



**MINUTES OF THE KCLC SHOWS LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD
ON WEDNESDAY 7 APRIL 2021 AT 11.00AM VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

PRESENT:	Mr S Bennett	Area 6 - Midlands
	Mr N Bryant	Area 7 - South East and East Anglia
	Mrs A Cawthera-Purdy	General & Group Championship Shows
	Mrs GC Chapman	Area 7 - South East and East Anglia
	Ms A Cooper	Area 6 - Midlands
	Mrs B Croucher	General & Group Championship Shows
	Mr P Davies	Area 4 - North West
	Miss S Kimber	Area 7 - South East and East Anglia
	Ms P Martin	Area 1 - Scotland
	Miss McLauchlan	Area 5 – North East
	Mrs I McManus	Area 1 - Scotland
	Mr M Ord	Area 5 - North East
	Mrs D Rose	Area 6 – Midlands
	Mrs D Stewart-Ritchie	Area 2 – Northern Ireland
	Mr A Paisey	General & Group Championship Shows
	Mr N Price	Area 3 - Wales
	Mr P Routledge	Area 4 - North West
	Mr A Rowe	Area 4 - North West
	Mr M Sanders	Area 3 - Wales
	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

IN ATTENDANCE:	Miss D Deuchar	Head of Canine Activities
	Mrs A Mitchell	Senior Committee Secretary
	Mr J Winnington	Breed Shows Team Manager
	Miss T Newson	Breed Shows Team Officer
	Mr A Marett	Breed Shows Team Senior Officer (Item 6.a only)

1. A minute's silence was held in memory of the Council Chairman, Mr R Greaves and Mrs F Marshall, who represented the North East.

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

2. The Council noted that following a request via email for the submission of nominations for Chairman, Mrs A Cawthera-Purdy was nominated and seconded, and was duly elected as Chairman, there being no other nominations.

IN THE CHAIR: Mrs A Cawthera-Purdy



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

3. The Council noted that following a similar process as for the election of a Chairman, Mr D Bell and Mr S Bennett were nominated and seconded, and therefore a ballot was undertaken with Mr Bennett taking the position of Vice-Chairman.

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

4. Mr Bennett was proposed and seconded for the role of Council representative for the Show Executive Committee and therefore duly elected to the role.

ITEM 4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

5. Apologies were received from Mr D Bell, Mr P Broadbent, Mrs Y Burchell, Mrs S Duffin, Dr SA Marshall, Mrs A Moss, Mr EA Webster. It was noted that Mr J McCreath was not present.
6. All new members of the Council were introduced by the Chairman.

ITEM 5. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 13 MAY 2019

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

ITEM 6. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS / MATTERS ARISING

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

Hands-On Assessment for Judges Competency Framework (JCF)

Proposal: 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.

Outcome: The proposal was not referred to the Judges Committee for consideration but was considered as part of the JCF review, outcomes of which had now been published. The Council noted that the Judges Education Programme (Breed Shows) came into force on 1 January 2021.

Closing dates

Proposal: That a policy should be put into place whereby each society should continue to be free to set a paper and online closing date, according to its own criteria, but that no extensions should be permitted.

Outcome: The proposal was recommended to the Board by the Show Executive Committee (SEC). A concern was raised by the Board that this would go against the drive to improve show entry levels and exhibitor experience. The matter will therefore be further considered by the Shows Liaison Council at its next meeting.



ITEM 7. UPDATE ON THE JUDGES EDUCATION PROGRAMME (BREED SHOWS)

9. The Council noted the update regarding the Judges Education Programme (Breed Shows) (JEP).
10. A query was raised in relation to the Requirements of a Dog Show Judge (RDSJ) and Conformation and Movement seminars and, whether there had been any development in the plans for these to be given electronically. It was confirmed by the office that the RDSJ seminar was in the final stages of preparations and should be available electronically in the upcoming weeks. Following this, the possibility of offering an electronic Conformation and Movement seminar would be reviewed.
11. A query was raised regarding the implementation date of the JEP noting that the ongoing coronavirus pandemic may negatively affect the programme throughout 2021. It was confirmed that the Judges Committee had considered the implementation date in line with coronavirus and had directed that due to the original announcement regarding Level 1 criteria being made in 2017 there would be no amendment to the January 2021 effective date. It was further clarified that as part of the Independent Review Panel the criteria for many of the lower levels had been reduced from the original announcement.

