



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BREEDS LIAISON COUNCIL HELD ON 5
JUNE 2024 AT 11.00AM IN THE BOARDROOM, THE KENNEL CLUB, CLARGES
STREET**

PRESENT

Mr A Bicknell	Working
Miss C Boggia*	Hound
Mrs D Britten*	Terrier (Up to paragraph 67)
Mrs J Collins-Pitman	Gundog
Mr G Davies*	Utility
Mr J Horswell	Pastoral
Mr T Hutchings*	Working
Mrs T Jackson	Pastoral
Mrs K Moores*	Gundog
Mrs C Morgan*	Gundog
Miss E Newton*	Hound
Mr E Paterson	Utility
Mrs J Piper*	Working
Mr K Pursglove	Hound
Mr D Roberts*	Hound
Mrs J Sparrow*	Toy
Miss A Summers*	Toy
Miss S Taylor	Pastoral
Mrs B Thornley*	Pastoral (Up to paragraph 67)
Mr M Walshaw	Terrier
Mrs S Walton	Gundog
Mr T Whitehill	Toy (From paragraph 26 onwards)

* Denotes attendance via Microsoft Teams.

GUEST

Mr D Simpson	Great Dane Representative
--------------	---------------------------

IN ATTENDANCE

Mrs H Kerfoot	Chief Canine Health, Events and Activities Officer
Miss D Deuchar	Head of Canine Activities
Mr J Winnington	Breed Shows Team Manager
Miss T Newson	Breed Shows Team Senior Officer
Ms R Mansfield	Working Dog Activities Team Committee Secretary

IN THE CHAIR:

MRS JACKSON

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies had been received from Mr S Collier, Mrs D Ellrich, Mr R Kinsey, Miss SA Leslie and Mrs A Teasdale. Mr L Anness and Mrs M Swash were not in attendance.

ITEM 2. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 21 NOVEMBER 2023

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 21 November 2023 were approved as an accurate record.

ITEM 3. RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS/MATTERS ARISING

3. Mrs Morgan requested an update from the office on The Kennel Club's work on creating a tiered registration system. The office explained that the new model had not been confirmed by the Board and further updates would be available later in the year.

Have a Go Dog Show

4. The Council noted that the Show Executive Committee (SEC) had discussed whether the Have a Go Dog Show initiative was meeting its aims. It was decided that the initiative needed a review and therefore, Have a Go at all-breed championship shows was put on pause for 2024 to allow time for the event and internal processes to be reworked, ideally for 2025.
5. The SEC noted that there had been a number of suggestions as to how to improve and rework the event such as holding events at agricultural shows, with local ringcraft groups being involved and having leaflets about dog shows to be distributed at agricultural and fun shows. It was further noted that it was of utmost importance that events were well run and friendly and it was suggested that holding events at all-breed championship shows may not be the best place.
6. Having events at agricultural shows would potentially capture a wider audience of people who may not be aware of what a championship dog show was, it could also capture a younger audience, which was thought would be beneficial to the show scene. The Show Executive Committee wished to seek the views of the Shows Liaison Council and Breeds Liaison Council. It was noted that show societies did not appear to be utilising local ringcraft training groups or publicising the event in their local area as intended.
7. The Council was of the view that holding the events at championship shows had not worked and holding them at agricultural shows was a good suggestion, noting that there was already a basis for it at those events as they often held

talks with a ringcraft lesson and a simulated class. It was also suggested that the event could be held at special companion shows or open and limited shows which could be enhanced with sponsorship. Additionally, breed club fun days could be an option as there would likely be lots of new dog owners and people that may wish to take up dog showing.

