

MINUTES OF THE KENNEL CLUB OBEDIENCE LIAISON COUNCIL
MEETING HELD AT THE KENNEL CLUB AT 11.00 AM ON 30 JUNE 2015

PRESENT:

Mrs A Benoist	North East
Miss F Godfrey	South East and East Anglia
Mr A Kousourou	Scotland
Mrs D Lavender	North East
Mr P Lubbi	South East and East Anglia
Mr M McCartney	Northern Ireland
Mr J McIntosh	Scotland
Mr R Page	Midlands
Mrs M Ray	Midlands
Mr S Rutter	North West
Mrs B Smith	Midlands
Mrs L Turner	South and South West

IN ATTENDANCE:

Miss D Deuchar	Manager – Canine Activities Team
Mrs A Mitchell	Committee Secretary – Working Dog Activities Team

IN THE CHAIR:

Mr S Rutter

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies for absence had been received from Mr D Garrett, Mrs A Height, Mrs J Jessop and Mrs S Henstridge. Mr R Harlow was not present.

ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

2. The minutes of the meeting held on 21 January 2015 were signed by the Chairman as an accurate record.

ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3. Proposed amendment to Regulation G33.d Judges and Judging
At the Council's meeting in January a proposal from Mr R Becque for an amendment to Regulation G33.d. had been considered but Mr Becque had been requested to clarify it. The Council considered a revised proposal submitted by Mr Becque. The proposal was seconded by Mr Page.
4. The Council was in agreement with the principle of the proposed amendment, which would allow for a dog in co-ownership with a judge at a show to compete at the same show provided it was not judged by one of the co-owners. However it

considered that the revised Regulation should also allow for the dog to be entered into a different part of a class, where the class was split, and a revised amendment to the Regulation was proposed by Mr A Kousourou and seconded by Mrs Smith to allow for this. A vote took place and the following amendment to the Regulation was **recommended** for approval:

Regulation G33.d Judges and Judging

TO:

Judges at Obedience Shows must not enter for competition a dog which is recorded in their **sole** ownership ~~or part ownership~~, or handle a dog, at the Show at which they are judging. **A dog recorded in part ownership with the Judge may be entered for competition in any part of a class other than the part which the judge is judging.**

(Deletion struck through. Insertions in bold.)

Commentary for obedience competitions at Crufts

5. Following discussion at its meeting in January 2015, the Council gave further consideration to the introduction of commentary for the Obedience Championships at Crufts. After consultation with handlers by members of the Council, it was understood that those competing in the Championships would have no objection to commentary as they would not hear it and it would have no adverse effect on them.
6. A query was raised as to whether commentary was necessary as spectators at the Championships were in the main very knowledgeable and did not require it. However it was accepted that some spectators may be new to the discipline, or may be members of the public with little or no knowledge of Obedience, and would find commentary helpful and informative.
7. After a vote, it was agreed that commentary for the Championships should be introduced, if possible from 2016 onwards, subject to the agreement of the Crufts Sub-Committee. Commentary would only take place in between exercises, not during them.
8. All present were requested to consider suitable individuals who may be able to fulfil the role of commentator, and to submit suggestions to the office as soon as possible so that approaches could be made. At least two people would be required each day.

ITEM 4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE ACTIVITIES SUB-COMMITTEE

9. The Council noted a report from Mr Rutter on recommendations made by the Activities Sub-Committee, which were as follows.

Kennel Club Code of Practice for Owners and Handlers with Dogs Taking Part in Canine Activities

10. The Council's views on the document had been noted and a revised version would be produced in due course.

Retrieve over hurdle

11. The Council's concerns regarding the use of a solid hurdle in the retrieve over hurdle exercise in the Obedience World Cup and the Inter-Regional competitions held at Crufts had been referred to the Crufts Sub-Committee. [Afternote: it was confirmed that the hurdle used for the World Cup would remain unchanged from that used previously. The hurdle used for the Inter-Regional Competition would be of the same type used in Rally competitions, consisting of two cones with a displaceable pole. The height of the hurdle would vary depending on the height of the dog.]

Amendment to Regulation G(C)4.f.(1)

12. The Council noted that at its meeting on 14 April 2015, the General Committee approved an amendment to Regulation G(C)4.f.(1). The proposal for the amendment had been submitted by the office in view of the Council's wishes and in the interests of consistency, and brought the Regulation into line with Regulation G(A)5.(3) which stated that the detailed test would include 'Recall with a finish on lead, off lead or long line, at the handler's choice.'