ITEM 8. PROPOSALS

a. That regulations F(1)26.a and F(1)26.b Best Puppy in Show be amended as follows:

'Where the Best of Breed, Best of Group, or Best in Show is a puppy, it should automatically be awarded Best Puppy in Breed, Best Puppy in Group or Best Puppy in Show respectively, **at the discretion of the judge.**'

'Where the Reserve Best of Breed, Reserve Best of Group, or Reserve Best in Show is a puppy, it should automatically be awarded Best Puppy in Breed, Best Puppy in Group or Best Puppy in Show respectively, **at the discretion of the judge.**'
(Additions in bold)

12. The proposal was submitted by Mr D Coode, and presented by Miss Snook, who was of the view that the amendment would make the reasoning clearer should a puppy win Best in Show but not Best Puppy in Show where both competitions had separate judges.
13. A concern was raised regarding the proposed wording that appeared on the agenda. It was clarified that following further discussion at an area meeting it had been proposed that the word 'automatically' be removed from the regulation. A suggestion was made that the word 'should' be replaced with 'may'.
14. It was acknowledged that the actual basis of what a judge was permitted to do was not being amended and it was solely the wording which the Council wished to change in the interests of clarity. After some discussion, the Council agreed upon the following amended wording, which was subsequently proposed by Miss Snook, seconded by Mrs Chapman and therefore **recommended** the following amendments to the Committee for consideration:

F(1)26.a

'Where the Best of Breed, Best of Group, or Best in Show is a puppy, it ~~should~~ **automatically may at the discretion of the judge** be awarded Best Puppy in Breed, Best Puppy in Group or Best Puppy in Show respectively.' (Additions in bold, Deletions struck through)

F(1)26.b

'Where the Reserve Best of Breed, Reserve Best of Group, or Reserve Best in Show is a



puppy, it ~~should automatically~~ **may at the discretion of the judge** be awarded Best Puppy in Breed, Best Puppy in Group or Best Puppy in Show respectively' (Additions in bold, Deletions struck through)

b. When a dog has been awarded three Reserve Challenge Certificates these could be upgraded to one Challenge Certificate. However, the dog must also have been awarded two Challenge Certificates via the usual route to be awarded the title of Champion/Show Champion. Each of the awards must have been awarded by a different judge, and one of which when the dog was over a year old.

15. The proposal was made by, Mr E Webster and in his absence presented by Mrs Cawthera-Purdy, the Chair.
16. The Council was advised that this was a discussion item at its previous meeting and has now been brought back as a firm proposal. A number of queries were raised including whether only one of the Reserve Challenge Certificates (RCC) needed to be awarded after the dog was a year old or whether this would apply to all three RCCs. The office clarified that it was thought the proposal's intention was for one Challenge Certificate (CC) to be awarded after a dog was a year old however should the proposal be recommended to the Shows Executive Committee (SEC), this would need to be confirmed.
17. A further query was raised as to the implementation date, and whether it would be permissible for people to use RCCs won by dogs throughout the whole of its lifetime. The office clarified that it was unusual for the Kennel Club to back date new initiatives and therefore it would be likely that a date in the future would be selected.
18. A query was raised as to the wording of the proposal and if this would go on to be the regulation wording. It was confirmed the should the proposal go forward the regulation wording would need to be carefully considered to ensure clarity.
19. Disappointment was expressed that the proposal was noted as being from area 1, Scotland. As a representative from area 1 herself Mrs McManus expressed a different view that RCCs should only be upgraded if they were all won behind the same dog. Mrs Martin, a further representative from area 1, expressed a view that she too was unaware of this proposal prior to the meeting. It was clarified that this matter had been considered at the previous Council meeting and that all representatives should have been aware.
20. The office reminded the Council of the wording on a RCC in that the judge was signing to say the dog was worthy of becoming a Champion and therefore the necessity for all RCCs being won behind the same dog was questioned.
21. A view was expressed that the number of RCCs included within the proposal (three) was too low and that this should be increased to five or seven. It was noted that many members of the Council agreed with this view. It was acknowledged that some exhibitors found it very satisfying to win over another highly successful dog. It was suggested that a small group may need to take the proposal away and further consider the number of RCCs required.
22. A suggestion was raised that the number of RCCs required to upgrade into a CC be proportionate to the Stud Book Band (SBB) of the breed. For example, a SBB E breed may need three RCCs and a SBB B breed may need 7. A view was expressed that this would not be a fair criterion to implement.