8. It was noted that another consideration was how to retain newcomers who wanted to take up dog showing after attending a Have a Go Show. There was concern that some clubs and societies, as well as shows, were not welcoming to newcomers and that needed to be addressed. It was suggested that free club membership could be offered to puppy owners of current club members to entice them to be more involved with activities. It was noted that there was data that suggested there were a lot of new exhibitors, but it was accepted that there was difficulty in retaining them.
9. It was decided that the best course of action was for the Council representatives to go to the breed clubs and get ideas of how to revitalise the Have a Go Show as well as ways in which to retain newcomers to showing after they had attended the event.

ITEM 4. JUDGES EDUCATION PROGRAMME (BREED SHOWS) UPDATE

10. The Council was provided with an update from Mrs Kerfoot on the Judges Education Programme (Breed Shows) (JEP). The Council was informed that the online system would be available by the end of 2024, however there was no specific date available.
11. It was noted that there was work being done on a communication plan for judges on how to get ready for the online platform. Mrs Kerfoot stressed that there would be a lot of testing of the website to ensure it was ready to launch. There would also be webinars and sessions in the members lounge and roadshows to demonstrate how it would work.
12. It was explained that the traditional system and grandfathering rights would cease at the end of 2025 and after that all judges would follow the new JEP route. Mrs Kerfoot acknowledged that there had been some unrest on social media about the standard of judges who had undertaken the new program, however, it was clarified that on investigation there was no foundation to those accusations as most of the judges approved via the JEP route for a breed had not yet awarded Challenge Certificates to that breed.

ITEM 5. SUBMISSION OF JUDGES

13. The Council noted a reminder from the office of the correct way for breed clubs to submit their judges via the online form. Council delegates were requested to

communicate the information to breed representatives, and breed clubs. It was noted that the form could be found on the website here:

<https://www.thekennelclub.org.uk/forms/single-breeds-sub-group-championship-show-judges-nomination-form/>

14. It was raised that the online form did not give confirmation of submission which was causing concern. The office confirmed that this had been raised internally and was due to be amended however no timeframe could be given. The office explained that the submissions would be dealt with in order of priority of the show date and not necessarily order of submission.
15. The Council was requested to inform breed club secretaries that the form linked in Find a Show and Find a Judge should not be used to nominate judges, as it was to flag incorrect data on those platforms, such as judging numbers etc. The link above was the only one that should be used for nominating judges. If there was an urgent request, for example a show within the next three months, then an email could be sent to the Breed Shows Team.
16. It was requested that a link to the correct form be added to the secretary's area of the online account, so it was in the same place as the licence application and other relevant documentation. The office agreed to action the request but could not confirm a timeframe.

ITEM 6. PROPOSALS

a. Definition of Undergraduate

Proposed by: Mrs S Pounds-Longhurst

Presented by: Mrs S Walton

17. The Council considered a proposal to amend the current class definition for Undergraduate to bring it in line with Graduate, Post Graduate etc. Mr Horswell seconded the proposal.

Regulation F(A) Definitions of Classes at Championship, Open and Limited Shows:

* applies to championship and open shows only

** applies to limited shows only

UNDERGRADUATE

* For dogs which have not won a Challenge Certificate/CACIB/CAC/Green Star or 3 or more first prizes at championship shows **in Undergraduate, Graduate, Post Graduate, Minor Limit, Mid Limit, Limit or Open Classes whether restricted or not** where Challenge Certificates were offered for the breed

~~(Minor Puppy, Special Minor Puppy, Puppy and Special Puppy Classes
excepted, whether restricted or not).~~

**** For dogs which have not won 3 or more first prizes at open or championship shows in Undergraduate, Graduate, Post Graduate, Minor Limit, Mid Limit, Limit or Open Classes whether restricted or not** ~~(Minor Puppy, Special Minor Puppy, Puppy and Special Puppy Classes excepted, whether restricted or not).~~

(Additions in bold, deletions struck through)

