

**MINUTES OF THE WORKING TRIALS LIAISON COUNCIL MEETING HELD
ON WEDNESDAY 26 APRIL 2017 AT 10.30 AM IN THE BOARDROOM,
THE KENNEL CLUB, CLARGES STREET**

PRESENT

Mrs F Ball	Iceni Dog Training Club
Miss R Cahill	Welsh Kennel Club
Mr E Carpenter	Essex Working Trials Society
Miss J Carruthers	North East Counties Working Trials Society
Mr B Gilbert	ASPADS Working Trials Society
Mr N Hines	Lincolnshire German Shepherd Dog & All Breeds Training Society
Mrs J Holt	North West Working Trials Society
Mrs J Howells	Hampshire Working Trials Society
Mr M Lewindon	Surrey Dog Training Society
Mr G Martin	East Anglian Working Trials Training Society
Mr R Musgrave	Yorkshire Working Trials Society
Mrs L Priestley	The Bloodhound Club
Mr B Riste	Wessex Working Trials Club
Mr D Robertson	Association of Bloodhound Breeders
Mr B Russell	Scottish Kennel Club
Mr G Talbot	Midland Counties German Shepherd Dog Association
Mrs S Tannert	British Association for German Shepherd Dogs
Mrs F Webb	Southern Alsatian Training Society
Mr J Wykes	Leamington Dog Training Club
Mr S Ford	(Guest)

IN ATTENDANCE

Miss D Deuchar	Senior Manager - Canine Activities Governance
Miss R Mansfield	Officer - Working Dog Activities Team
Mrs A Mitchell	Senior Committee Secretary - Working Dog Activities Team

IN THE CHAIR

MR B GILBERT

ITEM 1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1. Apologies were received from Mrs V Thomson.

ITEM 2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

2. Paragraph 85 of the minutes of the meeting held on 27 April 2016 (copies previously distributed) was amended to read as follows:

‘The Bloodhound Trial Regulations and Judging Procedure seminar presentation had been reviewed to reflect the current practice of running the practical session in the morning and the Rules and Regulations presentation seminar, followed by the paper, during the afternoon.’

3. Subject to the above amendment, the minutes were approved.

ITEM 3. MATTERS ARISING/RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Attracting new competitors and increasing entries

4. At its previous meeting the Council had agreed that there should be further discussion regarding ways in which new competitors could be attracted into the discipline and how entries could be increased.
5. The Council noted the information obtained by Mr Gilbert from Mr M Skillin, the Editor of Working Trials Monthly, which indicated that there were currently approximately 300 active triallists. It also considered concerns raised by Mrs L Cottier in respect of reducing entry numbers and the lack of newcomers to the discipline.
6. The Council was in agreement that numbers of participants were decreasing and that some trials were attracting very low entries. In particular it was acknowledged that Introductory and CD Open Stakes did not appear to be drawing good entries and of those competitors who were entering in CD Open, it was unclear how many were new to the discipline.
7. It was acknowledged that competing in Working Trials was time consuming and required considerable commitment from handlers, which was problematic for those with work and family commitments. There were also practical issues in finding suitable areas to train, as some farmers were reluctant to allow dogs on their land. However, the Council agreed that it was necessary to continually review ways in which to attract new competitors to the discipline.
8. Special stakes appeared to be attracting good entries but again it was unclear whether these were from new competitors or existing ones. However it was accepted that stakes without jumps were helpful in attracting competitors as they allowed younger dogs to participate.
9. It was acknowledged that newer competitors were reluctant to travel long distances in order to compete, and also that there was a wide range of other disciplines such as agility and rally open to them. It was necessary

for clubs to offer attractive events within Working Trials, and the Council considered ways in which this could be achieved.

10. It was noted that many competitors particularly enjoyed nosework and tracking, and that special stakes which included these exercises but excluded jumps and stays appeared to be popular. It was highlighted that the UK Tracking Dog Association had approached the Kennel Club to request that tracking assessments be carried out under the auspices of the Kennel Club. The matter was still under consideration and the Council would be advised of the outcome in due course.
11. It was suggested that demonstrations of Working Trials be held at events which attracted the general public, such as 'All About Dogs', as such promotional activity would draw the attention of a wide range of dog owners who may be potential competitors.
12. A further suggestion was that clubs provide 'taster' training days to attract dog owners and to encourage them to consider taking part in working trials.
13. A concern was expressed that competing at a working trial for the first time could be quite daunting. It was therefore essential for new competitors to be welcomed, and for the transition from training to competing to be made as easy as possible. Some new competitors, having entered their first competition found it to be an overwhelming experience and did not wish to repeat it. In particular, the role of judges was emphasised, noting that a kind and sympathetic judge was a crucial part of the process of encouraging new competitors to continue to take part.
14. All Council representatives were requested to gather information from entries into special stakes as to what percentage of those entering were new to the discipline. It was accepted that such statistics would not be completely accurate as it was not always possible to clearly identify 'new' competitors but they would provide a helpful indication of whether special stakes were attracting new competitors.
15. It was agreed that the issue of attracting new competitors would remain under constant review.