Regulation G(C)4.f.(1)

TO:

f. Recall-

(1) Introductory Class to Novice: At the start of the exercise the dog should be in the sit or down position (handler's choice of position) at the handler's left side. On command, the handler shall leave the dog in the direction instructed. When instructed, the handler will halt and then turn to face the dog. When instructed, the handler will recall the dog which must return briskly to the "present" position and sit. When instructed, the handler will command the dog to go to the heel position on the handler's left side and sit in the "heel" position. ~~In the Introductory Class finishing the dog to the "heel" position is not included in the exercise.~~
(Deletion struck through)

13. The Council noted that on a number of occasions it had been necessary for it to consider consequential amendments in order to ensure consistency throughout the Regulations. Clubs or individuals submitting a proposal for an amendment to Regulations should check whether any consequential amendments were necessary and if so, these should be included within the proposal. Representatives receiving proposals were also requested to check whether consequential amendments were necessary.

ITEM 5. TO NOTE THE TABLED REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE ACTIVITIES SUB-COMMITTEE DURING 2014

14. The report was noted.

ITEM 6. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY

Young Kennel Club Obedience

15. There was some concern regarding progress relating to the YKC. The Council was keen to encourage YKC members to take part in Obedience but it was unclear as to what action should be taken, and by who.
16. It was noted with regret that the YKC's Summer Camp would not take place due to lack of numbers, but it was accepted that the YKC was planning a number of weekend events for its members in the future.
17. The Council accepted that few young handlers came into competitive Obedience via the YKC, but that most new competitors were people who had acquired a dog and had sought an activity in which to take part. These were often people in their 20s rather than children.
18. It was accepted that there were difficulties in trying to attract young handlers into Obedience, and that it appeared that many young handlers were attracted to Agility rather than Obedience.
19. Many shows would not schedule YKC classes as they did not attract a good entry, and those that did schedule them had noted that entries were falling.
20. It was pointed out that Heelwork to Music had faced a similar difficulty and had introduced a points system whereby YKC members could gain points from a Heelwork to Music class at any show in order to qualify for Crufts, rather than qualifying by means of classes specifically for YKC members. This was attractive to handlers, and also meant that there was no necessity for shows to schedule special classes for YKC handlers which may not attract many entries. The Council agreed that a similar approach would be a positive means of encouraging young handlers to enter Obedience shows, and that an initial approach to the YKC should be made by Mr Rutter.
21. The Council noted that YKC handlers competing in Obedience could gain points at YKC events and classes, with the winner receiving the Rebecca Pointer Memorial Award. [**Afternote:** the Award was not presented in 2015 and the YKC team confirmed that it was in the process of agreeing a revised format for awarding of the trophy. A press release would be issued in due course to announce the new format.]
22. It was agreed that a representative from the YKC team should be requested to attend the Council's next meeting in January 2016 in order to discuss the issues involved in attracting its members to participate in Obedience.

Council engagement with grass-roots competitors

23. It was noted that Council representatives were active within Obedience clubs, and were available at shows to discuss issues with the Obedience community. It was agreed that it was particularly important to take opportunities to talk to young and new competitors taking part in Introductory, Pre-Beginner and Beginner classes.

24. A query was raised as to whether it would be possible to produce a printed version of the 'Beginners Guide to Obedience' booklet. It was noted that the Council's original decision had been that the Guide would only be available online, but it was considered that some people would find it helpful to have a printed copy. It was accepted that it would not be cost-effective for the Kennel Club to print and sell booklets. It was possible to download and print the Guide but the format did not allow for easy printing.
25. It was agreed that the office would investigate whether a print-friendly version of the booklet could be made available.

Crufts - promote Obedience to potential newcomers

26. The Obedience Information Stand at Crufts was discussed later in the meeting (paragraphs 60-63 refer).
27. There was a discussion as to whether it would be possible for a small display of Obedience exercises to take place in front of the Obedience Information stand at Crufts, but it was accepted that there was insufficient space for this. It was also suggested that a display could take place adjacent to the Obedience ring in Hall 5 but it was agreed that this would not be practical due to the proximity of the Obedience ring itself, show rings, the food court, emergency exits, and the lack of carpeting in the area.