18. It was hoped that the amendment would prevent confusion as some exhibitors believed they could still enter Undergraduate unless they had 3 Undergraduate class wins. It would also help to improve entries in the class, and, where it was scheduled, could help slower maturing breeds of dogs which may not be ready to go from the age classes to graduate.
19. It was noted that a full discussion had been held on the topic at the Council's last meeting, where it had been agreed that a proposal should be brought forward for consideration. As such, it was agreed that no further discussion was required and following a vote the proposal was unanimously **recommended** to be progressed to the Show Executive Committee.
- b. Show Certificate of Excellence (ShCEx)

Proposed by: Ms J Cranfield

Presented by: Mr D Simpson (breed representative)

20. The Council considered a proposed amendment to the allocation of points for the Show Certificate of Excellence (ShCEx), which would allow for 1 point to be awarded for Best of Breed at a breed club open show. A limit of 3 points in total from breed club Best of Breeds may be added. Mr Bicknell seconded the proposal.
21. Currently, Junior Warrant points could be gained from both general open shows and breed club open shows. However, for the ShCEx, points from general open shows were allowed but not from breed club shows. While it was important to encourage exhibitors to support general open shows, it was important that it did not detract from breed club shows, especially breed club open shows.
22. The Council was of the view that with bigger entries at breed club open shows than a breed class at a general open show, it was harder to achieve Best of Breed and should be rewarded with the chance to gain points towards the ShCEx. The 3-point limit would ensure a balance across shows and would not detract from general open shows.

23. The office clarified that when the award was created, breed club shows were intentionally not included in the points system as the intention of the award was to support general and group open shows.
24. Mr Simpson explained that the inclusion of the limit in the proposal was to continue to support general open shows, so that people could not gain all their points at breed club shows. The Council accepted the intention but was of the view that the three point limit in the proposal should be removed. Mr Walshaw proposed an amendment to remove the limit, which was seconded by Mr Bicknell.
25. After full consideration of the amended proposal, the Council **recommended** the Show Executive Committee to consider allowing 1 point for Best of Breed at a breed club open show to count towards the Show Certificate of Excellence (ShCEX).

Mr Whitehill joined the meeting.

c. Term of office for volunteer roles

Proposed by: Northern Boston Terrier Club
Presented by: Mr E Paterson

26. The Council considered a proposal to introduce the same term of office of three years, for all volunteer roles. It was noted that it was only the Breed Education Coordinators that did not currently have a 3-year term of office. It was suggested by the Northern Boston Terrier Club that the introduction of a term of office would bring The Kennel Club in line with the principles and working practices of all major organisations that rely on volunteers.
27. It was noted that the term of office would not prevent incumbents from re-standing but would allow for others who may be interested in the role to put themselves forward. It may also encourage more volunteers to consider the roles if they perceive the role to be of a fixed term rather than a prolonged commitment.
28. Mr Walshaw seconded the proposal. The Council supported the proposal and **recommended** that it be put to the relevant committees to progress.

d. Declaring a neutered dog on show entries

Proposed by: Ms J Cutler
Presented by: Ms T Jackson

29. The Council considered a proposal that would allow owners to add the word 'neutered' to their dog's name on show entries if they had notified The Kennel Club of their intention to show a neutered dog. It was noted that in this instance the word neutered referred to both male and female dogs.