Young Kennel Club

16. At the Council's previous meeting it was highlighted that new members joining the Young Kennel Club (YKC) did not receive information regarding working trials in their Welcome Pack.
17. The Council was pleased to note that the YKC department had indicated its willingness to publicise any young handlers' days or events on its website and on social media. Details of any such events should be sent to the office at ykc@thekennelclub.org.uk

18. In addition, the Working Trials Beginners Guide had been added to the information contained on the new memory stick available to YKC members.

Use of electric collars and pinch/prong collars

19. At its previous meeting, the Council had discussed the use of the above devices and whether in the interests of welfare, all societies should be required by the Kennel Club to ban the use of electric collars and pinch/prong collars at all club events and training, and rules regarding their use written into the constitution of all societies.
20. The Council considered a proposal formulated by Mr Martin, under the terms of which the use of pinch collars, electric/remote collars, or prong collars would not be permitted at any event licensed by the Kennel Club. It was also proposed that a rule to that effect should be included in the constitution of societies registered with, or affiliated to, the Kennel Club.
21. The proposal was seconded by Mr Musgrave.
22. Mr Martin was of the view that the Kennel Club should take a strong stance on the use of any methods of training seen to be aversive in nature, especially where evidence indicated that the use of devices such as electric collars or pinch and prong collars was detrimental to dogs.
23. However, whilst it was accepted that such evidence may exist, it was noted that it had not been placed before the Council and therefore could not be considered as part of the discussion.
24. A query was also raised as to whether the proposal, which would apply to all Kennel Club disciplines, was outside the remit of the Council. A discussion took place as to how best to address the issue and it was agreed that a revised proposal should be considered which would only apply to Working Trials.
25. The Council considered the use of pinch and prong collars, and whether their use was acceptable. It was noted that experienced handlers in some disciplines used such collars as a training aid in appropriate circumstances and considered them to be a useful tool. However, some representatives were of the view that the use of such collars should have no place in modern methods of training.
26. Noting that legislation regarding the use of electric shock collars had come into effect in Wales in 2010, the Council wished to strongly encourage the Kennel Club to consider the banning of the use of electric collars at all events licensed by the Kennel Club, and, further, to press for similar legislation to be implemented in other parts of the UK.
27. It was noted that clubs were free to include provisions within their constitution regarding the use of pinch collars, electronic shock collars, or prong collars should they wish to do so.

28. After a lengthy discussion, a revised proposal was made by Mr Martin and seconded by Mr Musgrave, as follows:

Regulation 12. Welfare of Dogs

TO:

An exhibitor (or competitor) whose dog is entered at a Kennel Club licensed event should take all reasonable steps to ensure the needs of their dog(s) are met, and should not knowingly put their dogs' health and welfare at risk by any action, default, omission or otherwise. A breach of this Regulation may be referred to the Board for disciplinary action under Kennel Club Rules and Regulations. **The use of pinch collars, electronic shock collars, or prong collars, is not permitted at any Working Trials event licensed by the Kennel Club, or at Working Trials training events held by Kennel Club Registered or Affiliated Societies. This shall apply at the venue or within the precincts of the Trial.**

(Insertion in bold)

A vote took place and, by a majority, the proposal was **recommended** for approval.

Gun tests

29. The Activities Committee, at its meeting on 23 June 2016, noted the Council's suggested guidance for the office regarding a course of action to be implemented where the use of guns was no longer permitted due to legislation. It had requested clarification from the Council regarding the Test of Courage and how this would be affected under these circumstances.
30. The Council noted that the use of a gun was not necessary as part of the Test of Courage and that, accordingly, should legislation be introduced which did not permit the use of guns, there would be no effect on the Test of Courage.

