



**MEETING OF THE FIELD TRIALS LIAISON COUNCIL HELD ON THURSDAY  
1 MAY 2025 AT 10.30 AM VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS**

**M I N U T E S**

Mrs M Asbury	Scottish Field Trials Association
	Dukeries (Notts) Gundog Club
Mr J Bailey	Guildford Working Gundog Club
	Herts, Beds, Bucks, Berks & Hants Retriever Society
	South Eastern Gundog Society
Mr G Bird	Golden Retriever Club
	Yellow Labrador Club
	Labrador Club of Wales
Ms C Bridgwater	Essex Field Trials Society
	Meon Valley Working Spaniel Club
	Kintbury Gundog Club
Miss C Calvert	Northern Ireland Pointer Club
	Ulster Irish Red Setter Club
Mr M Canham	North of Scotland Gundog Association
	Lothian & Borders Gundog Association
Ms C Carpenter	Bristol & West Working Gundog Society
	Weimaraner Club of Great Britain
	Wiltshire Working Gundog Society
Mrs M Cox	West of England Labrador Retriever Club
	Cornwall Field Trial Society
	North Devon Working Gundog Club
	Coventry & District Gundog Society
Mr N Doran	Ulster Gundog League
	Craigavon Gundog Club
Ms H Ford	Flatcoated Retriever Society
	South Western Golden Retriever Club
Mr R Gould	Gordon Setter Field Trial Society
	Southern Pointer Club
Mr D Hall	The Pointer Club
	Strabane and District Field Trial Society
Mrs M Halliday	Mid Herts Gundog Club

Mr J Henderson	Gordon Setter Association
	Scottish Gundog Association
	Tay Valley Gundog Association
	Strathmore Working Gundog Club
Miss J Hurley	Hungarian Vizsla Society
	German Shorthaired Pointer Association
Mrs S Jenkins	West Dartmoor Working Gundog Club
	Westward Gundog Society
Mrs A Johnson	Norfolk & Suffolk HPR Field Trial Club
	Italian Spinone Club of Great Britain
Mr R Johnston	Ulster Retriever Club
	Labrador Retriever Club of Northern Ireland
Mr S Kimberley	German Wirehaired Pointer Club
	Worcestershire Gundog Club
	German Longhaired Pointer club
	Large Munsterlander Club
Mr R Major	Brittany Club of Great Britain
	Usk Valley Working Gundog Club
Mr S McGrath	Dove Valley Working Gundog Club
	United Retriever Club
	Norfolk Gundog Club
	Midland Counties Field Trial Society
Ms P Pinn	Shropshire Gundog Society
	Welsh & English Counties Spaniel Club
	East Anglian Labrador Retriever Club
	Eastern Counties Retriever Society
Mrs J Reed	Utility Gundog Society
	Carmarthenshire Working Gundog Society
	Glamorganshire Field Trial Society
	East Midland Gundog Club
Mr S Richardson	Midland Gundog Society
	North Western Counties Field Trials Association
	Leconfield Working Spaniel Club
	Western Counties & South Wales Spaniel Club
Ms T Siwek	Eastern Counties Spaniel Society
	English Springer Spaniel Club of Northern Ireland
	Antrim & Down Springer Spaniel Club
	Mid-Ulster Gundog Association
Mr P Smith	Northern Ireland Working Cocker Club
	Foyle Valley Working Cocker Club
	Kent, Surrey & Sussex Labrador Retriever Club
	Hampshire Gundog Society
Mrs J Venturi-Rose	Hunt, Point & Retrieve Gundog Association
	Hungarian Wirehaired Vizsla Association
Ms R Webster	

Ms S Whyte	Midland Counties Labrador Retriever Club Lincolnshire Gundog Society Northumberland & Durham Labrador Retriever Club Yorkshire Retriever Field Trial Society
Mr N Wroe	Weimaraner Association Hungarian Vizsla Club

**ITEM 1. TO ELECT A CHAIRMAN FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM OF COUNCIL - UNTIL DECEMBER 2025**

1. The election process was conducted via email prior to the Council meeting, there were two nominations, both of which were seconded: Mr Rees and Ms Whyte. A ballot took place via email, and Ms S Whyte was elected as Chair of the Field Trials Liaison Council.