30. The rationale for the proposal was intended to address instances where a judge or steward would ask for a letter from The Kennel Club when a neutered dog was being shown, or where a judge considered it a fault and penalised or refused to place a dog. It was noted that it was proposed for it to be optional to declare a neutered dog.
31. It was suggested that if a steward could see from the catalogue that the dog was neutered, then the judge could be notified before the class. They should then accept that the dog must be judged the same as the others in the class. It was noted that all breed standards stated that 'any departure from the foregoing points should be considered a fault and the seriousness with which the fault should be regarded should be in exact proportion to its degree and its effect upon the health and welfare of the dog and dog's ability to perform its traditional work.'
32. It was clarified that the proposal did not require a regulation change and would hopefully encourage people to show their neutered dogs. Mr Bicknell seconded the proposal.
33. The office informed the Council that a letter from The Kennel Club regarding a dog's neutered status must not be shown to judge as it included the dog's registered name, it was noted that it also should not be shown to a steward. It should only be shown to The Kennel Club if there was a dispute. It was accepted that there was a need for further education of judges to reinforce that a neutered dog should be judged the same as the other exhibits. However, it was also accepted that breed standards currently specified that dogs needed to be entire, which was something that could be looked into.
34. It was noted that a judge should not see the show entry prior to judging and as such, including the word 'neutered' in the catalogue would not inform the judge. There was also concern that there was no way to confirm whether a dog had been entire prior to being neutered or may have had a medical condition.
35. It was felt that an exhibitor may be choosing to show their neutered dog due to it being their only dog, and neutered dogs should be allowed to be shown to encourage people to show. It was acknowledged that the core purpose of showing had moved away from purely breeding stock and as such, owning a neutered dog should not prevent it from being shown.
36. It was also noted that there was no way to know that a bitch had been neutered and as such a judge would never know they were judging a neutered bitch. This reinforced the view that neutered dogs should be allowed, to maintain fairness. Additionally, if it was optional to declare a neutered dog then some exhibitors may not choose to do so, which would detract from the reasoning behind the proposal.

37. The Council voted and was not in favour of the proposal as written but was of the opinion that there needed to be further education and clarity on the process, including whether the exhibitor should inform the judge or steward if a dog was neutered. The office would look into internal processes and education to improve understanding of the situation and the Council could also bring some ideas back to the next meeting for further discussion.

e. Health results on registration documents

Proposed by: Poodle Breed Council
Presented by: Ms T Jackson

38. At its last meeting the Council considered a discussion item submitted by the Poodle Breed Council for The Kennel Club to review its decision to cease including health test results on Kennel Club registration documents. The Council was in agreement with the discussion item and requested the Poodle Breed Council to bring back a proposal.
39. Accordingly, the Council considered a proposal that The Kennel Club registration documents should contain all test results that The Kennel Club requires of breeders in the Assured Breeders Scheme. Mr Walshaw seconded the proposal.
40. The office informed the Council that the reason the health test results had been removed was because they would only be up to date at the point of printing. The Kennel Club website provided more current information and a list of breeds and what health tests were required for each breed. Additionally, puppy packs were due to be released shortly for breeders which would include the link to health information.
41. The Council accepted that the website and puppy packs would be useful, however, it relied on breeders being willing to give that information to puppy buyers. Having the test results on Kennel Club documentation ensured that puppy buyers had one official document that stated the health status of their puppy.
42. The Council believed that the health test results should be reinstated on the registration document and voted in favour and **recommended** the proposal to progress.

f. Racing/Lure Coursing class definition

Proposed by: Whippet Breed Council
Presented by: Ms E Newton

43. The Council considered a proposal submitted by the Whippet Breed Council which would add a definition for a Racing/Coursing class for use when it was

held which could be adopted by any of the sighthound breeds. It was proposed that the following definition would ensure uniformity of the class.

RACING/LURE COURSING for Whippets over 12 months of age on the first day of the show who have competed (trials not accepted) twice or more in Racing or Lure Coursing during their lifetime with a recognised club/association, prior to the close of entry. The recognised club/association passports or licence will be checked on the day of the show. (Proof of eligibility may be confirmed with the recognised club/association.)

44. There was no seconder for the proposal and as such it was not discussed.
- g. Proposed amendment to F(1)22.d.(2).a – Time limits between championship show judging appointments

Proposed by: North East Bull Terrier Club
Presented by: Mr M Walshaw

45. The Council considered a proposal submitted by the North East Bull Terrier Club which would reduce the time limit between championship show judging appointments from 18 months to 12 months.