ITEM 7. PROPOSALS

Proposed amendments to Regulations G(A)5.f(1) and G35(g)

28. Mrs Godfrey, on behalf of Ms S Budgen, wished to propose amendments to the above Regulations in order to address ambiguities within the G Regulations regarding the use of a toy in the Introductory class. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Turner.
29. The Council was in agreement with the principle but a revised proposal was put forward by Mr Kousourou and seconded by Mr Page to specify that the toy should be silent.
30. A vote took place and the following amendments to Regulations were **recommended** for approval:

Regulation G(A)5.f(1) Introductory

TO:

Play with dog for 15-30 seconds on or off lead at the handler's choice. **Handlers may use a silent toy if they wish.**

(Insertion in bold)

Regulation G35(g)

TO:

Food and/or toys shall not be carried or given to a dog under test except in Introductory Class where silent toy and food rewards may be used ~~between and~~

~~after exercises~~ **in accordance with the Introductory class Regulation** and in a Special Class if specified in the class definition. Competitors must not distract other dogs when rewarding their dog with food, toy or play. (Refer to Obedience Code of Conduct).

(Deletion struck through. Insertion in bold.)

Proposed amendment to Regulation G.35.d. Competing

31. The proposal was introduced by Mrs Godfrey, representing Ms S Budgen. Mrs Godfrey explained that the intention of the proposal was to formalise existing custom and practice, and that giving the owner's first name and the pet name of the dog did not constitute an indication of the identity of the handler or the dog. The proposal was seconded by Mr Page.
32. The Council agreed that the proposed amendment to the Regulation would provide clarity, and after a vote, it **recommended** the following amendment for approval:

Regulation G35.d. Competing

TO:

Nothing may be carried, worn or displayed by a handler or a dog during judging which is capable of indicating the identity of the dog or owner nor must anything be said or any action taken which identifies the dog other than by exhibit number.

If asked for by the judge or ring steward a handler may (at their choice) disclose their first name and dog's pet name for possible show report use.

(Insertion in bold)

Proposed amendment to Regulation G(C)4.h.

33. Mr Rutter requested the Council to consider a proposed amendment to the above Regulation. Mr Rutter's view was that the possible use of food and toys as permitted in the Introductory class should not extend to the stay ring, where their use may present problems for other competitors in other classes as stays for the Introductory class now took place in the main stay ring. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Smith.
34. The Council was of the view that Regulations relating to the stay ring should be applicable to all classes, and after a vote, recommended the following amendment for approval:

Regulation G(C)4.h.

TO:

Stays **in ALL** classes - The Judge or Steward will direct handlers to positions in the ring. The command "Last Command" will be given and handlers should then instantly give their final command to their dogs. Any further commands or signals to the dogs after this "Last Command" will be penalised. Handlers will then be instructed to leave their dogs and walk to positions indicated until ordered to return to them. These are group tests and all dogs must compete together, but where this is impracticable at an indoor show, the class may be equally divided but the judging for the groups must be consecutive.

(Insertion in bold)

Proposed amendment to Regulation G16.a. Obedience Championships

35. Mr Rutter presented the proposal on behalf of Miss A Wilkinson and Mrs M Ward, who wished to propose that a dog awarded one or more Obedience Certificates, or three or more Reserve Obedience Certificates during the calendar year preceding Crufts, should be entitled to compete at the Championships at Crufts.
36. There being no seconder for the proposal, no further discussion took place.

Proposed new Regulation G16.d. Obedience Championships

37. The proposal was presented by Mr Rutter, representing Miss Wilkinson and Mrs Ward, who wished to propose that, where the winner of an Obedience Certificate was unable to compete in the Obedience Championship due to circumstances beyond their control, the Reserve Obedience Certificate winner would take their place at Crufts. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Turner.
38. Miss Wilkinson and Mrs Ward were of the view that this would give practical significance to the Reserve Obedience Certificate, and that it would also address the issue of Obedience Certificate winners who were unable to compete at Crufts because of injury.
39. However, the Council was unclear as to whether, in the case of a dog which had won multiple Obedience Certificates during the year withdrawing from the Championship at Crufts, all dogs awarded Reserve Obedience Certificates to that dog would become eligible to compete.
40. It was clarified by the office that the Reserve Obedience Certificate was awarded so that in the event of the Obedience Certificate winner being disqualified, the Certificate would be awarded to the dog which had received the Reserve Obedience Certificate.
41. A vote took place and the proposal was not recommended for approval.