**IN THE CHAIR: MS S WHYTE**

**ITEM 2. TO ELECT COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVES TO THE FIELD TRIALS COMMITTEE FOR THE VARIOUS SUB GROUPS EFFECTIVE FROM JUNE 2025 TO MAY 2028**

2. The Council conducted its election of representatives for each of the four sub-groups to the Field Trials Committee via email prior to the meeting.
3. Ms Whyte, in her capacity as Chair of the Council, automatically became a representative on the Committee, and would represent the Retriever sub-group.
4. Two additional candidates, Mr Johnston and Mr Rees were proposed and seconded to represent the Retriever sub-group. A ballot took place via email, and Mr Johnston was duly elected.
5. Three candidates, Mr Kimberley, Mr Major and Mr Wroe were proposed and seconded to represent the HPR sub-group. A ballot took place via email, and Mr Kimberley and Mr Major were duly elected.
6. Mr Adams and Miss Siwek were proposed and seconded to represent Spaniels, and were duly elected.
7. Mr Hall and Mrs Kirk were proposed and seconded to represent Pointers and Setters, and were duly elected.

**ITEM 3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

8. Apologies were received from Mr S Adams, Mr S Capstick, Mr J Castle, Mrs C Clarke, Mr S Cullis, Ms F Joint, Mr J Kean, Mrs F Kirk, Mrs B Kuen, Miss M McNally and Mr R Proctor.

9. The following Council representatives were not in attendance: Mr K Byron, Mr M Clifford, Mr S Crookes, Mr W Megaughin, Mrs V Stanley and Mr P Turner.

**ITEM 4. TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 12 JUNE 2024**

10. The Council considered the minutes of the meeting held on the 12 June 2024.
11. The Council held a lengthy discussion over the approval of the minutes. It was highlighted that the minutes had been approved by the Chair and Vice-Chair following the meeting. It was also noted that the minutes had been considered by the Field Trial Committee, and that both the minutes and Results of Recommendations had been circulated to all Council members.
12. However, a number of the Council did not feel that the minutes were a true reflection of the meeting, and that not all the opinions had been accurately represented. It was considered that it was not possible to convey the true passion of the meeting within the minutes.
13. It was pointed out that a member of Council had resigned due to the conflict between their views of the one dog one handler issue and the minutes which were released. It was suggested that the minutes should be revised to further incorporate the opinions expressed during the meeting.
14. The protocol around recording the meeting was queried. It was noted that the Field Trials Liaison Council representatives signed a declaration stating that they would keep the contents of the meetings confidential and therefore it was not clear as to why the Chairman of the council could not have access to those recordings to verify the minutes.
15. It was noted that the meeting recordings were only to aid the office in writing the minutes.
16. The Chair of the previous meeting, Mr Richardson, confirmed that he had approved the minutes of the meeting, along with the Vice Chair, before they were issued to the council.
17. The Kennel Club Year Book stated that "The Kennel Club shall recognise liaison councils to act as advisory bodies on the matters of the immediate concern of each council." It also stated that "The Field Trials Council shall be representative of the interests of field trial societies and shall provide a channel of communication between all such societies and the Kennel Club on matters concerned with field trials." There was concern raised by the Council that this did not appear to be the case and subsequently the purpose of the minutes were queried. The office

confirmed that the minutes were not verbatim of what was said during the meeting and that they reflected the overall view of the discussion. It was confirmed that the recordings were removed once the minutes had been approved by the Chair and Vice Chair.

18. The office queried whether any of the decisions recorded on the minutes were fundamentally incorrect, as it was considered that the issue was mainly concerning the passion and feeling of the meeting that had not been reflected. The office also confirmed that the minutes were approved by the Chair and Vice Chair and then published onto the Kennel Club website and that if approval was not confirmed until the following meeting then no recommendations or actions could be considered by the Field Trials Committee.
19. However, the Council agreed that the Chair and Vice Chair approve the minutes for release and the Council as a whole approve the minutes and that recommendations should still be taken forward to the Committee for consideration. that the Chair and Vice Chair approve the minutes for release and the Council as a whole approve the minutes and that recommendations should still be taken forward to the Committee for consideration.
20. Ms Whyte proposed the minutes as an accurate record of the meeting, seconded by Ms Carpenter. A vote took place and subsequently the minutes of the meeting were approved.