Regulation F(1)22.d.(2)(a)

TO:

There must be an interval of not less than ~~48~~ **12** calendar months between the appointment of a judge to award Challenge Certificates to the same sex of the same breed.

46. There was no seconder for the proposal and as such it was not discussed.
- h. Amendment to the 'Progeny not eligible for registration' endorsement

Proposed by: Boxer Breed Council
Presented by: Mr T Hutchings

47. The Council considered a proposal from the Boxer Breed Council to change the 'progeny not eligible for registration' endorsement to add an option which would allow a breeder to lift an endorsement for one litter at a time and be automatically reapplied after the litter had been registered. Currently, the endorsement could be lifted by the breeder but once lifted could not be reinstated.
48. It was understood that conscientious breeders did not want their lines being abused; they did not want their puppies falling into the hands of unscrupulous, commercial breeders; hence they often found it much easier to endorse all their puppies in order to save themselves the worry. However, it was feared that the widespread use of endorsements was a deterrent to new breeders entering the hobby.

49. It was proposed that it should be made possible for breeders to lift an endorsement for one litter, but for the endorsement to be reinstated immediately afterwards. Any request for future litters from the owners could then be considered individually by the breeder in a similar way.
50. It was believed that the proposed amendment to the endorsement would allow the conscientious original breeder the comfort of knowing that they still retained some degree of control, and it would allow the keen newer breeder to demonstrate good faith. It would also mean, hopefully, that more people would become responsible breeders.
51. The perceived problem with the current system was that the removal of the endorsement was a one off, irreversible act. Once it had been removed a breeder lost control over their line. It was queried how easy the change would be to police and the office explained that there were certain legal issues regarding ownership that could impact the matter as well as logistical considerations in terms of resourcing and IT amendments.
53. There was a lot of support from the Council for the proposal as it was felt it was a necessary change, whilst accepting there may be an impact of introducing it. It was complicated but deserved resourcing given to it. A vote was taken on the proposal and by a majority it was **recommended** to be progressed.

ITEM 7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Matches and special events

Presented by: Mr J Horswell

54. The Council discussed whether the maximum number of dogs permitted to enter matches should be increased from 64. It was queried why the number was 64 and whether a maximum was needed at all. It was noted that some clubs were having multiple permission letters to allow more dogs.
55. The office explained that the number was historic and had been highlighted as potentially needing review. Clubs were encouraged to have multiple permission letters in order to facilitate where they often held multiple classes at one match event and therefore wanted more dogs. It was noted that the activity disciplines did not have a limit on the number of dogs. The special event would be a final of a competition where the qualifiers were run throughout the competing season that was held by a Kennel Club registered club.
56. It was queried why permission was needed for these events and the office clarified that it was in order to be able to have oversight in case any incidents occurred.

57. The office informed the Council that it was a topic that was due to be considered by the Show Executive Committee and requested the Council to leave the matter with the office and wait for the outcome of the SEC consideration. The Council agreed to that course of action.

b. Written critiques

Presented by: Mr J Horswell

58. The Council discussed whether breed clubs should be encouraged to ask judges to provide written critiques on all dogs exhibited at their shows.
59. Breed club show societies could allow for written critiques to be provided, where time constraints and the impact on other breeds and group judging would not be a consideration. It was suggested that this could give exhibitors more value for their entry fee and could be a useful training aid for judges and observers at open shows. At championship shows exhibitors could gain a critique from an expert, and if a student judge was present, it could enhance their education.
60. There were a number of comments that the idea could be useful for numerically small breeds but would not work for breeds with large classes as there would not be time to facilitate it. It was also raised that if it was not mandatory then this could cause complaints to be raised with The Kennel Club if a judge chose not to do it.
61. The Council was of the view that there was not much appetite for the suggestion, however if a proposal were submitted to the Council in the future, it could be considered.

c. Special Beginners definition

Presented by: Mrs S Walton

62. The Council discussed concerns, raised by the Labrador Club of Scotland, with regards to the definition of Special Beginners and considered reviewing and rewriting the criteria for Special Beginners to better reflect its original purpose of encouraging new entrants.
63. It was noted that the current criteria allowed for individuals with several years of experience to be classified as beginners. Additionally, it was queried how judges approved to judge at championship shows could compete in Special Beginners noting that a requirement of approval to judge at that level was to have owned or bred at least three dogs in the Stud Book and to have had a significant amount of experience with the breed concerned. A concern was raised regarding the perception of judges who had been deemed experienced enough to judge at CC level also exhibiting in Special Beginners.