23. A concern was raised that it may be confusing for exhibitors to need to remember which dog was awarded the CC each time they won a RCC. It was noted that the office would need to implement a system to keep track of this.
24. After a lengthy discussion on the points raised the Council undertook a vote on the proposal of three RCCs and an amended proposal of five RCCs. The Council noted the outcome of the vote in that the amended proposal of a dog needing to be awarded five RCCs to allow them to be upgraded into a CC would be **recommended** to the Shows Executive Committee (SEC).

ITEM 9. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Best in Show and Reserve Best in Show at breed club open shows should become Crufts qualifiers.

25. The discussion item was submitted by Mrs A Moss and, in her absence presented by the Chair.
26. A suggestion was raised that Best Puppy and Reserve Best Puppy in Show should also qualify. A further suggestion was raised that Best Dog and Best Bitch/Best Opposite Sex should also qualify. It was noted that the majority of dogs which win these awards at breed club open shows would go on to qualify for Crufts in the usual way. A query was raised as to whether there was a need to over complicate the item, noting that it would be good to support breed club open shows.
27. After a short discussion the Council expressed agreement with the item and requested that it be brought back as a proposal to the next meeting.

b. Challenge Certificate winners to be eligible to compete in match competitions in their own special class. They would not be eligible to compete for Best in Match/Best Puppy in Match.

28. The discussion item was submitted and presented by Miss Snook. The Council noted the reasons for the item including supporting societies and allowing up and coming judges to gain hands on experience with CC winning dogs.
29. After a concise explanation of the reasoning behind the item the Council was in support of the item and Miss Snook undertook to submit a proposal for the next meeting.

c. That any dog regardless of age is eligible to gain points towards their Show Certificate of Excellence if competing in an adult class.

30. The discussion item was submitted and presented by Mr Bennett.
31. It was noted that a dog could win the same awards as a puppy/junior but would not be able to claim any points for this.
32. It was clarified that the Show Certificate of Excellence (ShCEX) award was an initiative that came from the Dog Show Promotion Working Party (DSPWP) and the rationale behind the award being only for dogs over the age of 18 months was to encourage exhibitors to attend open shows throughout a dog's lifetime. It was hoped that in turn this would offer support to the open show societies.
33. There was some mild support although many members of the Council understood and agreed with the original rationale. Mr Bennett undertook to relay this to his region.



d. Regulations to be amended regarding Best in Show (BIS) and Best Puppy in Show (BPIS). It is felt that a Best of Breed (BOB) winner competing in the groups has already beaten all other dogs in that breed regardless of age.

34. The discussion item was submitted by Mr Bennett. The Council noted as the proposal included within item 8.a was recommended for consideration by the Committee there was no need for this matter to be discussed.

e. That class averages for general open shows running more one show per year be withdrawn.

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

36. Mr Bennett noted that it was the view of his area that so long as a show is financially viable, and the society was happy and able to run it there should be no regulations preventing this.