**ITEM 5.      MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
AND RESULTS OF RECOMMENDATIONS PASSED TO THE  
FIELD TRIALS COMMITTEE (RESULTS OF  
RECOMMENDATIONS)**

21. The Council noted the Results of Recommendations document which had been circulated prior to the meeting.
22. It was noted that a query regarding Drive Certificates would be discussed further in an item submitted under Any Other Business.
23. The Council queried a point raised in the Results of Recommendations document regarding dogs of non-standard colour. It was queried whether the statement that 'dogs that did not adhere to the breed standard in other elements were not excluded from entering field trials, therefore the colour should not be a consideration' was false.
24. It was of the opinion that generally the Labradors competing in field trials did meet the breed standard, however it was silver, charcoal, champagne coloured Labradors, or those found to have the dilute gene that did not meet the breed standards and should not be eligible to be awarded a Stud Book number.
25. Concern was expressed with the current Kennel Club arrangement that in the past those Labradors had been registered with the Kennel Club,

however the Council noted that imports were now required to be tested for the dilute gene.

26. It was highlighted that there were now also 'blue' Weimaraners, which were also considered to be a non standard colour and should not be eligible to be awarded a Stud Book number in order to protect the breed standard.
27. It was confirmed by the office that the Field Trials Committee had discussed the matter on several occasions, and it was of the opinion that the dogs should be awarded based on their working ability and merit rather than appearance or colour.

## **ITEM 6.      PROPOSALS FROM SOCIETIES**

### Proposed amendment to J(B)7d(3) - Retriever's Trial Procedure

28. The East Anglian Labrador Retriever Club and the Eastern Counties Retriever Society, represented by Mrs Reed, wished to make an amendment to regulation J(B)7d(3) to provide clarity in order of sending when there were dogs from different rounds in line at a Retriever trial.
29. The proposal was seconded by Ms Pinn.
30. A potential issue was raised whereby handlers with more than one dog could have one dog on five retrieves and another on four and this proposal could cause confusion.
31. It was highlighted that it was clear in the guide for J regulations (formerly the seminar scripts) how the regulation was to be interpreted. However, it was raised that this may not be clear within the J regulations themselves.
32. Following a brief discussion, a vote took place, with a majority in favour and the proposal was **recommended** for approval to the Field Trials Committee.

### Proposed amendment to Regulation J12.a.(6) - Judging of spouses or partners

33. The North Western Counties Field Trial Association, represented by Mr Richardson, wished to propose an amendment to regulation J12.a.(6) to make it clear that it was unacceptable to run a dog at a trial or working test that was being judged by a spouse or partner.
34. The proposal was seconded by Mr McGrath.
35. Mr Wroe proposed an amendment to the proposal. He was of the opinion that "to have been handled at a trial, boarded or prepared for competition by one of the scheduled judges within the previous 12 months prior to the trial" should not be struck through and should remain in the regulation. Therefore, the following amendment to the proposal was suggested.

### Regulation J12.a.(6)

**TO:**

To have been handled at a trial, boarded or prepared for competition by one of the scheduled judges within the previous twelve months prior to the trial. **No person should enter or handle a dog for competition at a field trial or working test at which their spouse or partner is judging.** This provision does not apply to judges appointed in an emergency.

(Insertion in Bold.)

(Effective from 2 February 2026)

36. Mrs Venturi-Rose seconded the amended proposal.
37. It was considered that immediate family members should also be added to the regulation.
38. The Council was advised of the wording used by other activity disciplines: 'Handled by the scheduled judge's spouse, immediate family or is resident at the same address as the scheduled judge. This shall not apply to a judge appointed in an emergency.'
39. It was suggested that partners not living at the same address or not living full time at the same address should also be considered. However, it was noted that it would be difficult to include all types of scenarios for relationships and living situations within the regulations.
40. The Council queried whether, for consistency, the other activities regulation wording be adopted by the J regulations as well.
41. As the Council agreed that it was not intended for the 'To have been handled at a trial, boarded or prepared for competition by one of the scheduled judges within the previous twelve months prior to the trial' to be removed, the second amendment was withdrawn for consideration. There was some confusion as to the placement of the amendment, but it was considered that J.12 - Disqualification and forfeit of awards, would be the most appropriate location.
42. A further amendment was suggested by Ms Carpenter and Mrs Venturi-Rose seconded the proposal.

Regulation J12.a.(6)

**TO:**

To have been handled at a trial, boarded or prepared for competition by one of the scheduled judges within the previous twelve months prior to the trial **or handled by the scheduled judge's spouse, immediate family or is resident at the same address as the scheduled judge.** This provision does not apply to judges appointed in an emergency.

(Insertion in Bold.)