64. The Council noted that a proposal regarding Special Beginners had been discussed at the Shows Liaison Council (SLC) meeting held on 23 April 2024. The office updated the Council on the SLC discussion. It was noted that the SLC had not agreed on suitable criteria that would solve the issue at hand. It had been recommended that the two Councils communicate to come up with a proposal to alleviate exhibitors concerns.
65. There were a number of suggestions from the Council, such as time limit of how long a person had been competing or a time limit for being eligible for the class. It was acknowledged that it was unfair that people with years of experience could compete in a class aimed at beginners.
66. The Council was in agreement that the Special Beginners class should be for true beginners and an amendment to the definition was required. It was decided that the Breeds Liaison Council would liaise with their counterparts on the SLC and breed clubs and bring ideas to the next meeting.

Mrs Thornley and Mrs Britten left the meeting.

d. Non breed standard puppy adverts

Presented by: Mr D Roberts

67. The Council discussed whether The Kennel Club should continue to accept advertisements for non breed standard colour puppies.
68. The rationale provided by The Dachshund Club felt that people looking for a puppy and seeking advice from The Kennel Club would expect information to be accurate and assume that puppies being advertised by The Kennel Club would be Kennel Club registered and have a Kennel Club 'seal of approval'.
69. It was believed that there was concern at the high number of puppies being registered with The Kennel Club that were of colours outside of The Kennel Club Breed Standards and advertised on the Find a Puppy website. The reason why The Dachshund Club was against the dilute colours being bred was that it believed there could be health issues associated with them, which was an issue that was relevant not just to dachshunds.
70. The office explained that it was waiting for the finalisation of the new registration model before being able to comment further, however it was appreciated that there were frustrations.
71. The Council wished to make its dissatisfaction known that puppies that were not to Kennel Club standards were being permitted to be sold through The Kennel Club's Find a Puppy service. The office took the feeling of the Council on board and would provide an update on the new registration model as soon as possible.

e. Judging time frame

Presented by: Mr M Walshaw

- 72. The Council considered reducing the time limit between judging appointments at championship shows for vulnerable breeds, specifically relating to breed specialists, from 18 months to 12 months.
- 73. The Council noted that this discussion item was similar to a proposal that had been discussed earlier in the meeting (paragraphs 45-46) which had not received a seconder. It was noted that this was specifically for breed specialists in vulnerable breeds. There was no support from the Council on this topic and as such it was not discussed.

ITEM 8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 74. Miss Taylor asked, on behalf of the Golden Retriever Representative, whether a press release could be issued when the minutes of the council meeting were released.
- 75. The office explained that the criteria for issuing press releases had been changed by the Press Office and it was not possible to do a press release for council minutes, in any discipline. However, the office was looking into alternative ways of disseminating the information and currently the minutes were emailed to all delegates to share with their representatives as well as being posted on The Kennel Club's Dog Showing and Crufts Exhibitors News Facebook group. The office agreed to email the minutes to all the Breed Liaison Council representatives to help.
- 76. The Chair thanked the Council for their hard work and a productive meeting.

ITEM 9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 77. The Council noted that the date of the next meeting was **5 November 2024**. The submission deadline for items for the agenda was 7 August 2024.
- 78. The meeting closed at 13.50pm

**MRS T JACKSON
CHAIRPERSON**