37. The Council expressed a view that it agreed with Mr Bennett. It was noted that this matter had been discussed previously by both the Council and the SEC in relation to Scotland and Cornwall and that the 4 per class average was reduced to 3.5 for the whole of the UK for a two-year trial period. It was further noted that due to COVID-19 this trial would not give significant results and therefore the matter of an extension for the trial was due to be discussed by SEC later in the year.

38. After a short discussion the Council voted on the matter. It was noted that a clear majority supported the matter and therefore it was **recommended** for consideration by the SEC at the earliest opportunity.

f. Import and Rare Breeds be exempt from regulation F(A)8 at the irrelevant breed club shows.

'No dog is eligible for exhibition at a Limited Show or Match competition which has 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 e.g. CACIB, CAC, Green Star.'

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

40. It was noted that many Imported Register Breeds and Rare Breeds are shown in other countries and therefore gain awards such as CACIBs which eliminated them from their breed club shows in the UK. It was acknowledged that this was not helpful to the show scene and that the Council wanted to offer as much support to breed clubs as possible.

41. A query was raised as to whether this should only be relevant for UK dogs to prevent overseas exhibitors bringing their dogs over for these shows.

42. The Council expressed much support for the matter and therefore after a short discussion Mr Bennett, Miss Snook and Mrs Chapman undertook to consider some details and bring the matter back to the next meeting as a proposal.

g. That the offer of more training be given towards secretaries and show managers. Particularly for those that are new.

43. The discussion item was submitted by Mr Bennett and presented by the Chair.



44. It was noted that the Council was in full support of offering further training and support to new show secretaries and show managers. Mrs Cawthera-Purdy informed the Council that The Kennel Club was currently considering producing something similar to the Guide of Secretaries on the Kennel Club Academy. It was noted that although there was no date for this, it was a matter which was already being considered by the relevant departments and therefore did not require the Council's discussion.
- h. That the 'Have a Go Dog Show' be expanded and where possible be given the opportunity to be conducted at open shows.**
45. The discussion item was submitted and presented by Mr Bennett.
46. Mr Bennett noted that Mrs Chapman successfully ran several of the Have a Go events at the all-breed championship shows and therefore requested some further information. Mrs Chapman explained that a lot of work went into the events and that it would not be possible to run a like-for-like event at the majority of open shows.
47. It was acknowledged that The Kennel Club provided the participants with a copy of the Beginners Guide to Dog Showing booklet, which was available as a PDF on the website, and should any open show societies wish to run a similar event they should be able to provide this to their members.
48. It was suggested that open show societies may be able to nominate a committee member/volunteer to be on hand for help and advice for any new exhibitors at the show. The Council was in agreement that it did not wish for the matter to be brought back to the next meeting.
- i. Non Challenge Certificate (CC) breeds and Any Variety Imported Breed Register dogs be eligible for the Junior Warrant, or similar equivalent, and therefore be able to gain a Stud Book number. Rare breeds are in- between imported and CC breeds, they feel in limbo. They are able to collect ShCEx points, however points towards JW would give rare breeds the recognition they are requesting. Some rare breeds can stay on the rare breed register for a number of years before being awarded championship status.**
49. The discussion item was submitted and presented by Mr Bennett.
50. Mr Bennett noted that currently these breeds had no way of gaining a Stud Book Number (SBN). The office clarified that Mr Bennett was correct in that Imported Register Breed and Rare Breeds (breeds not allocated championship status) were unable to gain a SBN though dog showing. It was further noted that should this be recommended a number of regulation updates would be necessary.
51. It was acknowledged that currently the Junior Warrant (JW) entitled dogs to a SBN but the Veteran Warrant (VW) did not. It was noted that the current JW criteria required a number of points to be awarded at shows which had CCs on offer for the breed, which was not possible for Imported Register and Rare Breeds.
52. A suggestion was raised that a different type of warrant for these breeds may be better than adapting the current JW, noting the Imported Register Breeds would be gaining points though Any Variety classes. Mr Bennett alongside Mrs Walmsley and Mrs Chapman undertook to consider this and bring a proposal to the next meeting.
- j. At present the onus of whether a judge physically checks an exhibit's dentition lies with the judge.**