(Effective from 2 February 2026)

43. It was queried as to whether 'handled' should be amended to 'entered', however it was noted that a dog could be entered by an owner who may not be the handler and therefore 'handled' was most appropriate.
44. There was some discussion about the regulation applying to the Championships. It was discussed that it was hard to qualify for the Championships therefore it would not be fair to restrict those handlers from entering if it did apply to them.
45. It was consequently suggested that the proposed regulation should not apply to Championship trials, and therefore Mr Rees proposed to amend the proposal to clarify it did not apply to Championship trials. Mrs Venturi-Rose seconded the amended proposal, as follows.

Regulation J12.a.(6)

**TO:**

To have been handled at a trial, boarded or prepared for competition by one of the scheduled judges ~~within the previous twelve months prior to the trial~~ **or by the scheduled judge's spouse, immediate family or is resident at the same address as the scheduled judge within the previous twelve months prior to the trial.** This provision does not apply to judges appointed in an emergency **or at any Field Trial Championship or Champion Stake.**

(Insertion in Bold. Deletion struck through.)

(Effective from 2 February 2026)

46. There was concern that the Field Trials Committee would amend the proposals if it felt necessary, and that those amends may not reflect the original proposal brought forward from the grass roots. The office confirmed that that was within the remit of the Committee.
47. The Council also discussed the term 'resident at the same address', however it was highlighted that the regulation applied to the dog and not the handler, and that it was the residence of the dog that was being referred to in the regulation.
48. Following a lengthy discussion, a vote took place. The Council unanimously voted for the proposal and therefore the amended proposal from Mr Rees was **recommended** to the Field Trials Committee for approval.

**ITEM 7.      DISCUSSION ITEMS**

Training Programmes

49. Mrs Reed presented the discussion item on behalf of the East Anglian Labrador Retriever Club and the Eastern Counties Retriever Society. The Council was requested to discuss instigating an up to date, ongoing training programme for all judges. This training programme listed a number of suggestions, including: Clubs receiving guidance from the Kennel Club in how to run practical judge training days, classroom seminars, and directions to provide judge 'shadowing' appointments.



50. The Council was informed that there had been discussions amongst panel and non-panel judges regarding a lack of a proper training programme for judges. The list of suggestions had been put forward to implement an ongoing programme for judges.
51. The Labrador Retriever Club raised that they had put forward a similar proposal a few years ago and it was not clear what the outcome of this item had been. The office investigated the matter and advised the Council of the Result of Recommendation from the previous meeting.
52. At the Council's meeting held on 31 May 2022, a similar item had been discussed. The following outcome had been included in the Results of Recommendations document circulated to the Council and published.

*Results of recommendations forwarded to the Field Trials Committee from the Field Trials Liaison Council held at the Kennel Club on 31 May 2022*

*The Committee noted the Council's views, but expressed some reservations at imposing what may be perceived as unduly onerous requirements on aspiring judges, such as any necessity for them to maintain records of occasions on which they had assisted at trials and in what capacity, and for them to have done so on a set number of occasions. It noted that helpers in field trials did so on a voluntary basis and was of the view that obliging them to assist at trials may prove to be counterproductive.*

*It also considered that societies had a responsibility not to invite non-panel judges to officiate where there was any concern at a lack of suitable knowledge or experience.*

*Accordingly, it did not consider that the Council's suggestions should be progressed at this time, but wished to draw attention to the following Codes of Best Practice for field trial competitors for all sub-groups, which set out a number of 'target' activities, including assisting at trials.*

53. It was highlighted that there appeared to be some A panel judges who were not confident in dispatching game correctly and it was suggested that this be added to the judges training, or made a part of the assessment when judges were nominated to the panel.
54. It was noted that HPR societies had a criteria of what prospective judges must have completed before taking up judging appointments and it was highlighted that many HPR societies already held training days for judges.
55. It was raised how important it would be for judges to have a forum and an open discussion in the hope of improving the quality of the judging. The standard of judging was raised, and it was considered that the points within this discussion item could be beneficial, with further consideration.