Proposed amendment to Regulation G24. Entry for Competition.

42. Mr Rutter, on behalf of Miss Wilkinson and Mrs Ward proposed an amendment to the above Regulation which would specify that the number of awards won up to and including the closing date for entries would be counted when entering a class, rather than up to and including the seventh day before the closing date as was currently the case. The proposal was made with the objective of reducing the number of handlers working in classes when they had already qualified for a higher class. This would be beneficial both to those handlers, who would not need to work a class in which a win would not count towards progression, and would not hold back others from progressing. The proposal was seconded by Miss Godfrey.
43. There was some concern that this would encourage entries to be made at the last minute as a handler's eligibility for classes may not be known if entering earlier. It was accepted that it would be possible to enter a show earlier and then to subsequently request a transfer to a higher class if necessary, but this may cause logistical problems for secretaries.

44. It was accepted that at any show it was likely that there would be a number of handlers working in classes that they had qualified out of, but 'bonus wins' were not considered to be a major issue. Many handlers welcomed the opportunity to use such classes to gain experience before competing in a higher class. The Council was not of the view that a Regulation change was warranted.
45. A vote took place and the proposal was not recommended for approval.

ITEM 8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

Stays In Introductory Class

46. Mr Rutter wished to draw the attention of the Council to the apparent ambiguity in G Regulations relating to stays in the Introductory class. Regulation G(A)5.c. stated that 'Handlers will not be penalised for encouragement or extra commands in all exercises.' However, in the explanatory notes there was no reference to any exception for the Introductory class in respect of further commands or signals after the 'Last Command' had been given.
47. The Council was therefore requested to consider whether it wished to recommend an amendment to Regulations in order to allow encouragement or extra commands to be permitted during stays in the Introductory class.
48. The Council's view was that extra commands or signals in the stay ring, in any class, had the potential to be intimidating to other dogs in the ring at the time. Handlers would be away from their dogs and the calling out of extra commands would be unhelpful and undesirable. Dogs could be in either a sit or down position during stays in the Introductory class and it could be confusing for them if extra commands were being given by other handlers. It was also considered that newer competitors should be encouraged to behave in a way which did not have an adverse effect on other handlers, and that not allowing extra commands in the stay ring would help to educate new competitors how to handle their dogs quietly.
49. The Council had already expressed its view that Regulations relating to the stay ring should be applicable all classes (paragraphs 33-34 refer) and it had recommended for approval an amendment to Regulation G(C)4.h. to that effect. It was accordingly agreed that a consequential amendment was necessary to Regulation G(A)5.c. to ensure consistency, and following a proposal from Mr Kousourou which was seconded by Mrs Turner, and after a vote, the Council **recommended** for approval the following amendment:

Regulation G(A)5.c

TO:

Handlers will not be penalised for encouragement or extra commands in all exercises **except stays**.
(Insertion in bold.)

Draws for Championship Classes

50. Mr Rutter wished to raise the issue of the way in which draws for Championship classes were conducted, with particular reference to the issue of handlers with multiple dogs being drawn consecutively.
51. It was confirmed that, at present, the office received details of entrants in merit point order. The name of the owner or handler was not considered as part of this process.
52. The Council considered whether the office should be given guidelines as to how to proceed should one owner be drawn consecutively, however, it was of the view that it would not be possible to legislate for every eventuality and that the office could not be expected to anticipate and allow for issues which may arise on the day of the show. It was accepted that only a relatively small number of handlers were affected by such issues. It was agreed that the existing process for conducting Championship draws should remain unchanged, in the interests of simplicity and transparency.
53. It was accepted that problems did arise where one owner had two dogs drawn consecutively and the Council considered how best to deal with such a situation. Under such circumstances, it was customary for the judge to take a short break in between the two dogs, but this was not possible during the early stages of the running order.
54. It was anticipated that in many cases, judges would use their own experience and discretion to resolve issues. However it was highlighted that Regulation G30.f.(7) stated that: 'The Chief Steward may, in exceptional circumstances, relax the running order. All such decisions must be recorded in the Show's Kennel Club Incident Book.' There was no Regulation which prevented the relaxation of the running order in Championship classes and the Council agreed that where there was an issue with the running order, the Chief Steward may make an appropriate change to it, in consultation with the judge. It was emphasised that this should only take place on the day should an issue arise, and that the Chief Steward should not make pre-emptive changes to the running order. Any changes made must be noted in the Incident Book.
55. It was noted that it may be necessary in future to make an amendment to Regulation G30.f.(7) in order to specify that the decision to relax the running order must be made in consultation with the judge, as detailed in Regulation G(E)2.g.
56. It was emphasised that the role of the Chief Steward was an important one. The Council wished to highlight the requirements of Regulation G(E)1.a. which stipulated that a Chief Steward should have at least eight years of competitive Obedience experience, a sound knowledge of the Kennel Club Rules and G Regulations, and a familiarity with the Kennel Club complaints procedure.