53. The discussion item was submitted by Mr Webster and presented by the Chair.
 54. It was noted that the judge is in control of the ring and although custom and practice is that the judge looks at a dog's dentition should an exhibitor request to do this themselves it was thought that most judges would allow this. It was noted that the COVID-19 guidance suggested that exhibitors show their own dog's teeth.
 55. It was acknowledged that Young Kennel Club/Junior Handlers are often asked to show their dog's teeth and it would be hoped that many training classes would start to introduce this within their classes.
 56. It was further acknowledged that some dogs can be put off by a judge handling their mouth and it may be better for the handler to do this.
 57. Overall, the Council was in support of the matter and wished for its views to be known. It was noted that the minutes would be available on the website in the hope that societies become aware of the Council's views and over time custom and practice may change.
- k. The Kennel Club consider supplying a judge's badge once a person is approved to judge. This badge would include the judge's unique ID number and name and should be worn for all judging appointments.**
58. The discussion item was submitted by The Late Mrs Marshall and presented by Mrs Cawthera-Purdy.
 59. It was noted that this matter had been discussed a number of times and had not received majority support. It was further noted that cost for personalisation and the number of badges that would be required were factors for the lack of support. It was acknowledged that judges were not allocated a judge's number until a CC appointment had been considered by the Judges Committee.
 60. It was acknowledged that judges at Kennel Club organised events received a Kennel Club badge similar to judges at other individual rosettes.
 61. It was noted that the matter was raised to reduce cost for societies. It was further noted that there was some support for the idea of having a generic badge, it was suggested that judges may be able to get these engraved on the back should they wish to.
 62. Mr Ord and Mrs McLauchlan undertook to bring the matter back as a proposal. It was noted that when the badge should be worn and, whether judges should be penalised for forgetting or losing their badge should be included within the proposal.

ITEM 10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Reminder of Council Procedures

63. The office issued a reminder of Council procedures to assist the new Council members.

Second Council Meeting

64. It was requested that moving forward a second Council meeting be held in the Autumn. It was noted that one meeting per year could be held remotely and one in person.
65. The office clarified that the reason for one meeting was often the amount of business to be considered and the length of time it takes to have area meetings. It was reiterated that the Council meetings would be more proactive if there were more proposals than discussion items.



66. A suggestion was raised that an autumn meeting was more of an update meeting, or that the office could email Council representatives with an update when there is one. The office confirmed that it would do this.

Council Timeframes

67. A query was raised as to whether the timeframes for items for the agenda being requested and the agenda being issued could be reduced. It was clarified that this had been discussed by the Breeds Liaison Council and was currently progressing through the relevant channels.
68. A further query was raised as to whether the date of the meeting could be changed so that area meetings did not need to be held around Christmas. It was noted that although items for the agenda were requested around Christmas there was nothing to stop area meetings being held at any point throughout the year in preparation. It was further noted that some areas held drop-in sessions at general and group championship shows.

Term of election and processes

69. A query was raised as to the process for elections and the next term of office. The office clarified the process and confirmed that Council representatives would hear more in due course.

Virtual meetings

70. A query was raised as to whether representatives could join future meetings virtually if they were to take place in London. The office confirmed that this should be possible and would be discussed in due course.

Thanks to the Chair and office

71. The Council offered a vote of thanks to Mrs Cawthera-Purdy and the office for the work put into the organisation and running of the meeting.

ITEM 11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

72. An announcement confirming the date of the next meeting would be made in September 2021.

The meeting closed at 2.20pm. with a vote of thanks to the Chair and the office.

Mrs A Cawthera-Purdy
Chairman