56. It was agreed that a training programme for all judges was a good idea, however some elements listed in the discussion were already covered within the J regulations and the Seminars. It was agreed that certain areas of judging did need improvement.
57. It was highlighted that there was information on the Kennel Club website that would be helpful to judges, especially with regards to the handling of game.
58. It was noted that unless the requirements listed were made compulsory it would be difficult to insist judges comply with them.
59. It was highlighted that it should be the responsibility of the clubs and societies to organise training days for judges. The Council also noted that these days did not have to run at a loss, and people could be required to pay to attend to ensure the club did not incur a financial loss. It was noted that overreliance on the Kennel Club would be an unrealistic approach.
60. Concern was raised with the number of panel judges within Pointer & Setters and that these restrictions would not be achievable within that sub-group and may be detrimental to running trials.
61. It was noted that apart from the J regulation examination there was no practical training in place for field trial judges, and it was highlighted that field trials were the only discipline that did not have one. The office highlighted that the judge's education programme currently only applied to breed showing judges.
62. It was noted that it was the clubs and societies who selected the judges for trials and not the Kennel Club and that they should only be appointing judges who had the appropriate experience. It was highlighted that it was important for judges to complete the judge's evaluation forms accurately in order for the Field Trials Committee to recommend good and appropriate judges to the next Panel.
63. It was highlighted that education was a complex topic. The list of approved presenters had been expanded and more detailed presentations had been developed in order to enhance the current training.
64. It was queried whether a proposal should be considered at a future meeting with regards to the handling of game, as there was concern that judges were not willing to dispatch game correctly.
65. A suggestion was made that parts of the requirements within this discussion item be included as part of the judge's contract.
66. It was requested that a proposal be brought forward to the next meeting, and that societies should be encouraged to hold training days for the

relevant subgroups. The office agreed to include an item in the field trials newsletter reminding societies that they could run training days for judges should they wish to do so. The Council agreed that this was a good interim solution.

#### Judge Reporting Systems

67. Mrs Reed presented the discussion item on behalf of the East Anglian Labrador Retriever Club and the Eastern Counties Retriever Society. The Council was requested to discuss bringing in a reporting system for all Judges, so that non-panel judges could report on panel judges, and B panel judges could report on A panel judges.
68. It was highlighted that there had been scenarios where Panel judges had not been supportive of non-panel judges.
69. It was agreed that societies needed to know that the panel judges they had appointed were doing a good job and that fair assessments were being given.
70. It was raised that this had been discussed previously by the Council and it was confirmed by the Field Trials Committee that any feedback on Panel judges should be reported in the incident book. However, it was raised that non panel judges may not wish to report issues in this way and that the incident book appeared to have negative connotations. It was hoped that a 360-degree assessment model would highlight any issues when judges were nominated to the Panels.
71. It was noted that providing good feedback was sometimes difficult and that some feedback was undetailed or too vague.
72. It was queried whether the Field Trials Committee was satisfied with the current standard of panel judges and whether the Committee believed those judges to be competent in their role. The Council noted that the Field Trials Committee had no reason to doubt the competency of the panel judges until given a reason to, through feedback. It was highlighted that it would have to be a breach of regulation and would need to be formally reported and not through hearsay.
73. The Council was reminded that when judges were being nominated to a Judging Panel, the Committee could only act on what was included in the evaluation comments from their co judges. It was highlighted that the A Panel judges were responsible for the management of the trial, and it was beholden on them to accurately report on their co judges on the B or Non-Panel.
74. It was noted that the A panel judges were currently exempt from feedback, and it was suggested that a tick list or form could be available for non-panel judges to complete so that they could provide feedback.

75. It was agreed that the discussion item would be revised and resubmitted for consideration at the Councils next meeting.

Handlers of two dogs

76. Mrs Venturi-Rose, speaking on behalf of Ms Joint, presented the discussion item on behalf of the Burns and Becks Gundog Club. The club requested the Council discuss a health and safety issue which had come to prominence with the increasing number of triallers handling more than one dog at trials. The club suggested that this should not be a decision made by the Field Trials Committee, but by individual Field Trial Club committees alone who understood and knew the ground on which their trials were held. It was raised that they should have the freedom to insist on their schedules that handlers of two dogs bring a deputy to hold their second dog whilst the first was being handled in line, unless unavoidable by being called from the reserves at the last minute.
77. It was highlighted that there could be a health and safety risk depending on the ground used for the trial, and there was concern over who would be liable for any incidents if a stranger was holding another handler's dog. It was noted that it should be up to the society to look at the terrain at the trial and decide whether they required a handler to hold a second dog if deemed necessary.
78. The Council queried whether it was necessary for the Field Trials Committee to discuss the issue or if it was at the club's discretion. It was noted that the wording "if you're running more than one dog can you make arrangements for a deputy handler to hold your second dog " or similar had been included on several schedules.
79. The office confirmed that as long as handlers were not being penalised and were still able to enter and run both dogs in the trial, even if they were not able to bring a deputy, then societies could include wording to that effect.
80. There was concern that if trial officials were holding second dogs, they may not be able to conduct their required role as well.
81. It was queried what would happen at a trial if a handler had not brought a deputy handler, and neither an official or someone in the gallery was not able to hold the second dog. It was agreed that if that scenario happened the handler would have to withdraw from the trial.
82. It was highlighted that this would be across all sub-groups and that if it was insisted that a second deputy handler was always required there may be a risk that trials could be cancelled due to a lack of entries.
83. The Council concluded that it would feed the discussion item back to their clubs and remind the clubs to refrain from using the word 'must' when asking competitors to bring a handler to hold their other dogs.