Emblehope Estate

31. The Council noted that the Bloodhound Club had held its Championship Working Trial on the estate 25-29 February 2017. Despite wet conditions, the trial had been very successful. It was noted particularly that the farmer had been very helpful and accommodating.
32. It was noted that a keeper had been appointed and had now commenced his duties. Pheasant and partridge would be brought in during the summer and shooting on the estate would commence in early autumn 2017. Bookings may be made via the office in conjunction with the keeper. It was confirmed that the estate would be open for use for Working Trials, and it was anticipated that it would be a good asset for societies wishing to hold trials there.
33. Provision of further facilities was in hand.

ITEM 4. KENNEL CLUB ACCREDITATION SCHEME FOR INSTRUCTORS

34. The Council received a presentation from Mrs Carney which gave a brief overview of the Kennel Club Accreditation Scheme for Instructors.
35. The purpose of the Scheme was to provide a means for the public to identify competent and experienced dog training instructors to enable them to make informed choices in their selection of instructors. This was achieved via KCAI Scheme membership where dog training instructors and canine behaviourists may gain accreditation as evidence of their knowledge, skills and experience as instructors.
36. The Scheme was UK-wide and was aimed at dog training instructors and canine behaviourists across a wide range of canine disciplines. It offered its members the opportunity to gain a nationally recognised, vocational accreditation award, based on standards set by the Kennel Club, and certificated by City & Guilds.
37. Applicants were required to successfully complete nine online assessments to demonstrate knowledge and understanding in key canine-related topics, after which an application for accreditation may be submitted. A practical and oral assessment was then conducted, feedback given to the applicant, and a recommendation made to the KCAI Board by the Assessor, after which the applicant would be notified of the outcome.
38. Mrs Carney was thanked for her presentation which had been very informative.

ITEM 5. PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES/PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

Southern Alsatian Training Society
Proposed amendment to Regulation I(C)4

39. Mrs Webb, on behalf of Southern Alsatian Training Society wished to propose an amendment to the above Regulation whereby at Open Trials, where a mix of stakes was judged by a single control judge, the down stay would be judged in two groups. The objective of the proposal was to ensure that more experienced dogs would not be disturbed by those with less experience which may be more likely to break stays.
40. It was highlighted that Trials Managers were free to specify that stays should be carried out separately and that a Regulation amendment was not necessary in order for them to do so. Alternatively stays may be carried out together but ensuring that the two groups were at a distance from each other to minimise any risk of disturbance. The Council was of the view that a Regulation amendment may prove to be restrictive and

that it was preferable for organisers to make such arrangements as they considered to be appropriate.

41. No seconder for the proposal was available and no further discussion took place.

ASPADS Working Trials Society
Proposed amendment to Regulation I(A)9.d

42. ASPADS Working Trials Society, represented by Mr Gilbert, proposed an amendment in the above Regulation in order to correct a mathematical error. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Holt.
43. However, the Council was not of the view that any amendment was necessary. A vote took place and, by a majority, the amendment was not recommended for approval.

ASPADS Working Trials Society
Proposed amendment to Regulation I18.b

44. Mr Gilbert, on behalf of ASPADS Working Trials Society proposed an amendment to the above Regulation in order to bring Championship Trial qualifications into line with Open Trials whereby only 'Excellent' certificates would be presented at Championship Trials.
45. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Holt.
46. Concerns were raised that some competitors may be discouraged if they were not eligible to receive an 'Excellent' certificate, as this represented a significant achievement even where it did not count towards progression.
47. A vote took place, and by a majority, the proposal was not recommended for approval,

North East Counties Working Trials Society
Proposed amendment to Regulation I(C)1.

48. Mrs Carruthers, on behalf of North East Counties Working Trials Society, proposed the following amendment:

Regulation I(C)1. Description of exercises & guidance for judges

TO:

Method of Handling.

Although implicit obedience to all orders is necessary, dogs and handlers must operate in as free and natural a manner as possible; persistent barking, whining, etc. in any exercise other than location of articles, person or speak on command should be penalised. ~~Food must not be given to the dog by the handler whilst being tested.~~ **The handler must not have food or a toy on their person whilst the dog is being tested.**

49. The proposal was seconded by Mrs Tannert.

50. The Society wished to highlight that the current Regulation stated that food must not be given to the dog by the handler whilst being tested, but it was of the view that should a handler have food or a toy on their person whilst the dog was working, the dog was not being adequately tested. For purposes of clarity, and to ensure that dogs were properly tested, it therefore wished to propose the amendment in order to state that handlers must not carry food or toys whilst under test. It considered that newer judges in particular would benefit from the clarification.
51. There were some concerns regarding the practicality of enforcing such a Regulation, but it was accepted that judges were free to ask competitors whether they were carrying food or a toy. There was also some difficulty in defining a toy, noting that competitors may use items such as a lead or a glove as a toy. However, it was accepted that judges had discretion to remove marks should it be considered appropriate to do so.
52. A vote took place and, by a majority, the proposal was **recommended** for approval.