ITEM 9. ACTIVITIES HEALTH & WELFARE SUB-GROUP

57. The Council noted the written report, which had been prepared by the office, on the recent work of the Activities Health and Welfare Sub-Group.
58. The Council noted that the next meeting of the Sub-Group would take place on 2 September 2015.

ITEM 10. JUDGES WORKING PARTY

59. The Council noted a written report from Mr Page on the Judges Working Party following its meeting on 28 April 2015.

ITEM 11. OBEDIENCE INFORMATION STAND AT CRUFTS

60. The Council received a report from Miss Benoist and Mrs Lavender regarding the Obedience Information Stand at Crufts.
61. There had been a great deal of interest from visitors and a number of leaflets had been taken. It was noted that it would be helpful in future to have more display boards relating to the Good Citizen Scheme and to the YKC. Visitors had been encouraged to ask questions and to find out more about Obedience and the reaction had been highly positive.
62. Miss Benoist and Mrs Lavender confirmed that they were happy to organise the stand again in 2016 but beyond that it was hoped that other individuals would come forward to take over.
63. Miss Benoist and Mrs Lavender were thanked for their efforts which had been most productive.

ITEM 12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Multi-choice Class

64. A query was raised as to whether any shows had scheduled a Multi-Choice class. Those present were not aware of any such classes having been scheduled.

Stay information

65. The Council noted that, as agreed at its meeting in January 2015, Mr Rutter was collating information regarding dogs breaking down stays in class C after the 5 minute mark. It was confirmed that information should be provided to Mr Rutter rather than to the office.
66. Mr Rutter would also like to receive information in respect of incidents occurring in or around the stay ring and all competitors and judges were encouraged to report such incidents to him.

67. It was accepted that often only anecdotal information was available regarding incidents, as many people were reluctant to make formal reports in a show's Incident Book. It was highlighted that the Kennel Club would not follow up an incident noted in the Incident Book if it had been resolved on the day, unless it was considered to be serious or relating to a number of incidents involving the same dog.

Clashes of shows

68. A concern was raised regarding competing shows being held on the same weekend but a short distance apart. As a result, the entries for both shows would suffer. Show secretaries were reminded that when submitting dates to the Kennel Club, objections should be made to any other shows which could potentially be seen as competitive.
69. A suggestion was raised that it should be permissible to hold two shows on the same day and at the same venue if a partnership was agreed between two clubs. Each show would be separately licensed by the Kennel Club. There would be potential benefits to both clubs under such circumstances, and to competitors.
70. It was agreed that the office would make further investigations as to whether this would be possible.

Overseas judges

71. It was confirmed by the office that all judges officiating at shows in the UK must fulfil the Kennel Club's qualification criteria.

Training rounds

72. A query was raised as to whether a competitor may specify on their entry form that they wished to do a training round but still be included in the running order. It was noted that there would be no objection to this subject to the agreement of the judge who had discretion as to whether or not to allow training rounds. With this proviso, it was up to show organisers as to whether they wished to accommodate such requests received from competitors.

Bitches in season at Obedience shows

73. The Council noted with concern that it appeared that bitches in season were being taken to shows, and wished to draw the attention of all competitors to Regulation G10 Removal of Dogs, which stated that 'Following discussion between the Chief Steward and the show management and/or a veterinary surgeon, a dog shall be prevented from competing and/or removed from the Show if it is... A bitch which is in season.'

Mr Rutter

The Chairman wished to record his thanks for all the support he had received from Council members since his election as Chairman of the Council.