Regulation J6.f.

84. Ms Ford presented the discussion item on behalf of the South Western Golden Retriever Club. It requested the Council discuss whether the regulation allowing a refund of an entry fee where a dog was withdrawn from a trial 7 days prior to the stake be amended or reconsidered.
85. The Council discussed how some clubs still took payments via cheque and that some of the club bank accounts (business accounts) were charging additional fees for those payments. It was noted that not all business accounts charged those fees and that clubs should investigate their best banking options.
86. It was considered the clubs could increase their entry or nomination fees to cover the costs.
87. The Council was reminded that the reasons in which a society was able to keep a competitor's entry fee were only those as stipulated in the regulations (J6.f). Whilst some situations, such as a car breaking down may prevent a competitor from taking their run, the clubs would not necessarily be obliged to refund the entry fee for that occurrence.
88. There was concern raised that J6.f was not applied in all scenarios, and the wording was 'may' not 'must' therefore some legitimate refunds were not being issued. It was requested that the provisions of J6.f was included in the field trials newsletter as a reminder to clubs and societies. It was noted that if refunds were not issued by a society, a report could be submitted to the office for investigation.

Nominations of Spaniel Judges for the Championship

89. The item had been withdrawn for consideration.

**ITEM 8.      ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Drive Certificates

90. Ms Whyte raised the item on behalf of Mr Capstick and the Yorkshire Gundog Club. It raised the question whether the drive certificate was still necessary.
91. The Yorkshire Gundog Club requested the Field Trial Liaison Council discuss and recommend a review by the Field Trials Committee to assess whether the drive certificate remained a meaningful and essential component of field trials.
92. The item was raised as a result of an item at the previous meeting with regard to a proposal to create a walked up certificate.
93. The percentage of trials held as walked up or driven was queried. It was raised that even in a walked up trial there may still be driven elements. It was also highlighted that it was a fundamental part of a Retriever's job.

94. It was suggested that if a judge felt a dog was worthy of winning an Open stake whether that be in a walked up or driven trial, which therefore contributed to its Champion qualification, would the drive certificate still be required.
95. It was agreed by the Council that the water certificate was still relevant, to ensure the dog was able to enter water readily and swim.
96. It was noted that the Field Trials Committee had previously requested that the Council submit a proposal if it felt it was necessary, in order for it to be included on the agenda. This would ensure the views of the clubs and grassroots competitors would be represented.
97. Therefore, it was agreed an item on whether the Drive certificate was still required would be submitted as a proposal for consideration at the Council's next meeting.

#### Costs to clubs

98. It was queried whether clubs could remove the requirement to appoint an auditor. It was highlighted that the membership fees of the club should cover the cost of running the club and therefore if costs were going up then consideration needed to be given into increasing fees.
99. It was raised that the Kennel Club Year Book stated that "Certification of accounts must be carried out by one qualified accountant or two individuals with accountancy experience. Those undertaking the certification must be independent from those who prepared the accounts." It was agreed that if societies chose to use "two individuals with accountancy experience" that could minimise the costs to the society.
100. It was requested that the item be submitted as a proposal or formal discussion item for consideration at its next meeting.

#### Future of the Field Trials Liaison Council

101. It was queried when the Council would receive an update on the future of the Council as it was raised that the current term of office had only been extended until December 2025. The office confirmed that there was due to be an announcement in May.

#### HPR Championship nominations

102. It was queried whether societies had the opportunity to nominate judges for the Championship, and it was confirmed that the judges were selected by the HPR Championship working party, however people could suggest judges to those working party members if required.

**The meeting closed at 14:13.**

**MS S WHYTE**  
**Chairman**

#### ***THE KENNEL CLUB'S STRATEGIC AIMS***

- *Champion the wellbeing of dogs*
- *Safeguard and enhance the future of pedigree dogs, addressing breed-associated health issues*
- *Protect the future of dog activities together with our grassroots network*
- *Become relevant to more dog owners to increase our impact*
- *Deliver an excellent member experience and widen our community*
- *Ensure we are financially secure and sustainable*