Ms J Hall

Proposed Amendment to Regulation I.26.b

53. Ms Hall, represented by Mrs Carruthers, wished to propose an amendment to Regulation I.26.b Judging which would allow judges at working trials to enter a dog which was recorded in their ownership or part ownership; or to handle a dog at a trial at which they were judging.
54. Ms Hall was of the view that judges were being discouraged from accepting appointments due to not being allowed to compete, and that there were enough witnesses at a Trial to ensure that marking was both fair and appropriate.
55. The proposal was seconded by Mr Musgrave.
56. It was noted that in most other Activities disciplines, judges were not allowed to both judge and compete at one event covered under a single licence, although it was highlighted that judges at Bloodhound Working Trials may enter a dog provided that they did not enter the Stake that they were judging.
57. It was acknowledged that it may be advantageous for judges if they were permitted to compete and judge at the same event, however, the Council was of the view that the perception of fairness was very important and that an individual judging and competing at the same trial may be open to allegations of unfairness.
58. It was suggested that a judge may be permitted to compete only after completion of their judging appointment, which would to some extent remove the perception of unfairness, but a concern was raised as to the potential difficulties involved in making practical arrangements, such as

timings, to accommodate the wishes of judges under these circumstances.

59. A vote took place and, by a majority, the proposal was not recommended for approval.

Yorkshire Working Trials Society

Proposal for a new Regulation regarding protective equipment

60. Mr Musgrave, speaking on behalf of Yorkshire Working Trials Society, wished to propose the introduction of the following new Regulation:

Insert New Regulation I(C)18:

Protective Equipment - For all exercises where the dog is expected to bite, protected stewards should wear a single-arm protective sleeve on the right arm. The sleeve should be clear and obvious to the dog and handler. Covert sleeves, bite jackets and bite suits must not be used unless, for a location exercise, the judge deems it necessary to ensure the safety of the protected steward.

(Insertions in bold. Subsequent paragraphs to be renumbered.)

61. The proposal, made in the belief that it reflected the views of many competitors, suggested that judges should set tests using only protected stewards with single-arm sleeves as the use of bite jackets and bite suits was more appropriate to 'civil' bite work. The Society considered that there may be a risk of dogs trained on such equipment biting in inappropriate circumstances.
62. There was some discussion as to whether there was any risk that dogs trained on such equipment may be more likely to bite inappropriately, with a range of views being expressed.
63. It was also acknowledged by the Council that it was important to ensure that protected stewards were provided adequate protection from any risk of injury, although there was no evidence to suggest instances of dogs biting anywhere other than on a protected sleeve.
64. There were mixed views on the proposal, with some representatives considering that it removed the discretion of judges to use bite suits if they wished to do so, and was therefore not a desirable step. Others were of the view that the use of bite suits was not appropriate under most circumstances at Working Trials.
65. A vote took place, and by a majority, the proposal was **recommended** for approval.

Yorkshire Working Trials Society

Proposed amendment to Regulation I(C)15

66. The following proposal to amend Regulation I(C)15 was presented by Mr Musgrave:

Regulation I(C)15

TO:

15. Search and Escort.—The “protected steward” will be searched by the handler with the dog off the lead at the sit, stand or down. The Judge will assess whether the dog is well placed tactically and ready to defend if called to do so. The handler will be told to escort the “protected steward” at least 27.432m (30 yds) in a given direction, he will give at least one turn on the direction of the Judge. During the exercise the “protected steward” will turn and attempt to overpower the handler. The dog may defend spontaneously or on command and must release the “protected steward” at once, ~~both where he stands still and~~ when the handler calls him off.

(Deletion struck through)

67. The Society considered that the proposed amendment would bring the rules into line with current custom and practice, noting that at present judges did not penalise dogs that retained their hold of a passive protected steward until called off.
68. A vote took place, and, by a majority, the proposal was **recommended** for approval.