Mr Page

75. It was noted that this would be Mr Page's last Council meeting after 30 years service. Mr Page was thanked for all his hard work on behalf of the Council. He would be much missed.

ITEM 13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

76. The date of the next meeting of the Council would be confirmed in September 2015.

77. There being no further business, the meeting closed at 13.30 p.m.

S RUTTER
Chairman

THE KENNEL CLUB'S STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

“To raise the relevance of the Kennel Club in the eyes of the public at large, dog owners and those who take part in canine events, so as to be better able ‘to promote in every way the general improvement of dogs.’ This objective to be achieved through:-

- Ensuring that the Kennel Club is the first port of call on all canine matters.
- Improving canine health and welfare.
- Popularising canine events focusing on the retention of existing participants and the attracting of new.
- Achieving a widening of the Kennel Club membership base.
- Encouraging the development of all those concerned with dogs through education and training.
- Encouraging more people to provide input in the Kennel Club's decision making process.ou8yuuuuuuuuuu

Kennel Club Obedience Liaison Council Representatives

1 January 2013 to 31 December 2015

Midlands, Ms B Smith, 99 Highfields Road,
Chasetown, Staffs, WS7 4QS, Tel: 01543 674238,
Email: beverley.j.smith@bt.com

Midlands, Mr R Page, 2 The Glade, Shoal Hill,
Cannock, Staffs, WS11 1JH, Tel: 01543 505820,
Email:
shelaghandroy@showprinting.freemove.co.uk

Midlands, Mrs M Ray, 13 Helmdon Close, Rugby,
Warks, CV21 1RS, Tel: 01788 561253,
Email: draped@aol.com

North East, Miss A Benoist, 43 Canterbury Way
Wideopen, Newcastle upon Tyne NE13 6JH, Tel:
07702 469743, Email: girlsplusone@yahoo.com

North East, Mrs D Lavender, 63 Weetshaw Close,
Shafton, Nr Barnsley, S72 8PZ, Tel: 01226
715980, Email: debralavender60@yahoo.co.uk

North West, Mr S Rutter, Galgate, 80 Long Lane,
Orford, Warrington, Cheshire, WA2 8PX, Tel:
01925 656175, Email: steve.rutter@tiscali.co.uk

North West, Mrs A Height
Tel: 01942 867010, email annpete2@sky.com

Northern Ireland, Mr M McCartney, Glen-Craig,
28 Moneybroom Road, Lisburn, Co. Antrim, BT28
2QP, Tel: 028 9262 2992,
Email: glencraigdogs@hotmail.com

Scotland, Mr A Kousourou, Actim, 8 Powburn
Crescent, Kylepark, Uddingston, S Lanarkshire,
G71 7SS Tel: 01698 813817,
Email: andrew.kousourou@virginmedia.com

Scotland, Mr J McIntosh, 45 Shawstonfoot Road,
Bellside, Cleland, Lanarkshire ML1 5NY, Tel:
01698 860358
Email: macintosh-james@hotmail.co.uk

South & South West, Mrs S Henstridge, 104 The
Crescent, Andover, Hampshire, SP10 3BN, Tel:
01264 360257, Email: stellazhivi@aol.com

South & South West, Mrs L Turner, The
Bungalow, 25 Sandys Close, Basingstoke, RG22
6AR Tel: 01256 816388
Email: lillian.doghouse25@btinternet.com

South East & East Anglia, Mr R Harlow,
Starhaven, Sundridge Road, Chevening,
Sevenoaks, Kent TN14 6HB, Tel: 01732 462216,
Email: rharlow@btconnect.com

South East & East Anglia, Mr P Lubbi, Layash,
2 Celia Crescent, Ashford, Middlesex, TW15
3NW, Tel: 01784 258334,
Email: layash2@aol.com

South East & East Anglia, Miss F Godfrey, 25
Kevington Drive, Orpington, Kent, BR5 2NT
Tel: 01689 876112
Email: fran.godfrey@uk.pwc.com

Wales, Mr D Garrett, 69 Blaendare Road,
Pontypool, Gwent, NP4 5RU, Tel: 01633 875404,
Email: davejgarrett@aol.com

Wales, Mrs J Jessop, Broad Eaves, Chepstow
Road, Langstone, Newport, Gwent, NP18 2JP,
Tel: 01633 411449,
Email: jenniferjessop@aol.com