ITEM 6. DISCUSSION ITEMSMrs A ColesHealth effects of Working Trials jumps

69. Mrs Coles, represented by Mr Russell, wished the Council to discuss concerns expressed by some owners in respect of the style and height of the jumps in Working Trials. She was of the view that such concerns were preventing some potential competitors from taking part in Working Trials who would otherwise enjoy participating in the discipline and entering competitions.
70. The Council noted Mrs Coles’ concerns regarding possible health issues, particularly in respect of dogs which developed arthritis later in life, but considered that there was no evidence to suggest that such conditions arose as a result of dogs jumping, or taking part in any activity.
71. However, the issue of jumps would be considered later in the meeting.

ITEM 7. FIVE YEAR STRATEGY

72. The Council noted the Five Year Strategy document, which was provided as a basis for ongoing future discussion.

Developing options to attract new people into working trials at the lowest levels

73. This issue had been discussed earlier in the meeting (paragraphs 4 - 15 refer).

Raising awareness about the availability of training for working trials

74. The Council was concerned to note that it appeared that new owners of registered dogs received only minimal information regarding Working Trials, with the discipline not being referred to at all in a list of activities published within the booklet issued to such people. The office agreed to investigate.

Consider options for standardising test levels and judging standards

75. Whilst it was accepted that standards should be applied, it was agreed that caution was necessary in being too prescriptive as it was important that judges were able to retain discretion as to how they set and judged tests in order to maintain individuality.

ITEM 8. JUDGES WORKING PARTY

76. The Council noted a report from Mr Gilbert on the progress of the Judges Working Party since the Council's last meeting on 27 April 2016.
77. It was noted that fewer working trials seminars were taking place as the majority of working trials judges had already attended.
78. All disciplines were currently in the process of considering content to be placed on the Kennel Club Academy website.
79. Consideration was being given as to content relating to working trials. This would include the production of a video which would feature details of a tracking exercise together with video clips of the other exercises. Other information would be available on all aspects of judging and how a judge should prepare for judging a working trial. A significant amount of work was required but when complete, it was anticipated that the video would be a very useful learning resource for candidates attending a classroom-based judging seminar and would also be used as discussion items during the practical judging sessions.

ITEM 9. ACTIVITIES HEALTH AND WELFARE SUB-GROUP

80. The Council considered the possibility of a number of dogs being filmed whilst jumping, and for detailed analysis of footage to be carried out by Nottingham Trent University. It was keen to take advantage of the opportunity for research, but accepted that it was necessary to frame a specific objective.

81. A discussion took place regarding whether such research could examine the factors which combined to make a successful jump. These could include the dog's position relative to the jump, its position on take off and landing and how this changed when the height or length of the jump was altered. Take-off and landing forces would also be of interest. The effects of conformational issues such as the breed of dog, its size and shape, and its fitness levels could also be considered.
82. However, it was acknowledged that the above issues were too wide-ranging and it would be necessary to define a more specific research objective.
83. It was noted that there was some perception that dogs jumping may be injurious to their health, and it was agreed that this would be a highly suitable area for research as it would provide factual evidence on which to base future decisions. Accordingly it was agreed that research should be based on a comparison of dogs jumping a 5 foot scale versus a 6 foot scale; and an 8 foot long jump versus a 9 foot long jump. A further suggested area for research was that of impact forces acting upon a dog when landing, but it was anticipated that the analysis of results from the proposed research into dogs jumping the scale and the long jump would also provide further information on this issue.

ITEM 10. KENNEL CLUB WORKING TRIAL CHAMPIONSHIPS

Hosts for 2021 Kennel Club Working Trial Championships

84. The Council recommended for approval an application from Yorkshire Working Trials Society to host the 2021 Kennel Club Championships.

The following host societies had previously been approved:

2018: North West Working Trials Society

2019: ASPADS Working Trials Society

2020: Surrey Dog Training Society

85. Offers from clubs wishing to host the 2022 Kennel Club Championships would also be welcomed and should be directed to the office at workingtrials@thekennelclub.org.uk

Ballot for Judges for the 2020 Kennel Club Working Trial Championships

86. A ballot was conducted to determine the Council's nomination of judges for the 2020 Kennel Club Working Trials Championships.

Judges

87. Judges for 2017 and 2018 were as follows:

2017

TD – Mrs L Newbold

PD – Mr G Martin

2018

TD – Mr R Musgrave

PD – Miss T Park

88. The Council noted that the following judges had been appointed for the 2019 Working Trial Championships:

TD - Mr G Martin

PD - Ms L Cottier

Lock out at the Patrol Dog Stake at the Kennel Club Championships

89. The Activities Committee wished to seek the views of the Council regarding where the judge of the Patrol Dog Stake at the Championships required a lock out prior to the Patrol round.
90. The Committee was of the view that in view of the considerable number of spectators who attended the Championships each year, it was highly desirable for them to be aware of what was expected of the competitors during the test.
91. However, it raised issues regarding security as it was important that details of the test were not relayed to the competitors. It was suggested that this issue could be simply dealt with by means of an official remaining with the competitors at all times during the lock out to ensure that there was no contact with anyone else at the trial, either in person or via the use of a mobile phone.
92. Subject to suitable security arrangements being in place, the Council was in full agreement with the Committee's view that judges should notify officials of the details of the test so that spectators could be given a brief overview.

ITEM 11. REFUSAL OF ENTRIES

93. In response to queries received by the office, the Council noted that Regulation 124(f) stated that the Committee of a society may reserve to themselves the right to refuse any entries, and that Regulation 121.c(15) required that the schedule must contain a statement to that effect.
94. It also noted the following advice issued by the Kennel Club in respect of the right of Societies to refuse entries to Kennel Club Licensed Events.

GENERAL ADVICE ON THE EXERCISE OF THE RIGHT OF SOCIETIES TO REFUSE ENTRIES TO KENNEL CLUB LICENSED EVENTS

INTRODUCTION

Under Kennel Club Regulations, all societies running licensed events are required to expressly reserve the right to refuse entries in the schedules to their events.

However, the right must be applied in a fair, reasoned and unbiased manner.

PROCEDURE

Should a committee wish to refuse an entry to an event, the following procedure should be followed;

1. The matter must be included on the agenda for a committee meeting.
2. At that meeting, the committee should fully consider the matter and decide whether or not to accept the entry, and discuss how long to maintain any refusal.
3. The decision and salient points of discussion should be minuted.
4. The exhibitor or competitor should be informed of the decision.

The refusal should not be indefinite or open ended, but stated to be for a particular event, or series of events or for a fixed period of time. The right should not be used as a substitute for expulsion from the club, which requires the prescribed procedure to be adopted. The right should be for a proportionate period of time and a club should always be open to the prospect of a review of any refusal.

GROUNDINGS

Used legitimately, this right is a very effective and practical tool for societies. It should, however, be used sparingly and fairly. Usual grounds for refusal are to bar entry to a known disruptive person, or where there is a serial non-payer of entry fees. The reason for the refusal should have some bearing and connection with attendance at the show, such as anti-social behaviour and/or non payers. The right should not be used in furtherance of a personal grievance, or to artificially manipulate the competition entry or for any other non-genuine purpose.

A competitor has a reasonable expectation that his/her entry will be accepted therefore he/she may well seek to complain if the right to refuse is applied for what appears to be an arbitrary reason totally unconnected with his/her attendance at the event.

If the right is not applied in a fair, even handed and consistent manner then this will undermine the right, if not possibly prejudice the use of the right for everyone else in the future. Societies should be mindful that a practical consequence may be a legal challenge to the exercise of the right, which could involve needless legal costs in then trying to justify a decision.

In view of this, societies are urged to follow the above procedure carefully. Subject to the above the committee of the society is not required to disclose reasons for refusing an entry to the individual concerned.

Whilst reasons do not generally need to be disclosed, it should be understood that if there is a challenge to the application of the right to refuse then the reasons may need to be disclosed, and the committee will then need to be comfortable and confident that, should it be required to disclose the grounds for refusal, it would feel able to explain and justify the decision made.

Over and above this, the right to refuse should obviously never be based upon any form of overt discrimination, nor personal issues, nor for events or disputes long since passed.

APPEAL AND REVIEW

A society should remain open and willing to review any decisions on refusal of entries and take on board any representations made by the individual, including apologies and explanations in mitigation.

95. It was acknowledged that there may be cases which require Kennel Club intervention where there were complaints against decisions to refuse entries. Under these circumstances, the Kennel Club would request sight of the committee minutes at which the matter had been discussed and may ask the society to review the decision.

ITEM 12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

96. No matters were raised under Any Other Business.

ITEM 13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

97. The date of the next meeting would be confirmed in September 2017.

The meeting closed at 4.10 pm

MR B GILBERT
Chairman

THE KENNEL CLUB'S MISSION STATEMENT

'The Kennel Club is the national body which exists to promote the general improvement, health and well-being of all dogs through responsible breeding and ownership'